

Scrutiny Panel December 8th 2016

I speak on behalf of Education for Everyone.

You have before you tonight a paper that that has been called in for various reasons such as :

Undue influence

Lack of due consideration of available information.

No discussion on consultation

I will only highlight our further concerns.

1. **RBWM wasted resident's money because of their haste to form a satellite Grammar School here. RBWM are doing the same again with this paper.**

When the government indicated a satellite grammar school would be allowed in Kent, RBWM started committing money and resources to open a satellite here. They commissioned a report costing £20,000 and Sir William Borlase seems to have been the only interested partner (incidentally as a resident I'm denied access to this report). At cabinet RBWM Leader Simon Dudley referred to Sir William Borlase as a disgrace because the proportion of students eligible for free school meals is very low as is the proportion of students with a statement of special educational needs. This information has been in the public domain since 2012 but RBWM still saw them as a potential partner to introduce selective education here.

2. **Currently it's illegal to introduce new selective schools.** It is unlikely there is a big enough majority in parliament to ensure the law changes but still RBWM seeks to commit money and officers time to a change in the education system that may not happen. Instead, we should focus on initiatives that will improve our current school system.
3. **History and data tells us academic selection in secondary education doesn't work.** Supporters of selection tell us that the new grammar schools will not be the same as the current grammar schools but how can they say this when we don't even know how they will be structured?
4. **What is the rush for this?** Mrs May has expressed her vision that new grammar schools focus on areas of deprivation. RBWM is not an area of deprivation.

As a scrutiny panel your task is **to hold the executive to account** for their policy making and their use of resources. Support for this paper will endorse wasting more resident's money on a pursuit of selection that as I've previously stated is not yet legal.

Please continue to support our excellent comprehensives and let's debate the suitability for selective secondary education when and if the law changes