

Development of the Campus Asset Management Plan

The original thrust for the concept of asset management planning came about when the Labour administration decided that the backlog of repairs/maintenance to schools needed significant capital investment. Nobody was quite sure as to the extent of capital monies that would be needed to put things right in England and Wales as a whole.

Each local authority was charged with producing its own LEA-wide asset management plan (AMP). Each plan would look at the condition of its schools, the sufficiency of accommodation and the suitability for the different teaching requirements. In my own authority (Leicestershire), our first LEA AMP was a huge document (for my own school) that was several inches thick. Due to time and resource restrictions, we felt it to be too 'broad brush' for our school's needs, if we were to be able to use it for detailed campus planning.

For instance, bold statements such as 'replace 10% of guttering/down pipes' in general do not help the on-site team decide a) which guttering or b) if it is better to replace the gutters at all (what if the building purpose is set to change?) and even c) if limited money would be better spent elsewhere. Consequently, we commissioned our own survey, paid for by us and which we fed into our own development ideas.

At this stage our own campus AMP (CAMP) was still very much a centrally driven document discussed largely by the LEA, headteacher, business and community manager and site manager.

With the arrival of our new head, Chris Williams, in January 2004 there was a significant move to 'shared leadership', with much greater emphasis on medium and longer-term planning, together with ACTIVE involvement of the governing body at committee level, as well as teachers and pupils.

Key aspects of this shared leadership, as described by Anne Clarke have informed our latest CAMP including:

1. A strong leadership team with the emphasis on teamwork
2. Delegation by the Head "within an atmosphere of trust
3. An involvement of staff at all levels in decision making
4. An ethos that promotes pupil participation, such as listening to the 'pupil voice'
5. A governing body that allows this to happen

In drawing up our current three-year CAMP, the following steps took place in an atmosphere of shared leadership using the above points.

- a) Site manager refers to LEA and self-commissioned, site-wide AMP document for identified major structural needs. These are discussed with the business and community manager. These include people's basic needs of being warm, dry and safe.



- b) Site manager/business and community manager and school health and safety committee consider legislation requirements, including Legionella prevention, asbestos removal, fire prevention survey recommendations, and incorporate into draft plan.
- c) Site manager received reports from contractors carrying out annual survey work including heating engineers, plumbers etc and incorporates work needed into the draft plan.
- d) Staff feed back from the whole school working parties, and individual faculties and departmental development plans are drawn on.
- e) Campus survey by key staff including health and safety committee, union representatives etc is carried out (once per term), and again put into the draft plan, including a record of slips, trips, falls and lighting.
- f) The leadership team discusses teaching and learning needs and identifies key areas for development and refurbishment including entire maths block and certain design technology areas. The needs of pupils regarding Healthy Eating and Healthy School initiative were identified.
- g) Pupils are involved via student council meetings between staff and students, and joint planning meetings with staff/pupils and governors. Toilets were very high on their agenda.

Parents' views are sought through surveys and at parents' evenings.

The next stage was for the business and community manager to produce the draft CAMP with the headteacher. This document listed expenditure of approximately 300% of the available budget! At the same time the business and community manager (note – not the headteacher) presented the document to the governors' campus development committee (a committee with full delegated executive powers) for general consideration and discussion.

After due deliberation, the head and business and community manager – bearing in mind the school's needs – come to a recommended priority list. This is then taken back by the business and community manager to the next governors' committee and the first year of the three-year plan is formally approved and goes forward to full a governors committee. Years 2 and 3 will go forward to September 2005 meetings and other subsequent meetings for finer details and 'firming up' once budgets are known and as 'demand led' needs are identified.

