



Education
Funding
Agency

Methodology for the Selection of Successful Schools

**Priority School Building Programme
Phase 2 (PSBP2)**

January 2015

PSBP2 methodology for the selection of successful schools

The methodology set out below describes the steps followed to identify which blocks would be funded through PSBP2. We prioritised blocks where: the poor condition is most highly concentrated and urgent; where the continued operation of the school is most at risk; and where the cost to address individual projects is of such significant scale that it would be difficult to pay for them through regular school condition allocations.

The methodology includes the following steps:

1. Block matching

Expression of interest (EOI) block references (as contained within individual PSBP2 applications) were matched to the corresponding Property Data Survey Programme (PDSP) blocks.

Note: The process undertaken to match blocks applied for through the expression of interest with the corresponding blocks in the PDS showed that, in some cases, a single block as referred to in the EOI is actually made up of multiple connected PDS blocks. In cases where one or more, but not all, of these interconnected blocks has sufficient condition need to qualify for the programme, we will take a view as part of the scoping study phase as to whether the connected blocks also require rebuilding or not. However, the programme will not undertake work that is not necessary.

2. Calculation of condition need

Each block's relative condition need was calculated using the total C and D condition need as identified by the property data survey and divided by the gross internal floor area (GIFA) to produce a relative condition need value per square metre.

Explanation: The definition of condition grades C and D as assigned through the property data survey are as follows:

Condition grade C – exhibiting major defects and / or not operating as intended;

Condition grade D – life expired and / or at serious risk of imminent failure.

The Department judged the relative condition measure described above to be the most accurate way of comparing the most serious and urgent need across different buildings.

3. Ranking

Individual blocks were ranked following the rules in the order set out below:

- 3.1. Blocks that automatically make the programme because of a significant structural / asbestos need issue that can only be sustainably addressed by rebuilding.

Explanation: All EOIs which ticked the relevant box to say they had a significant structural or asbestos related issue, and provided relevant supporting documentation, were assessed by independent technical advisers. This assessment considered whether the issues were of such significance to affect the immediate integrity of the building and necessitate a full rebuild or major refurbishment. Where blocks met this threshold, the independent technical advisers calculated the cost to remedy the condition need in line with PDS principles and indices and this cost was added to the condition need identified through the PDS survey to create a revised condition need per square metre calculation. We also identified those blocks where the structural issue is significant to the building but the cost attached to repairing the issue was not large enough for them to automatically qualify for the programme. In these cases technical advisers carried out an additional test; if there is a serious structural issue which needs addressing urgently, which can only sustainably be addressed by rebuilding the block (as opposed to a short-term, stop-gap repair), then these blocks were automatically included in the programme.

- 3.2. Automatic inclusion of any blocks with work categorised as condition D need by the PDSP report that require substantial funding and would not otherwise make the programme.

Explanation: We have included those blocks within the programme where the need categorised as D through the PDS is above the 95th percentile for D need of all the blocks applied for through the programme. This step has been included to ensure that the programme can address large and urgent projects which would be hardest for those responsible for schools to fund locally through their regular school condition allocations.

- 3.3. The remaining blocks were then ranked by their total C and D need per square metre (including structural and asbestos costings) and the total cost of the work needed to address the condition need of each block was estimated.

4. Minimum project thresholds

The indicative project costs of successful blocks were aggregated to school-level and any schools which did not meet the minimum estimated project threshold of £250,000 for primary (Nursery/Primary & Special/PRU) and £500,000 for secondary (Secondary, 16 Plus, All Through) were removed.

Explanation: Minimum project thresholds have been set to ensure the programme only addresses those projects that are hardest for those responsible for schools to fund locally through their regular school condition allocations.

5. Project Selection

The steps set about above resulted in a ranked list. Successful projects were determined by the point at which the blocks could no longer be funded within the programme's allocated budget.



Education
Funding
Agency

© Crown copyright 2015

This 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/publications

Reference: EFA-00055-2015



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



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk