

## **Meeting of Madras Parent Council, adjourned from previous meeting**

**Wed 8 Feb 2012**

- 1. Present** – Dawn Waddell, Cllr Ron Caird, Karen Barnett, John Barnett, Rory MacLeod, Andy Primmer, David Rickman, Rachel Naismith, Ian Jones, Jane Pettegree, Rhona Froom, Bruce Sinclair.
- 2. Apologies for absence** Charlotte Kirby, Linda Hardie, Rebecca Trengove, Jackie Himpson, Councillor Tim Brett, Florence Tanniou, Debbie Cunningham, Hugh Watson, Sam Byers, Staff members other than the Rector, Joanna Walker, Phil Williams, Emma Henderson
- 3. Fife Council's Consultation on its proposals for the replacement of Madras College –**

A decision was required on how to respond as a Parent Council to the consultation question, as requested by Fife Council. It was proposed that, as a statutory consultee, the Parent Council should make an unqualified response to the question, though comments may be added as part of the process if desired.

If this is agreed, it was further proposed that a secret Yes/No ballot be held after any Parent Council member who wishes to speak has addressed the meeting. Because this meeting was not a scheduled meeting and so that any response to Fife Council is as representative of the Parent Council as possible, any member who was not able to be present for some or all of the meeting was invited to submit to the Vice-Chairman or Secretary their vote in writing

The meeting decided to take the initial decision making process in three stages:-

- a) Does the MPC respond or not?
- b) If we do agree to respond then do we fill in a Y/N choice?
- c) If we agree to fill in a Y/N as a corporate view as a consultee, take this vote

Then to decide

- d) If we wish to append comments

Q - Can comments go in without yes/no decision? Yes. But may be difficult to find a consensus view.

The acting chair proposed that we respond, other members suggested not, as we have individual views that we can express, and we as a PC are there to help the School with whatever happens. Others may see a decision as being representative of parents, rather than just the views of those round this table. Difficulties that individuals may then be part of a vote that they do not agree with. Some worries therefore about the process under which we are being asked to act. Councillors at the last time said they would value a response from the Parent Council.

A number of votes were then taken. As per the constitution only parent members voted. Several parent members who were not present had submitted their votes to the Chair or Secretary. Vote counting was done by the Chair and Secretary.

Should we respond to the consultation – Yes 17, No 3 – result was we will respond in some way.

Should we tick a box, of some form, Yes 14, No 6 – result was we agreed to proceed submit a yes/no response, and so move on to take that vote

Vote on supporting the proposal to create a New Madras on the Kilrymont site - yes 7, No 9 – result is that the Parent Council will submit a No response to the consultation.

A wide ranging discussion was held on what response comments should go in on the form, this included comments such as:-

There are Concerns on decant. Only a limited amount of data has been provided. Why is there a different Fife Council view on decant here than at Burntisland? Will councillors monitor this properly please if it goes ahead – put in time to redo if necessary.

Site appraisal should be redone better and transparently.

Bussing makes KR in the wrong place, but community use is good having it where it is.

We are being asked to take a lot on trust.

There is a great deal of anxiety about the decant arrangements.

How many classrooms in KR- Rector not in a position to state, but decant rooms Rector says there will be enough there to do what is needed, at 80-90% occupancy. Roll drops slightly over next few years. Timetable modelled to show that the decant will work. John comments that Fife Councillors are responsible and will make sure that any decant will work.

Should state that there was not unanimity in decision. Chair disagrees. Without a comment on numbers there is the chance of people who may make mischief.

A member proposed we add the comment “Result was clear, but not unanimous”. Another member seconded. For 9, against 2. Proposal carried.

There was discussion about further comments, which were in due course agreed by consensus, and as listed below, along with the previously agreed comment. The emailed comments from one member were considered – some of those comments are covered by the general comments below.

- Result of the vote was clear, but not unanimous
- We need more information on the decant
- There is concern over environmental Implications of bussing over the next decades.
- There are concerns over the adequacy of site appraisal process.