

## SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE

**Venue:** Town Hall, Moorgate  
Street, Rotherham.

**Date:** Thursday, 20 January 2005

**Time:** 9.30 a.m.

### A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any items which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies
4. Minutes of previous meeting held on 30th September, 2004 (copy herewith). (Pages 1 - 5)
5. Matters Arising
6. Minutes of a meeting of the Local Admissions Forum held on 11th November, 2004 (copy herewith). (Pages 6 - 9)
7. Matters Arising
8. ONS reclassification of Rural/Urban Areas (list enclosed). (Page 10)
9. The Education (School Organisation Proposals)(Miscellaneous Amendments)(England) Regulations 2004 (herewith). (Pages 11 - 12)
10. DfES Five Year Strategy: Consultation on Proposals for Foundation Schools, Expanding Popular and Successful Schools and Adding Sixth Forms (herewith). (Pages 13 - 16)
11. Redscope Infant and Junior Schools - Proposed 'amalgamation' (verbal report).
12. Children Act 2004: School Organisation Committees and the Children & Young People's Plan (letter enclosed - not available electronically). (Pages 17 - 18)
13. Date and Time of Next Meeting

**SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 2004**

Present:- Councillor Boyes (in the Chair)

Mr. F. McDermott (Roman Catholic Schools)  
Mr. M. Robertson (Church of England)  
Mr. P. Robins (Junior and Infant Schools)  
Mr. B. Sampson (Church of England)  
Mr. M. Sulleman (Minority Communities Group)  
Mr. A. Walker (11-16 Secondary Schools)  
Mrs. B. Watson (Infant Schools)  
Mr. P. White (Church of England)

Also in attendance were the following officers:-

Mr. M. Harrop (Education, Culture and Leisure Services)  
Mr. D. Hill (Education, Culture and Leisure Services)  
Mrs. A. Hercock (Education, Culture and Leisure Services)  
Mrs. S. Green, Democratic Services Officer

**1. WELCOME NEW MEMBERS AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Susan Green, Committee Services Officer, welcomed those in attendance, and particularly a new Member attending for the first time.

**2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Ann Winfield, Christine Lawler, Councillor Austen, Pat Lennighan, and Jackie Scott.

**3. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

Resolved:- That Councillor Boyes be appointed Chairman of this Committee for 2004/2005.

(Councillor Boyes took the Chair for this meeting).

**4. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

Resolved:- That Bronwen Watson be appointed Vice-Chairman of this Committee for 2004/2005.

**5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH FEBRUARY, 2004**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> February, 2004 be received as a correct record.

**6. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM**

**HELD ON 13TH MAY, 2004**

Resolved:- That the minutes of a meeting of the Local Admissions Forum held on 13<sup>th</sup> May, 2004 be received as a correct record.

**7. UPDATE TO SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2003/04-2007/08**

Martin Harrop reported on the proposed update to the School Organisation Plan 2003/04-2007/08. This had been put together in response to DfES advice and gave an opportunity to look at the demographic information, particularly in relation to the actual numbers entering schools in 2003/04 compared to the estimates contained within the Plan.

The main issues referred to and discussed were:-

**Section 1 - % of schools with 25% + unfilled places**

8 Primary Schools – 1 Secondary School

However, in both the Primary and Secondary sectors the numbers entering Reception and Y7 were greater than estimated and, therefore, the % of surplus places overall were smaller in both cases. In line with this, the % of pupils in excess of school capacity in secondary schools rose, as anticipated, but to a slightly greater extent.

Members considered the schools which had 25%+ surplus places and the changes which were already in the pipeline such as new build at Dinnington Primary, PFI at Maltby Craggs and the closure of Kimberworth Comprehensive.

**Section 7 – Numbers entering Reception**

Statistics showed that rather than migration away from Rotherham, it was now the opposite position.

The Chair commented that, certainly in terms of work addressed within the regeneration of Rotherham, evidence did point to the beginning of a growth in population.

This factor also seemed to be the case regarding Admission Appeals and more families were coming to Rotherham from neighbouring authorities.

The figure relating to the birth rate had shown a slight rise and a tendency to follow the evidence in terms of when Rotherham last had a very small cohort which was approximately 25/26 years ago.

**Secondary Schools – Forecast for Yr7**

Figures highlight some of the problems in terms of admissions and that

numbers were very much at the height currently going into Year 7. The final entry figure was 3840 compared to an estimate of 3777, an increase of 63.

### **Section 9 – Primary Schools**

This section dealt with the twelve planning areas.

Aston/Aughton has the biggest difference of predicted and actual numbers on roll. Other areas where actuals were greater than the predicted numbers were considered, particularly in relation to Appendix 7 of the Plan, which outlined the largest house building development areas.

Members referred to the Admission Appeals process and the fact that Dinnington/Wales/Aston had the most pressure on schools with no other schools in the area to send children.

The meeting discussed the issue of some Rotherham schools filling with children from outside the authority and a situation which then arose when Rotherham parents did not submit early applications and numbers were high.

One member raised a question on whether new schools were planned for Aston/Aughton.

Reference was made to the 30 limit legislation which could mean a child not being able to attend a primary school next door to their home address.

### **Section 11 – Special Education Provision**

Proposals for statutory changes at 5 of the 7 Special Schools had been agreed, as outlined.

In addition, there were 3 changes in terms of SEN units at three other schools – Swinton Community School, A Maths and Computing College, Rawmarsh Sandhill and Wales Primary.

It was noted that there will be a Single Education Plan in 2006, details of which were presently awaited.

Resolved:- That the information be received.

## **8. REVISED GUIDANCE ON STATUTORY PROPOSALS TO CLOSE RURAL SCHOOLS AND CONSULTATION ON THE EDUCATION (MISCELLANEOUS)(ENGLAND)(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2004**

### **(a) Revised Guidance on Statutory Proposals to close Rural Schools**

Consideration was given to a report of the Principal Officer, Planning, Resources and Information which outlined revised guidance to replace the

previous DfES guidance for decision makers (i.e. the School Organisation Committee/LEA/Adjudicator) on the closure of rural schools.

The difference was only slight but placed an onus on proposers to provide evidence to demonstrate that within their proposal they have considered specific matters.

The current information held on Edubase showed wards rather than schools being classed as rural, although the guidance also made the point that it was up to School Organisation Committees to determine what they consider to be rural in their individual areas.

One Member commented that Rotherham LEA had a very good record of supporting small schools, which it was felt was reflected in a rise in the quality of education.

The revised guidance, which is statutory, comes into effect from 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2004.

(b) Consultation on the Education (Miscellaneous) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2004

The proposed regulations would amend parts of three pieces of current school organisation legislation – the Education (School Organisation Proposals) (England) Regulations 1999, the Education (School Organisation Committee) (England) Regulations 1999 and the Education (References to Adjudicator) Regulations 1999.

It is intended that regulations 2-4 and 11-13 will come into force in the Autumn, and regulations 5-10 in February, 2005. The latter are the regulations which relate to membership of the SOC.

Martin Harrop, on behalf of the School Organisation Committee, had responded to the proposals.

The most significant changes and the ones where action may/will be required are amending the definition of 'relevant school' to include nursery schools which will then also enable, through further amendment, the inclusion of a nursery school representative within the Schools Group of the SOC where there is at least one such school in the area. The requirement to include a Special School Representative is removed but only where there is no special school within the LEA area.

As the information from DfES on nursery representation had been ambiguous, this had been discussed with them. DfES had agreed to look into this matter and a response was presently awaited, the outcome of which may mean the need to obtain a Nursery representative to serve on the School Organisation Committee.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That further information from DfES on a proposed change to the inclusion of a nursery school representative on the School Organisation Committee be submitted to a future meeting.

**9. MEMBERSHIP/RESIGNATIONS/TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Secretary submitted details of recent new membership on to the Minority Communities Group, and resignations on the School Organisation Committee.

Resolved:- (1) That an advertisement be placed in the next School Governors Newsletter asking for representatives to substitute on the following Schools' Groups:-

11-16 Secondary Schools  
11-18 Secondary Schools  
Infant School

(2) That, on behalf of the School Organisation Committee, the Secretary write to Sue Birkin thanking her for the work she has carried out on the Committee and extending the Committee's very best wishes for her future health.

**10. LATEST NEWS FROM SCHOOL ORGANISATION UNIT, DFES**

The meeting considered an e-mail received from Jo Bell, School Organisation Unit informing of the Forum's Home Page entitled 'SOC Health Checks Available', now being offered by the Chief Schools Adjudicator following a recent pilot exercise.

The aim of the programme is to improve SOC's understanding of their statutory duties and framework in which they operate, and provide information and support to SOCs to help ensure they reach well founded decisions in accordance with regulations and guidance.

Martin Harrop reported that no further information was available due to the website having recently been unavailable.

Resolved:- That further information on this matter be submitted to the next meeting.

**11. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

This was agreed for Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

**LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM  
11th November, 2004**

Present:- Mr. B. N. Sampson (Church of England), Mrs. G. Atkin (Church of England), Mr. P. Storey (Diocese of Hallam), Mr. F. Hedge (Community Representative) and Mr. G. Lancashire (Junior and Infant Schools)

Also in attendance were Mrs. J. Griffiths, Mr. D. Hill (LEA), Miss. M. Jordan (LEA) and Tom Minett (RMBC)

**1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

Agreed:- That Councillor Hodgkiss be appointed Chairman of this Forum for the 2004/05 Municipal Year.

(Mr. B. N. Sampson took the Chair for this meeting)

**2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Agreed:- That Mrs. I. Hartley be appointed Vice-Chairman of this forum for the 2004/05 Municipal Year.

**3. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Boyes, Austen and Hodgkiss, Mrs. P. Powell, Mrs. I. Hartley and Mr. M. Robertson.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM HELD ON 13TH MAY, 2004**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 13th May, 2004 were accepted as a true record.

**5. MATTERS ARISING - ADMISSION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL 2005/06 - DRAFT BOOKLET**

Marina Jordan informed the meeting that the booklet had been submitted to the Press Office for comments on the content.

Some amendments had been suggested which were incorporated prior to the booklet being distributed.

**6. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 2004**

The minutes of the meeting of the above Committee were received and the content noted.

**7. MATTERS ARISING - SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2003/04 TO 2007/08**

David Hill informed the meeting of the up to date situation regarding new build projects.

It was noted that Rotherham schools were still popular with parents that lived outside the Borough, the effect of this and the difficulties that can result for Rotherham schools when places were allowed for extra district pupils were outlined.

The meeting was informed of the situation for 2004 in respect of the number of appeals heard compared with previous years.

The number had been reduced, the main reduction being the number of appeals heard for Church Aided Schools.

**8. ADMISSIONS CONSULTATION 2006/07**

Marina Jordan and Joanne Griffiths reported on the content of a report which, for admission numbers and admissions criteria, gave governors the opportunity to consider the admission arrangements which will apply for 2006/07.

The Local Admissions Forum has previously considered the requirements for consultation and has agreed that the LEA should facilitate this, as far as possible, by use of the Authority's Internet site.

The timetable for consideration of the arrangements is :-

Autumn Term 2004	Governing bodies consider the arrangements which will apply
By 14th January 2005	All relevant details to be forwarded to the LEA
18th January – 1st March 2005	Period of consultation via the LEA's website
By end of March	LEA and other Local Admission Forum consider any changes and forward any comments to appropriate Admission Authority(ies)
By 15th April 2005	All admission authorities to determine their arrangements and notify those consulted.

The report submitted set out the arrangements for Voluntary Aided Schools and for Community Controlled Schools.

Admission numbers, for all schools, for 2005/06 and proposed numbers for 2006/07 were submitted with the report along with advice on action to be taken in order to agree, or not, to the admission number indicated.

Reference was made to the co-ordinated admission arrangements from 2005/06, it being noted that it was intended to amend the scheme for



secondary preferences for 2006/07.

This was only in respect of extending the existing arrangements in South Yorkshire to include Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.

Discussion took place on the admission arrangements for pupils with special needs, whether statemented or not.

It was acknowledged that there would be more pupils with special needs in mainstream schools due to the inclusion policy. The effect of this on a school's admission criteria was referred to, it being under (v) for community schools (specific medical reason), as was the reasonableness/practicality of a particular school for a child with special needs e.g. accessibility and curriculum requirements being available on ground floor accommodation.

The Booklet and Common Application Form included reference to the need for parents to inform the Authority/School Governing Body of a child's medical needs. This would enable teaching staff to be made aware at an early stage of a child's requirements both educationally and physically.

The possible effect on schools' budgets was referred to should adaptations be required to cater for a child's needs and the need for schools to have an access plan. Such issues were to be considered when designing future plans of school buildings.

It was accepted that schools which were suitably adapted could receive a disproportionate number of children with a disability, although the numbers involved were low.

Agreed- That the report be received.

### **9. CO-ORDINATED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS**

Marina Jordon and Joanne Griffiths gave information in respect of :-

(a) the responses received from aided schools and other LEAs. The process appeared to be operating satisfactorily;

(b) the situation whereby parents were reminded to submit a preference for a school.;

(c) the relatively few queries received in respect of the new arrangements, the majority being from parents not living in the Rotherham LEA;

(d) the timetable for the co-ordinated arrangements;

(e) the questionnaire in the booklet (parental survey) and early responses

indicating that the information set out was in a way which parents could understand.

**10. PRIMARY AND SECONDARY ADMISSION BOOKLETS**

Booklets were distributed to those present. It was explained that the information contained therein was available in different formats.

**11. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- That the next meeting be arranged for Thursday 17th March, 2005 commencing at 9.30 a.m.

## ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

**ONS reclassification of Rural/Urban Areas.**

Information has now been received on the reclassification carried out by the Office for National Statistics on areas within Rotherham. This information can now be used by the S.O.C. if faced with any proposal for closure, as suggested in the DfES' recently revised guidance on such matters.

Overall 52.7% of the Rotherham area is classed as rural and that area contains 12.38% of the population.

Schools actually situated within the areas classed as rural are:

**PRIMARY**

Aston Fence  
 Harthill  
 Kiveton Park Inf.  
 Kiveton Park Meadows Jnr.  
 Laughton  
 Laughton C.E.  
 Thorpe Hesley Inf.  
 Thorpe Hesley Jnr.  
 Thrybergh Fullerton CE  
 Thurcroft Inf.  
 Thurcroft Jnr.  
 Todwick  
 Treeton C.E.  
 Wales  
 Wentworth C.E.  
 Woodsetts (16 schools)

**SECONDARY**

Wales High (1 school)

**SPECIAL**

Green Arbour (1 school)

A total of 18 schools, which is 13.9% of Rotherham's total of Primary, Secondary and Special schools.

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**REPORT TO THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE**

**Meeting Date: 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2005**

**Title: The Education (School Organisation Proposals)(Miscellaneous Amendments)(England) Regulations 2004.**

Following on from earlier consultation, the above Regulations were laid before Parliament on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

Members of the SOC will recall the consultation and, in particular, the discussion which related to the proposal to amend the Education (School Organisation Committees)(England) Regulations 1999. This specifically concerned the make-up of the schools group and the addition of a nursery schools representative.

The wording of the proposals in the consultation documentation seemed to be confusing and, in places, contradictory, but it is pleasing to report that the DfES has taken Rotherham's comments into account (see the e-mail attached).

The provisions relating to the addition of the nursery representative come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2005 and, although the wording is now clear, the position in Rotherham needs to be clarified. The position is as follows:

**Membership of the Schools Group.**

The number of members must be at least 1 and no more than 7, except that in some instances the membership may have to exceed 7 in order to comply with the provisions contained within the Schedule to the 1999 Regulations (N.B. the latter does not apply in Rotherham).

When setting up the schools group in Rotherham, the LEA decided to appoint 7 members even though the minimum number required (by reference to the Schedule) would have been just 3 (i.e. 1 Primary, 1 Secondary and 1 Special).

The minimum required under the new Regulations is 4 (same as above, plus the new Nursery rep).

Rotherham's current membership is as follows:

- 1 Secondary (11-16)
- 1 Secondary (11-19)
- 2 Primary (J&I/Primary)
- 1 Primary (Infant)
- 1 Primary (Junior)
- 1 Special

The addition of a Nursery rep. has the potential to increase the membership to 8, which would not be possible under the Regulations. Currently, however, the 11-16 schools representative (Mr A. Walker) is also a member of the Governing Body for the Arnold Centre and, therefore, can represent both. This would leave the number of members at 7.

**Consideration needs to be given as to whether this is the best way forward. (Mr. Walker has not been elected as a Nursery rep). If it is, what should the make-up of the group be, if Mr. Walker were to cease to be a member of the SOC in the future?**

**From:** Josephine.BELL@dfes.gsi.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 03 November 2004 10:58  
**To:** Martin.Harrop@rotherham.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Josephine.BELL@dfes.gov.uk  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed amendments to School Organisation Regulations - Consultation  
Martin

I'm replying further to your emails to Chris and Trevor and your contribution to the consultation process.

We have taken on board your comments and are taking legal advice in order to remove the contradiction of nursery representatives when nursery schools are less than 5% of the pupil population.

There appears to be nothing in current regulations that would prevent a member of the schools group representing two types/categories of school. If we make the amendment re nurseries and 5% it would still allow for such representation and also, would prevent such a member from inadvertently being barred because he was also governor of a school of less than 5% of the population.

We hope to shortly go to Ministers with these changes for their consideration.

Thank you again for your contribution to the consultation and in particular for drawing these points to our attention.

Regards

Jo Bell  
School Organisation Unit  
Ext 61277 (01325 391277)

-----

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	ECALS Cabinet Member and Advisers
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> December 2004
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	DfES Five Year Strategy: Consultation on Proposals for Foundation Schools, Expanding Popular and Successful Schools and Adding Sixth Forms (No specific Wards affected)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	ECALS

**5. Summary:** The DfES is consulting on proposed changes to regulations and guidance in line with the content of its Five Year Strategy, particularly in relation to secondary schools having 'a greater independence'.

**6. Recommendations: That:**

- i) **The report be received.**
- ii) **A response be made to the DfES consultation as outlined at the end of Section 7 to this report, and**
- iii) **This report be forwarded to the School Organisation Committee for information.**

7. **Proposals and Details:** The DfES' Five Year Strategy document includes a section (Chapter 4) on Independent Specialist Schools with stated goals of more choice for parents/pupils and independence for schools.

The strategy offers a system where there will be (amongst other things):-

- Freedom for all secondary schools to own their land and buildings, manage their assets, employ their staff, improve their governing bodies, and forge partnerships with outside sponsors and educational foundations.
- More places in popular schools.

In order to facilitate the above, the DfES is proposing changes to existing regulations and guidance. There will be new regulations, which will amend and add to three existing sets of regulations:

The Education (Change of Category of Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2000 (and subsequent amendments);

The School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003;

The Education (School Organisation Proposals) (England) Regulations 1999 (and subsequent amendments);

There will also be changes to the guidance, which the DfES issues (particularly to School Organisation Committees) in respect of school organisation proposals.

#### Foundation Schools

The 'freedoms' listed earlier relate, in the main, to the potential for schools to change category to Foundation Schools. It should be noted that the Governors of Community Schools, already have the power to publish proposals to change category (including to foundation schools). This is not, therefore, new.

However, the DfES believes that the current process for changing category of school to foundation is often seen by schools as onerous and that it acts as a disincentive to change.

The current procedure (in common with other change proposals) includes consultation, publication of proposals, production of prescribed information, a six week period for representation and decision by the SOC (or adjudicator, if a decision is not made or is not unanimous).

The DfES' new proposals are for no prior consultation, publication of proposals (but for a reduced period of 4 weeks), greatly reduced prescribed information and for the governing body of the school to determine its own proposals, even when there may be objections.

The lack of consultation and the ability of the proposers (governing body) to determine the proposals, even where there are objections, gives cause for concern. The process completely excludes the School Organisation Committee (SOC), which contradicts all previous DfES thinking on the nature of consultation and decision making. Also, the need for 'fast tracking' these proposals is considered to be both questionable and unnecessary.

Changes to the School Governance Regulations will seek to encourage foundation secondary schools to acquire foundations, which will then be able to appoint the majority of the governing body of the school (similar to the position in Voluntary Aided schools).

#### Expanding Popular and Successful Schools and Adding Sixth Forms

Once again, it should be noted that the power to publish such proposals does already exist. The main changes to the regulations proposed by the DfES are:

- i) 'Fast tracking' the proposals – representation period reduced from 6 to 4 weeks and the period after the expiry of which such proposals must be referred to the Adjudicator, if appropriate, from two months to six weeks;
- ii) Allowing the governing body bringing forward proposals to attend the School Organisation Committee (SOC) to make representations; and
- iii) Allowing all schools (rather than just popular schools) proposing expansion or the addition of a sixth form to appeal to the Adjudicator, if proposals are rejected by the SOC.

As with the proposals for foundation schools, the need to 'fast track' the procedures is questionable, particularly since such changes are likely to have consequences for other schools/FE institutions. Although the SOC maintains a role here, the extension of the right of appeal to the Adjudicator again signals a possible diminution of the role/power of the SOC. This can also be inferred from the guidance which is proposed to be issued by the DfES to Decision Makers in respect of such proposals. This will 'reinforce the existing strong presumption that expansion proposals will be agreed' and 'strengthen the presumption in favour of agreeing proposals for sixth forms ....'. Under these circumstances, the SOC will almost be obliged to agree proposals which will, in effect, leave it with little more than a 'rubber stamping' role.

In terms of the expansion of popular schools, for instance, the guidance will state that 'the existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less-popular schools should not in itself be sufficient to prevent this expansion, but if appropriate, in the light of local concerns, the Decision Makers (SOC) should ask the LEA how they plan to tackle any consequences for other schools. The Decision Maker should only turn down proposals for successful and popular schools to expand if there is compelling objective evidence that expansion would have a damaging effect on standards overall in the area, which cannot be avoided by LEA action'.



In response to the consultation the LEA might, therefore, question:-

- a) The rationale behind the proposals themselves. Does the desire to expand popular schools with little or no regard to any other institution seriously undermine both the LEAs planning role and also its role in driving up standards? Is the move to more foundation schools based on any sound evidence?
- b) The need to fast track any of these changes,
- c) The lack of consultation for school proposals in respect of changes of category, and
- d) The diminution (and exclusion in the case of foundation schools) of the role of the School Organisation Committee as detailed above.

**8. Finance:** There are no financial implications in this report.

**9. Risks and Uncertainties:** Following the recommended action would not entail any risk. However, if the proposals within the consultation are enacted, the LEAs planning and improvement role may be at risk.

**10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:** There are none in respect of the recommended action. However, the proposed DfES changes could have consequences for the future in terms of raising standards, performance indicators (surplus places), equalities and sustainability (transport etc), which might not be enhanced by, for instance, the expansion of popular schools, where this is not done within a whole LEA strategy.

**11. Background Papers and Consultation:** This is specific consultation by the DfES. Full details can be found on the DfES web site [www.dfes.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/consultation). Current regulations are as detailed under Section 7. Rotherham's Schools Organisation Plan 2003/04 – 2007/08 is available on Rotherham's internet site.

Contact Name: *Martin Harrop, PO Forward Planning, 01709 822415*  
e-mail: [martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk)



