

LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Thursday, 21 July 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 item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies.
4. Minutes of the previous meeting of the Local Admissions Forum held on 17th March, 2005 (copy herewith). (Pages 1 - 3)
5. Matters Arising.
6. Minutes of the previous meeting of the School Organisation Committee held on 20th January, 2005 (copy herewith). (Pages 4 - 11)
7. Matters arising.
8. Letter from DfES dated 19th May, 2005 (information to be provided at the meeting).
9. Draft Protocol for the Admission of Hard to Place Children (information herewith). (Pages 12 - 18)
10. Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements for admission to Schools 2005/06 (verbal update).
11. Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements for admission to Schools 2006/07 (verbal update).
12. Consultation for 2007/08 admission round (report herewith). (Pages 19 - 24)
13. Date and Time of Next Meeting.

**LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM
THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 2005**

Present:- Mrs. I. G. Hartley (in the Chair) (School Governors); Councillor Boyes (Rotherham LEA), Mr. B. N. Sampson (Church of England), Mr. P. Storey (Diocese of Hallam) and Mr. G. Lancashire (Junior and Infant Schools).

12. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Austen and Hodgkiss, Mrs. G. Atkin, Mrs. P. Powell, Mr. F. Hedge, Mr. F. McDermott, and Mr. M. Robertson.

13. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH NOVEMBER, 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 11th November, 2004, were accepted as a true record.

14. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 20TH JANUARY, 2005

The minutes of the meeting of the School Organisation Committee, held on 20th January, 2005, were received and their contents noted.

15. ADMISSIONS TO SCHOOLS 2006/07 - CONSULTATION REPORT

Consideration was given to a report of the Strategic Leader Resources and Information which covered issues that have arisen as a result of the annual consultation exercise with and between schools and other Local Education Authorities on school admission arrangements for the Admission Year 2006/07.

Annex 1 provided details of the LEA's consultation document relating to community and controlled schools. The admissions criteria are unchanged from the previous year and there has been no specific feedback from consultees on this.

Proposed admission numbers for community and controlled schools had, in the main, been agreed by school governing bodies. There had been some feedback and details were indicated at Annex 2 to the report.

Aided schools have also been taking part in the consultation and for this year this has been facilitated by use of the LEA's internet site. Details of aided schools proposed admission number and admissions criteria have been included on the site.

There has been no specific feedback on the consultation regarding the co-ordinated admission schemes. The period for consultation ended on

1st March, 2005 and determinations by admission authorities had to be made by 15th April, 2005.

The Local Admissions Forum also noted that there would be further consideration of the admission number for Aston Comprehensive School.

Agreed:- That the information about schools' proposed admission numbers for 2006/07, contained in the report now submitted, be received.

16. CO-ORDINATED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2005/06

The Local Admissions Forum discussed the co-ordinated arrangements for the admission of pupils to schools at the beginning of the 2005/06 academic year. The co-ordinated arrangements were being operated this year, for the first time in Rotherham. The following points were noted:-

- offer letters for admissions to Secondary Schools had been issued in accordance with the timescale on 1st March, 2005;
- offer letters for admissions to Primary Schools would be issued in accordance with the timescale on 1st April, 2005;
- 94% of parents had been offered a school place for their child at their first preference secondary school;
- 37 parents had not been offered a place for their child at any of their original three preferred secondary schools; these pupils would later be offered a place either at their catchment area school, or, if that school was already full, at another community school with places;
- a number of parents had, at a later stage, asked for their child to be placed on the waiting list for the school which had been their second or third preferred school;
- there had been fewer calls from irate parents than in previous years and, to date, no parent had questioned the operation of the co-ordinated admission arrangements;
- there was a positive working relationship with school admissions staff in the Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield Local Education Authorities;
- to date, there had been fewer admission appeals received by the Council.

The Local Admissions Forum placed on record its appreciation of the work of the school admissions staff in successfully implementing the co-ordinated admissions arrangements and agreed that a letter of congratulation be sent to the staff concerned.

17. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FORM - CHURCH OF ENGLAND

SCHOOLS

The Local Admissions Forum noted the alterations which had been made to the additional information form to be used by Church of England Schools when requesting details of children who wished to be admitted to those schools.

18. HARD TO PLACE CHILDREN - DEVELOPING AND AGREEING A PROTOCOL

The Local Admissions Forum considered a report of the Executive Director of Education, Culture and Leisure Services concerning the Government's Five Year Strategy for Children and Learners and the way this Strategy highlighted the need for schools to work together in providing school places for hard to place children. The Government expected every Local Admissions Forum to agree a protocol for sharing hard to place pupils and the protocol would have to be agreed with schools and be in operation at the start of the school year beginning on 1st September, 2005.

In discussing this issue, the Local Admissions Forum took note of advice received from the Department for Education and Skills, as well as a sample protocol and factors to be taken into account in the preparing a successful protocol.

The Local Admissions Forum noted that the protocol for Rotherham schools was currently being prepared by a multi-disciplinary team, co-ordinated by the Local Education Authority. The draft protocol would be issued to Members of the Local Admissions Forum in advance of the next meeting, enabling the protocol to be fully debated and agreed at the Admission Forum's next meeting on 21st July, 2005.

19. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting be arranged for Thursday, 21st July, 2005, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 20TH JANUARY, 2005**

Present:- Councillor Boyes (in the Chair)

Mr. P. Robins (Junior and Infant Schools), Mr. B. Sampson (Church of England), Mrs. J. Scott (Junior and Infant Schools), Mrs. B. Watson (Infant Schools) and Mr. P. White (Church of England)

Also in attendance were the following officers:-

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

12. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Malcolm Robertson, Ann Winfield, Councillor Austen, Kabir Hussain and Shabana Ahmed.

13. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH SEPTEMBER, 2004

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th September, 2004 be received as a correct record.

14. MATTER ARISING

Membership/Resignations/Terms of Reference

Discussion took place on the membership of the Committee.

The Secretary reported a lack of response to a recent advertisement placed in the Governors Newsletter for representatives to substitute on some of the Schools' Groups and for a Special Schools representative.

Resolved:- (1) That the Strategic Leader School Improvement be asked to raise this matter at the next Chair and Vice-Chairs meeting of Governing Bodies.

(2) That the Secretary pursue whether the Rotherham Association of School Governors have yet appointed a Chair and, if so, liaise with him/her on this matter.

15. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM HELD ON 11TH NOVEMBER, 2004.

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

16. MATTERS ARISING

(a) Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements

The meeting was informed that the new co-ordinated admission arrangements were presently working reasonably well.

An update report on this matter would be submitted to the next meeting of the Local Admissions Forum.

A discussion took place on the content of the booklet and in particular the amount of information for parents to absorb. It was noted that a two page summary was made available which furnished parents with sufficient information to enable them to complete the application form.

Parents were asked to complete a questionnaire on completion of the booklet and this was measured as a Performance Indicator within Education, Culture and Leisure Services.

Current feedback has indicated that the majority of parents are of the opinion that the booklet is clear or very clear. More up to date information on this issue would be reported to the next meeting of the Local Admissions Forum.

A very small number of parents who had failed to return an admission form, were sent a follow up letter and help was offered to families through the Welfare Service.

A great deal of effort was taking place this year, through Schools or other Agencies, to encourage parents to complete forms on time.

A debate took place on the issue of interpreters and the presentation of written information, it being pointed out that approximately fifty-seven languages were now spoken in schools.

In general, problems due to a lack of English did not seem to be apparent at Admissions Appeals.

It was pointed out that the LEA made use of the language library and the Welcome Centre as a point of contact for parents.

(b) Admissions Consultation 2006/07

It was reported that a great deal of work had taken place to ensure the admissions criteria for Church Aided Schools had been placed on the Council's web site by the deadline of 18th January, 2005.

The site also included information on the co-ordinated schemes for Primary and Secondary and admissions criteria and numbers for all community and controlled schools, and those of individual Church Aided

Schools

Agreed:- That a suitable press release be issued raising awareness of the availability of the on-line consultation and preference forms, and the timetable for the current admissions round.

17. ONS RECLASSIFICATION OF RURAL/URBAN AREAS

Further to Minute No. 8 of the previous meeting of this Committee held on 30th September, 2004, consideration was given to the information received on the reclassification of Rural/Urban Areas, carried out by the Office for National Statistics on areas within Rotherham.

This information can now be used by the School Organisation Committee 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.

The following schools actually situated within the areas classed as rural in Rotherham 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.

In the absence of further guidance from DfES, the point was made that it remained the responsibility of the School Organisation Committee to determine what a rural school was when considering individual proposals. Obvious considerations when deciding any proposed closure of a rural school would be transport and sustainability issues, as well as the issues relating to education standards.

The main aspect of DfES guidance is a general presumption not to close a rural school. This did not mean, however, that no rural school would ever close.

18. THE EDUCATION (SCHOOL ORGANISATION PROPOSALS)(MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS)(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2004

Following earlier consultation, the above Regulations were laid before Parliament on 25th November, 2004.

The meeting was reminded of a previous discussion at SOC which related to a 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.

DfES had now taken into consideration the views of Rotherham LEA and, as a result, removed the contradiction of nursery representatives when nursery schools are less than 5% of the pupil population.

The provision relating to the addition of a nursery representative will come into effect on 1st February, 2005, and, although the wording is now clear, the position in Rotherham needs to be clarified.

The position in terms of the membership of the schools group is as follows:-

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 had 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). This had been in order to give a broader

cross-section of views.

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

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 representative 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. Alan 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.

The meeting was asked to consider whether this is the best way forward despite the fact that Mr. Walker has not been elected as a Nursery representative.

If it is believed to be the best way forward, the question posed for this meeting was what did SOC think the make-up of the group should be, in the event of Mr. Walker ceasing to be a member of SOC in the future?

In the case of Rotherham it would be a representative for Rawmarsh, Arnold and Aughton Nurseries who now have their own Governing Bodies.

The meeting discussed the following issues:-

- impact of the Children's Centres in terms of the changing role of Nurseries
- Private Nurseries

Resolved:- (1) That no action be taken on the potential additional nursery representative position at the present time.

(2) That a further report be made to the next meeting.

19. DFES FIVE YEAR STRATEGY: CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS FOR FOUNDATION SCHOOLS, EXPANDING POPULAR AND SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS AND ADDING SIXTH FORMS

The meeting considered a report by the LEA in response to a consultation by the DfES to change regulations and guidance in line with the content of

its Five Year Strategy, particularly in relation to secondary schools having 'a greater independence'.

In view of the need to respond to the proposal by 31st December, 2004, a response had been sent to DfES, as outlined in Section 7 of the report now submitted.

The DfES' 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

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.

One member expressed concern regarding the DfES' new proposals whereby the governing body of a school could determine its own proposals, even when there may be objections. This was seen as a retrograde step.

In addition, it was pointed out that School Organisation Committees had been established to make local decisions.

There was discussion on the position in Rotherham and the possible demand for either of the above changes.

The second proposal could create more appeals being sent to an Adjudicator in the event of SOC being unable to make decisions.

Resolved:- That the Secretary write to DfES questioning (a) the rationale behind the proposals (b) the lack of consultation for school proposals in respect of changes of category and (c) the diminution (and exclusion in the case of foundation schools) of the role of the School Organisation Committee.

20. REDSCOPE INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS - PROPOSED 'AMALGAMATION'

The meeting was advised of the timetable for consideration of the proposed amalgamation of the above schools, as published on 7th January, 2005.

The consultation period was six weeks. In the event of no objections being received, the matter will be determined by the LEA. If objections

are received within the six weeks period, all relevant papers will be submitted to the next meeting and a decision on the proposal made by SOC.

The proposal had arisen following the retirement of the Head Teacher of the Junior School and was being carried out in accordance with the School Organisation Plan.

Meetings had taken place between the LEA, Acting Head Teacher (Junior School), Head Teacher of the Infant School, staff and parents and advice given to Governing Bodies.

Both schools and parents were very much in favour of the proposal.

Officers from the LEA were thanked for the amount of advice and information given to the school which had helped to ensure a very clear process had been followed by the Governing Body and staff.

21. CHILDREN ACT 2004: SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEES AND THE CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S PLAN

The meeting considered the contents of a letter from the Department for Education and Skills on their plan rationalisation proposals and the introduction of the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP). This Plan will be produced for the first time in 2006.

The Children Act 2004 provides a power to require Children's Services Authorities to prepare and publish a CYPP. The plan is designed to support the move to more integrated and effective services to secure the outcomes for children set out in Every Child Matters and reflected in the Children Act 2004.

At the same time, the existing complex statutory planning requirements were to be streamlined and the Children Act repeals seven statutory planning requirements including the School Organisation Plan (SOP).

The Department for Education and Skills was aware of the concern that removal of the SOP (and therefore the SOC's power to approve it) will undermine the role of the SOC and are therefore proposing to require local authorities, by regulations, to consult SOCs and diocesan authorities during the preparation of the plan. DfES also intend to support this requirement in non-statutory guidance on developing the CYPP.

Authorities will still need to plan effectively for school organisation, despite the removal of the statutory requirement to produce a SOP.

The LEA will therefore need to give consideration in terms of what was produced for consideration by SOC in the future.

The repeal of the requirement to produce a SOP will take effect as soon

as possible, probably with the first Commencement Order for the Children Act, early in 2005. With effect from the same date, SOCs will no longer have a duty to have regard to the SOP when considering individual statutory proposals.

Information on the contents of the full Plan by DfES was presently awaited.

Resolved:- That further information be submitted to a future meeting when up to date information had been received from DfES.

22. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next two meetings be held as follows:-

Thursday, 17th March, 2005 at 11.00 a.m.

(Please note: in the event of no objections to the Redscope Infant and Junior Schools proposed 'amalgamation', this meeting may not be necessary).

Thursday, 14th July, 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

(Please note: this is a provisional date to discuss the update of the School Organisation Plan).

DRAFT**Protocol for the Admission of Hard to Place Children**

In response to the revised guidance contained within the DfES' School Admission's Code of Practice, the Rotherham Local Admissions Forum has agreed the following protocol in respect of Hard to Place Children. This protocol applies equally to all secondary schools within Rotherham.

Main Principles

The Local Admissions Forum recognises that some parents can find difficulty in obtaining a school place for their child(ren) and that this can lead to an unnecessary delay in the admission to a school. This can be for a number of reasons, but it often also results in undersubscribed schools (which may also be operating under challenging circumstances) being asked to admit a larger proportion of hard to place pupils than those schools which are operating at their admission number.

This protocol is designed to:-

- provide for a fairer distribution of hard to place pupils,
- work in the best interests of all Rotherham's pupils,
- recognise that hard to place pupils should not be denied access to their catchment/nearest/most appropriate denominational school save in exceptional circumstances.

Protocol

A preference in respect of a child falling within one of the following categories will be agreed, even where the preferred school is already operating at or above its admission number in the year group concerned, where the preferred school is the catchment/nearest/most appropriate denominational school. In respect of a child in public care, this may be extended to any other school which is deemed by the Authority as the most appropriate as part of the child's personal education plan:

- i) public care,
- ii) permanently excluded from school (but see 1. and 2. below)
(The number of previously permanently excluded pupils will not, however, be allowed to exceed ?% of the total number of pupils in the year group as a result of this protocol),
- iii) attend a PRU and needing to be reintegrated back into mainstream education,
- iv) been out of education for longer than one school term (provided that an appropriate place has not already been allocated),
- v) refugees and asylum seekers not in accommodation centres,
- vi) homeless,
- vii) travellers.

(1. Further information relating to Rotherham's Secondary School Approach to the Re-integration of Permanently Excluded Pupils and Managed Moves for Children at Serious Risk of Exclusion can be found at Annex 1).

It is recognised that there are, inevitably, some instances where it is not appropriate to agree a preference made on behalf of a child for a specific school. This can equally

apply to hard to place children. Preferences will not therefore be agreed as part of the above protocol where the hard to place child:-

- i) is a challenging child and the preferred school has a particularly high concentration of pupils in challenging behaviour, or the child is particularly challenging and, in either case, the school concerned:-
 - a) is under special measures or has recently come out of them (within the last two years); or
 - b) has been identified by OFSTED as having serious weaknesses; or
 - c) is subject to a formal warning notice; or
 - d) is a Fresh Start school or Academy open for less than two years; or
 - e) is a secondary school where less than 25% of whose pupils are achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grade A*-C, or
- ii) has, in exceptional circumstances, a previously established connection with the school concerned,

and, in i) or ii) admission to the school would prejudice the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources.

NB. 2. Where a child has been permanently excluded from two or more schools and at least one of the exclusions took place after 1st September 1997, parents can still express a preference for a school place, but the requirement to comply is removed for a period of two years following the second exclusion. However, this does not apply to:

- children who are below compulsory school age when excluded;
- pupils who were re-instated following a permanent exclusion;
- and pupils who would have been re-instated following a permanent exclusion had it been practicable to do so.

A permanent exclusion is regarded as taking effect from the first school day the headteacher has told the pupil not to attend school.

In such circumstances the LEA will offer a place at a school it deems to be most appropriate and, therefore, this protocol will not apply.

Annex 1

**A ROTHERHAM SECONDARY SCHOOL APPROACH TO THE
REINTEGRATION OF PERMANENTLY EXCLUDED PUPILS**

EXCLUDING SCHOOL

Penalty one	loss, pro-rata, of AWPU
Penalty two	loss of £4,000 Pupil Support Grant

ADMISSION TO PRU

- LEA has control of admission
- PRU staff best place to assess need and potential for reintegration placement
- £1000 per pupil held centrally towards costs of PRU or alternative provision

TRIAL REINTEGRATION PROGRAMME IN RECEIVING SCHOOL

- Not an admission
- Programme agreed with pupil, parents, PRU and receiving school
- Ten weeks maximum before recommendations / decisions are made
- Hopefully a shorter period if success evident
- Sadly shorter if success clearly not evident and serious issues arise

Reward one	£250 per week X 10 from PRU during trial “educated elsewhere”
Reward two	optional £500 support package from BSS staff, or the £500 (one advantage being dual tracking of issues as they arise)
Reward three	Pro Rata AWPU

REQUIREMENTS

All schools to participate, if necessary exceeding admission limit
Immediate goodwill required for this scheme
Schools must agree “fresh start” ethos from first meeting with the excluded pupil

PITFALLS

If across Rotherham the pupil re-integration via PRU and “educated elsewhere” is not working, we would have to return quite quickly to LEA “admitting” to schools instead.

The pupil re-integration may not be successful in the view of the school, but parents might, at the end of the trial “educated elsewhere”, still apply for the LEA for an admission to the school.

Agreed with secondary headteachers September 2002

Managed Moves for Children at Serious Risk of Exclusion

LEA Circular 59 states:

"A managed move. If a school feels that it can no longer manage the behaviour of a particular pupil, the school may ask another school to take over his or her education. This should only be done with the full knowledge and co-operation of all parties involved, including the parents/carers and the Council (Admissions Section), and in circumstances where it is in the best interests of the pupil. Parents/carers should never be pressured into removing their child from school under threat of permanent exclusion, nor should pupils be deleted from the roll to encourage them to find another school place.

If a managed move is agreed, it is essential that the relevant support services within the Council are kept informed."

- Where pupils are at serious risk of exclusion, then schools can work together to agree a system of managed moves. This would need full agreement of all secondary Head Teachers and Governing Bodies, Local Admissions Forum and have members' approval to become part of the LEA Admissions Code.
- This could only be used for pupils where a fresh start is considered appropriate by both school and parents/carers and there is a serious risk of permanent exclusion. The home school will need to demonstrate that all appropriate strategies, resources have been exhausted.
- A checklist of interventions has been drafted to help schools ensure that all appropriate strategies have been tried. (Appendix I)
- This would provide an opportunity for collaborative working across schools. If we are all committed to the principles of the Green Paper and "EVERY CHILD MATTERS" then this presents a genuine step forwards.
- As far as possible, managed moves should not involve pupils travelling excessive distances
- Headteachers will be responsible for the organisation of the scheme and it will depend upon mutual trust, understanding and co-operation.
- In essence, the home school will liaise with another school to agree a trial placement for an agreed period (a minimum of 10 school weeks) whereby the child will attend the new school, remaining on the roll of the home school. It will be essential that a case review with school, parents/Careers, support services is convened to agree that this is the only way forward. An end date for the trial period will be set when the move is first negotiated.
- If there is agreement to proceed with a system for managed moves, then a written policy agreed by Head Teachers will need to be approved by elected members and the Local Admissions Forum. This will include agreement to admit over and above the admission limit where schools are oversubscribed.
- The receiving school should use a Pastoral Support Plan to ensure that the move is planned and the pupil supported. Review meetings will involve both schools, parents/carers and support agencies. Arrangements for school uniform and travel will need to be resolved between parent/carer and receiving school. Where a child

has a Statement of Special Educational Needs, then SEN Section must be consulted.

- The Behaviour Support Service will act as facilitators of the scheme and keep a record of the managed moves negotiated.
- Following completion of a successful trial, the child will formally transfer and be placed on the roll of the new school. Formal paperwork agreeing the move will need to be completed and sent to Admissions.
- Where a receiving school considers that even after intensive support the trial placement is failing then the child, following a formal meeting with parents/carers, will return to the home school.
- It is recommended that in any one school year no school should be asked to take more than 2 pupils on a managed move.

There is unlikely to be any central funding or resources to support this process, however head teachers may agree to jointly fund a behaviour support worker(s), managed from BSS, who could support the reintegration – in line with the practice for permanently excluded pupils.

Statemented Pupils and Managed Moves

Advice from RMBC Legal Services is that where the behaviour of a statemented child is a cause of serious concern and it can be demonstrated that the school is unable within its delegated resources to meet the needs of the child then the statement needs to be formally reviewed. If the parent then expresses a preference for another school for the child an amended statement would need to be written for the child to move to a new school. The LEA is bound to make the provision specified in the statement, it cannot make alternative provision without the statement being amended or a fresh statement being issued and that would trigger the parent's right to make a preference. Hence managed moves should not be used for statemented pupils.

- **Issues relating to Admission Appeals raised through the Group**
 - Recent practice in Admissions Section means that schools are now contacted before appeals are heard and if a head teacher wishes to add to the case he/she may do so.

10.02.2004

Secondary Head Teachers meeting – March 18th 2004 –as recorded in the minutes of the meeting it was formally agreed that the above report is adopted and becomes operational at the start of summer term 200

APPENDIX I**Checklist of interventions needing to be evidenced before managed move should be considered:**

	YES	NO
Pupil is at School Action Plus on Code of Practice and IEPs indicate little progress towards targets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil Support Plan in place and review(s) indicates little progress	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The emotional needs of pupil have been identified and strategies put in place to meet need, e.g. recent bereavement, change in living circumstances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School internal support systems have been fully utilised to support the pupil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Central support services, e.g. EPS, BSS, Young People's Services have been consulted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parents/carers have been invited to meetings to discuss school's concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil has experienced a range of internal sanctions and is at risk of exclusion from the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
KS4 pupils have been offered alternative curriculum opportunities - work related learning etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil's learning needs are met through appropriately differentiated work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Inclusion Services

<u>MANAGED MOVE AGREEMENT</u>	
Name of school pupil is currently attending:	
Name of new school	
Pupil Surname	Date of Birth
Pupil First name	Male / Female
Name of Parent / Carer	
Address	
Is the child looked after Yes / No	
SEN status	
Please give brief summary of pupil's circumstances	
Date trial starts at new school (pupil remains on roll of current school)	
Date trial will terminate	
Date of first review of trial	
All parties in agreement with the planned managed move to sign below	
Parent / Carer	
Pupil	
Current school signature	Designation
Receiving school signature	Designation
Date	
Please send a copy of this agreement to: Inclusion Support Services, International Centre, Simmonite Road, Kimberworth Park, Rotherham, S61 3EQ e-mail behaviour.support@rotherham.gov.uk	

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	12th July 2005
3.	Title:	Admissions Consultation for 2007/08 (All Wards)
4.	Programme Area:	ECALS

5. Summary: To consider possible changes to the LEA's admission to schools policy/ co-ordinated schemes for the admission year 2007/08

5. Recommendations: That:

- i) consideration is given to the changes outlined in this report,
- ii) the report is forwarded to the Local Admissions Forum for information and
- iii) the appropriate consultation with School Governing Bodies takes place, as usual, in the Autumn Term, 2005

6. **Proposals and Details:** The current admissions policy, and the criteria to be considered where there are more applications than places available at Community and Controlled schools, is shown in the attached appendix. Two issues need to be considered and these are as follows:
- i) Following sight of a number of decisions made by the Adjudicator, it has become clear that the admission of pupils in public care should appear as the first criteria. It would be preferable to make clear, before the list of criteria, that children with statements of SEN will gain a place at the school named in the statement and that the admission will be agreed through the statementing process.
 - ii) The admissions criteria (down to 'children who live nearest to the school'), have no tie breaker and places are normally allocated up to that point even where the admission number is exceeded. This guarantees a place, for instance, at the catchment area school, if a preference for that school is made by the closing date. This can cause problems, particularly in Key Stage 1 where class sizes are an issue, but, in many cases, the LEA can anticipate this and plan accordingly.
A greater problem exists, however, where there are a number of late applications, which miss the deadline, but can still be dealt with by the allocation date. If the admission number is close to being reached before the late applications are considered and then the late applications contain a number of catchment area preferences, there is currently no option other than to agree all of those preferences. A tie-breaker, based on distance, could alleviate this problem
8. **Finance:** Agreeing admissions, as now, where a school takes in a 31st pupil from the catchment area could have financial consequences, if another teacher had to be recruited. If that child had to travel to another school, as a result of any agreed changes, then that too could have financial consequences. However, individual circumstances will apply and broadbrush assumptions should not be made.
9. **Risks and Uncertainties:** For i) above, non-amendment could bring criticism from the Adjudicator.
10. **Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:** Any changes to the admissions criteria/ co-ordinated schemes could have consequences for individual pupils. However, the criteria/schemes seek to provide a fair, equitable and sustainable solution to the admissions process. The main change could be in relation to the addition of a tie-breaker to be used in respect of late applications. Notwithstanding this, officers would still continue to send reminders out to parents who have not applied and make every effort to ensure that preferences are received by the closing date.

11. Background Papers and Consultation: The appendix shows the current admissions criteria. There is annual consultation on this, which takes place with school governing bodies each Autumn Term and up to 1st March.

Contact Name :

Martin Harrop, P.O. Forward Planning, ext 2415

e-mail: martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk

Admission Criteria for community and controlled schools – 2006/07

Primary Reception

Places will be allocated in the following order of priority

- i) Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs will gain a place at the school stipulated in the Statement.
- ii) Children in Public Care will gain a place at the catchment area/local school or the school deemed most appropriate by the Authority as part of the child's personal education plan.
- iii) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iv) Those children who live outside the catchment area whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the preferred school or its associated junior school at the time of their admission.
- v) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- vi) Children with a compelling social reason which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**. The kinds of overriding social reasons which could be accepted are where there is evidence that the pupil's education would be seriously impaired if he or she did not attend the preferred school.
- vii) Children who live nearest to the school measured in a straight line on a horizontal plane (as the crow flies).

Year 3

Places in Year 3 at a Junior School will be allocated following receipt of parental preferences according to the following criteria, which are in priority order:-

- i) Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs will gain a place at the school stipulated in the Statement.
- ii) Children in Public Care will gain a place at the catchment area/local school or the school deemed most appropriate by the Authority as part of the child's personal education plan.

- iii) Children in attendance at Y2 in the associated Infant School.
- iv) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- v) Children whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the school at the time of their admission.
- vi) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- vii) Children with a compelling social reason which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- viii) Children who live nearest to the school measured in a straight line on a horizontal plane (as the crow flies).

Secondary Year 7

Places will be allocated in the following order of priority:-

- i) Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs will gain a place at the school stipulated in the Statement.
- ii) Children in Public Care will gain a place at the catchment area/local school or the school deemed most appropriate by the Authority as part of the child's personal education plan.
- iii) Children who, on the Allocated Date, are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iv) Those children who live outside the catchment area whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the preferred school at the time of their admission.
- v) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular** school essential.
- vi) Children with a compelling social reason which the Authority is satisfied make attendance **at that particular** school essential. The kind of overriding social reasons which could be accepted are where there is

evidence that the pupil's education would be seriously impaired if he or she did not attend the preferred school.

- vii) Children who, on the allocation date, are on the roll of one of the associated Primary/ Junior/Junior and Infant schools as identified by the Authority.
- viii) Children who, on the Allocated Date, live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plan, (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").

NB Places will be allocated in accordance with the LEA's co-ordinated admissions schemes for Primary and Secondary schools. In assessing preferences, the LEA will operate an 'equal preference' system, which means that no priority will be given according to the ranking of the preference, except where a potential offer can be made in respect of more than one school. In that situation, the final offer of a place will be made at the highest ranked of the potential offer schools.