

LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

r

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

Date: Thursday, 30th March 2006

Time: 10.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice- Chairman
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for Absence
4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 21st July, 2005 (copy herewith). (Pages 1 - 7)
5. Matters Arising
6. Minutes of previous meetings of the School Organisation Committee held on 28th July and 1st December, 2005 and 11th January, 2006 (copies herewith). (Pages 8 - 24)
7. Matters Arising
8. Admission to Schools for the Admission Year 2007 / 08 - Consultation Report (report herewith) (Pages 25 - 53)
9. Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements 2006/07
10. In-year transfers
11. Any Other Business
12. Date and Time of Next Meeting

**LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM
THURSDAY, 21ST JULY, 2005**

Present:- Councillor Hodgkiss (in the Chair); Councillor Austen. Mr. B. N. Sampson (Church of England), Mrs. G. Atkin (Church of England), Mrs. I. G. Hartley (School Governors) and Mr. F. Hedge (Community Representative).

20. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. P. Storey, Mr. M. Robertson and Mr. G. Lancashire.

21. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Local Admissions Forum were accepted as a true record.

22. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE

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

23. LETTER FROM DFES DATED 19TH MAY, 2005

The meeting considered the content of a letter from DfES dated 19th May, 2005 regarding the admission arrangements for 2005/06.

As part of this year's consultation process all voluntary aided schools had made available their admissions criteria on the internet.

The letter from DfES confirmed that, provided there were no changes to the voluntary aided admission arrangements for 2007/08, those schools did not have to go through the process of consultation this year.

24. DRAFT PROTOCOL FOR THE ADMISSION OF HARD TO PLACE CHILDREN

In accordance with minute No. 18 of the previous meeting of the Local Admissions Forum held on 17th March, 2005, the meeting considered the content of a draft protocol for sharing hard to place pupils. The protocol had been drawn up following guidance from DfES and at present only applied to Secondary Schools. The main aim of the protocol was to give a more equal distribution of these pupils to Secondary Schools.

The document included an Appendix relating to a Rotherham Secondary School's approach to the reintegration of permanently excluded pupils

and the arrangement for managed moves, whereby a child who may be in danger of being permanently excluded is offered a trial reintegration programme into a receiving school. The system on Managed Moves was already in place (agreed in 2002) and the Acting Head of Inclusion Support Services has been requested to provide a progress report.

The draft protocol was to be considered by Secondary Head Teachers at a meeting to be held on 6th October, 2005 who would then need to sign up to this document.

There appeared to be very little problem in Rotherham but there are cases each year where pupils either cannot get into schools quickly and come to appeal, or as had happened in several other Authorities, where lots of schools are full, and children who are hard to place were being placed in schools with surplus places. These could be vulnerable children or children with challenging behaviour. which could add to the problems at those schools.

The LEA had an existing policy for children in public care and those who had been permanently excluded and it was believed there would not be too many additional children affected by it, but it did mean that some vulnerable children may get into a school quicker than they would have done before.

The meeting expressed some minor concerns regarding the policy and raised the following issues:-

- (1) The possible reorganisation of classes as a result of additional pupils being taken on roll.
- (2) The financial implications for schools – do these children bring resources with them?
- (3) What constituted a “full” school?

The meeting was informed that some of these children were presently gaining a place at the appeal stage. These children were in the transfer groups.

Although DfES had asked that the number of previously permanently excluded pupils should not be allowed to exceed a percentage of the total number of pupils in the year group as a result of this protocol, they had not given an indication of what that figure might be. This would also be discussed at the Secondary Head Teachers’ meeting.

Advice was given regarding what could happen if the Secondary Head Teachers disagreed with the protocol. The policy could be amended or the DfES could impose a policy on the LEA.

Agreed:- That, whilst some Members of the Local Admissions Forum had

reservations, the draft policy be agreed, subject to the agreement of Secondary Heads and the situation monitored for one year and a further report submitted to this Committee.

25. CO-ORDINATED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS 2005/06

The meeting was informed that the co-ordinated admission arrangements for admission to schools 2005/06 had worked extremely well.

Communication with other admission Authorities had been excellent and everyone had cooperated very well.

Information from Rotherham's Aided Schools had been very good and very few problems had arisen.

One of the main differences for the LEA and parents, as part of the new arrangement, is the equal preference system. This had meant, for example, that if a parent had applied for three schools and one was a catchment school, they would at least have been guaranteed the catchment school.

The following figures were given:-

Reception/Foundation Stage 2

7 primary schools were oversubscribed and had waiting lists
2 others had reached the Published Admission Number exactly

Y2/3 Transfers

2 schools were oversubscribed and had waiting lists
One other school had reached the Published Admission Number exactly

Y6/7 Transfers

10 out of the 16 secondary schools were oversubscribed with waiting lists

The number of on-line applications received was:-

44 Reception/Foundation Stage 2
2 for Y2/3
24 for Y6/7

The number of children whose parents had not expressed a preference by 1st July, 2005 was:

11 for Reception/Foundation Stage 2
3 for Y2/3
4 for Y6/7

In accordance with the co-ordinated scheme, on 1st July, the LEA allocated a place at a school for these children.

For admissions in 2006/07 the secondary booklet was issued on 1st July, 2005. To date the LEA has received 34 online applications.

The reception figure was slightly higher but this was due to the fact that details for children due to start in reception/Foundation Stage 2 were received quite early but, in some cases, were more difficult to trace if they moved out of the area. Any child not receiving education would be referred to the Education Welfare Service in September.

There seemed to have been less parents changing their minds later on in the process because they had been offered a high ranking preference, in particular with one Secondary School bordering with Barnsley.

There had been fewer appeals, particularly by Y6/7 pupils in comparison to previous years.

There are still a great deal of transfers, and waiting lists appear to be shorter. People had been placed on the waiting list mainly for higher ranked preferences.

With Primary Schools, one or two Aided Schools had experienced slight difficulties with ranking applications but had worked very well with the LEA in terms of expectations from them to comply with the LEA's computer system and ranking.

One particular problem regarding a school's admission criteria on baptism had been sorted out for next year.

Rotherham LEA had built up trust with other admission Authorities which had been a major feature of the work, with everyone working together to achieve results.

Agreed:- That, on behalf of the Local Admissions Forum, the Admissions staff of the LEA be congratulated for their hard work and the smooth running of this year's admission process given the new co-ordinated arrangements for 2005/06.

26. CO-ORDINATED ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO SCHOOLS 2006/07

The meeting was informed of the new co-ordinated admission arrangements with Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Authorities which starts next year.

The national offer day is 1st March, 2006 so everyone will work towards that date.

There had been some children who had been offered two schools, one in Rotherham and one in Derbyshire for 2005/06. The difference in none co-ordination had been obvious this year, particularly for secondary schools, where two systems had been operating.

This means that for all neighbouring applications, from next year there will only be one offer of a school place.

The Secondary Booklet for children entering Secondary Schools 2006/07 has been sent to parents and some applications had already been received. Information was also on the internet and already 34 online applications had been received from 1st July, 2005. This was very good compared to the fact there had only been 24 applications during the whole of last year.

The Primary Booklet will be issued on the 30th September, 2005. E-Government targets regarding online admissions have been set. Parents are being advised regarding the online facility and Admissions staff are undergoing further training in computer skills. One feature of the online system, and an encouragement to parents, was the fact that applications were acknowledged electronically. Some parents had applied online and had also submitted a hard copy application.

The meeting pointed out that not all pupils and families had computers. It was clarified that information regarding the use of computers in schools and libraries was being sent to parents. The take up of online services was improving each year.

27. CONSULTATION FOR 2007/08 ADMISSION ROUND

In accordance with the annual consultation process on the LEA's admission to schools policy/co-ordinated schemes for the admission year 2007/08, the meeting considered a report regarding two possible changes.

The report had been considered by the Cabinet Member, Lifelong Learning on 12th July, 2005.

The changes are as follows:-

- (1) 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.
- (2) 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 appropriate 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.

For parents applying on time for catchment schools they will still be successful.

The tie-breaker may not have to be used very much but it was in line with that used by many other Authorities.

The meeting raised the following questions:-

- How did the change in SEN criteria affect transfers?

Transfers were always considered as individual applications. The main question posed in a transfer situation was whether the school was full or not. In the case of a child with a Statement of SEN, the school would be contacted about accommodating that child before the school is named in the statement.

- Would an extra-district child who applies on time be given a place over a catchment child in a situation where their application was late?

This could be the case. It is clear from previous judgements that the LEA must allocate to any child in accordance with the admission criteria and within the terms of the co-ordinated scheme.

The LEA worked very hard to send out reminder letters to parents, the first letter advising parents to apply being sent in July rather than September.

In view of (1) above, Voluntary Aided Schools may wish to re-examine their admissions criteria in future years.

The meeting was informed of admission policies at neighbouring authorities and the fact that they did not always allow catchment and siblings into a school. Governing Bodies will be asked to respond to these proposed changes in the consultation document.

Agreed:- (1) That the appropriate consultation with School Governing Bodies takes place, as usual, in the Autumn Term 2005.

(2) That the results of the consultation be fed back to Cabinet Member, Lifelong Learning and the Local Admissions Forum.

28. CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES 2007/08

The meeting was informed that there were no proposed changes to the co-ordinated schemes for 2007/08.

This information would be included in the consultation document to all Schools.

29. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING.

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

Thursday, 17th November, 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

(Please note this is a provisional booking and may not be necessary).

Thursday, 23rd March, 2006 at 9.30 a.m.

SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE
28th July, 2005

Present:- Councillor Boyes (in the Chair); Councillors Austen and Havenhand .

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

Also in attendance were the following officers:-

Mr. M. Harrop, Principal Officer, Forward Planning
Mr. D. Hill, Manager, School Organisation, Planning and Development

23. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs. A. Winfield, Mrs. J. Troy, Mr. P. White, Mr. K. Hussain and Mr. D. Smart.

24. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the School Organisation Committee held on 20th January, 2005 be received as a correct record.

25. MATTER ARISING

Membership

The meeting was informed that Mrs. M. Smith, the Vice Chair of the School Governors, Green Arbour School, was willing to attend future meetings of this Committee, representing special schools.

Resolved:- That Mrs. M. Smith be invited to future meetings of this Committee as representative of Special Schools.

26. MINUTES OF THE LOCAL ADMISSIONS FORUM

Resolved:- That the minutes of the above meeting held on 17th March, 2005 be received as a true record.

27. STATUTORY PROPOSAL - BRINSWORTH HOWARTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

The meeting considered a report which gave details of a proposal to make a prescribed alteration to the age range at Brinsworth Howarth Junior and Infant School.

Brinsworth Howarth Junior and Infant School is currently a 4-11 age range school. The proposal is to change the age range to 3-11 years to allow younger pupils to be admitted to a Foundation Stage Unit.

The following information attached as appendices to the report were considered:-

- Appendix A - Background information on the Foundation Stage Units
- Appendix B - Meeting with Parents – Tuesday, 26th April, 2005
- Appendix C - Meeting with Governing Body – Tuesday, 26th April, 2005
- Appendix D - Meeting with Staff – Tuesday, 26th April, 2005
- Appendix E - Comments from Catcliffe Primary School
- Appendix F - Letter from PaC (Parents at Catcliffe) dated 18th Ma 2005
- Appendix G - Letter from the Head Teacher, Brinsworth Whitehill Primary School
- Appendix H - Letter from Chair of Governors, Brinsworth Whitehill Primary School
- Appendix I - Letter from Clerk to the Governing Body, Brinsworth Whitehill Primary School
- Appendix J - Letter from Chair of Governors, Brinsworth Whitehill Primary School
- Appendix K - Letter from Member of the Public x 19

Proposals have stood for six weeks.

At the request of SOC Members, Mr. D. Hill reported on the proposal, the consultation undertaken, and addressed the representations/objections relating to the proposal which was set out in the report submitted.

In considering the proposals, members commented on the following:-

- (a) the effect of the proposal on other schools in the area, particularly Brinsworth Whitehill and Catcliffe Primary Schools and possible long-term effects
- (b) the overall situation regarding falling numbers, the resulting implications for the schools concerned particularly for staffing and financial resources
- (c) the impact on voluntary providers (no objections were received from them)
- (d) the timetable for implementing the proposal

Mr. D. Hill referred to the report which was the LEA's response to the representations made and which covered the above issues prior to the

five groups present voting on the proposal.

Following discussion on (d) above, the meeting was informed of discussions held between the LEA and the Head Teacher of Brinsworth Howarth Junior and Infant School regarding the timing of implementing the proposal, the schools group proposed that, should it be agreed, the implementation date be 1st January, 2006. The LEA had no objections to this modification.

The proposal regarding the implementation date was voted upon, three groups abstained and two groups were in favour of the proposal.

The groups then voted upon the proposal regarding the prescribed alteration to Brinsworth Howarth Primary school and the five groups present all voted in favour of the proposal.

Resolved:- (1) That the proposals at Brinsworth Howarth Primary School to make prescribed alteration to the age range at the school from the current age range of 4-11 to 3-11 years to allow younger pupils to be admitted to a Foundation Stage Unit, be agreed, the proposal to be implemented from 1st January, 2006.

(2) That the Secretary send the appropriate decision letters to objectors, Chairs of Governing Bodies and School Organisation Unit (DfES).

28. 2ND UPDATE TO THE SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2003/04 - 2007/08

Consideration was given to a 2nd Update report to the School Organisation Plan 2003/04 - 2007/08.

The Education (School Organisation Plans) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2003, which came into force on 1st June 2003, changed the requirement to publish a plan on an annual basis. Consequently, the next full plan was scheduled to be produced in 2006 (i.e. on a 3 yearly cycle). However, the Children Act 2004 has, since then, provided the power to require the publication of a Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) from 2006. At the same time, it repealed a number of statutory planning requirements including the production of the School Organisation Plan.

There is still a need for the LEA to plan effectively in terms of school organisation, but there is now no required format. In the interim, the LEA has decided, as it did last year, to produce an update to the 2003/04-2007/08 SOP.

The updated information includes references to Sections/pages in the current SOP which were highlighted in the report submitted.

Mr. M. Harrop gave a summary of the sections referred to which related to

the forecasting of numbers in primary, secondary and special schools.

It was noted that the forecast figures differed very little from the actual figures.

Resolved:- That the information be received.

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

In accordance with Minute No. 18 of a meeting of the School Organisation Committee held on 20th January, 2005, the meeting considered the content of an email from DfES concerning the make-up of the schools group and the addition of a nursery schools representative, in response to a letter sent to them from Martin Harrop, Principal Officer, Forward Planning.

The correspondence from DfES clarified the reasons why the Department has made specific provision for a nursery school representative as opposed to an early years' representative.

This had arisen from a review of the membership of the schools group following the introduction of the requirement for nursery schools to have governing bodies, in particular whether they would have representation on a par with special schools and middle schools.

Following consultation on revised regulations in June 2004, and discussions with colleagues in early years policy team, it had been decided that nursery schools should be represented on a par with special schools. In addition, Ministers believe nursery school members will be important contributors to any discussion on the impact on standards of any proposals relating to early years provision, in a similar way that special school representatives contribute to proposals relating to SEN provision in mainstream schools.

Discussion took place on the membership of the Rotherham SOC.

Resolved:- (1) That membership of this Committee remain as it is at present.

(2) That a full discussion on membership take place at the next meeting.

30. DFES: SCHOOL ORGANISATION MATTERS - FOUNDATION SCHOOLS/ EXPANSION OF POPULAR AND SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS - DECISION MAKERS PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE

Further to Minute No. 19 of a meeting of the School Organisation Committee held on 20th January, 2005, the meeting considered a report

concerning DfES consultations on School Organisation issues.

Foundation Schools

The meeting considered a letter from the Department for Education and Skills, together with copies of the amended regulations and list of consultees, confirming that regulations will be laid before Parliament on 8th July and will come into force on 1st August, 2005. Regulations will also be laid to allow the governing bodies of all secondary schools to appoint up to four sponsor governors.

The five-year strategy set out the Government's plans for a reformed system of strong, autonomous schools and a modernised role for local authorities acting as commissioners, rather than direct providers, of services for children and learners in their areas.

The five-year strategy made clear that the Government's principles for reform applied to all schools, and explained how primary schools would also enjoy more freedom, with a lighter-touch role for the local authority.

Foundation status offers community and VC schools a route to practical autonomy.

Foundation schools have formal ownership of their assets and their governing bodies are the direct employers of the school's staff; are their own admission authority; and have the power to publish statutory proposals for other changes.

Foundation and VA schools combined constitute a majority of secondary schools in several areas. In those areas the local authority and schools will already be working in a way which prefigures the reformed system outlined in the five-year strategy.

The Government proposes to make further amendments to the Education (Change of Category of Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2000 to bring community and voluntary controlled primary schools within the scope of the streamlined process available to secondary schools. The key principle is that the governors of individual schools are best placed to decide whether a change of category is in the best interest of their school and the wider community, taking account of the views of parents and other stakeholders.

The Government proposes to streamline the process for community and voluntary controlled primary schools to change category to foundation so that it is identical to the process being introduced for secondary schools. The effects of this would be as follows:

- The period during which representations may be made about

the proposals would be reduced to four weeks;

- the amount of prescribed information that the governors must publish would be significantly reduced; and
- the governing body would be able to determine their own proposals, and their determination would be final.

The Government is not proposing any changes to the governance arrangements for foundation schools.

The meeting made reference to the following points:-

- (1) the Government's response to the consultation, particularly the chairmanship of SOC, and the attendance at meetings by LEA officers
- (2) the proposals to streamline the process for primary schools to change category

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

(2) That this Committee place on record its appreciation of the way in which this meeting is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning, in an open and fair way.

(3) That an appropriate response to the consultation be made to the DfES regarding the proposal to streamline the process for primary schools to change category.

The response to include the same points raised and forwarded in response to the previous consultation relating to secondary schools.

31. LGG (ACSES) - COURSES AND CONFERENCES

Resolved:- That the letter from LGG ACSeS regarding details of a half day LGG workshop on 18th October, 2005 be received and noted.

**SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 1ST DECEMBER, 2005**

Present:-

Shabana Ahmed (Minority Communities Group), Mrs. I. Hartley (11-18 Secondary Schools) and Mr. P. Robins (Junior and Infant Schools), Margaret Smith (Special Schools' Group), Patrick White (Church of England), and Councillors Boyes and Austen (LEA Group).

Also in attendance were the following officers:-

Mr. G. Sinclair, Acting Strategic Leader, Children and Young People's Services
Mr. D. Hill, Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development, Children and Young People's Services

Also in attendance were the following objectors:-

Sharon Taylor, Chair of Governors, Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior School
Melanie Ross, Governor, Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant School
Alan Johnson, Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant School

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Malcolm Robertson, Ann Winfield, Kabir Hussain, Ted Kelsey, Barry Sampson, David Smart, Joan Troy, Jackie Scott, Councillor Havenhand, Mr. Sulleman and Frank McDermott.

33. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Irene Hartley be appointed Chair of this meeting.

34. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME

Introductions were made and Shabana Ahmed and Margaret Smith were welcomed to their first meeting of the School Organisation Committee.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Margaret Smith declared a personal interest. Margaret knew the Chair of Governors of the Junior School in a professional capacity.

Irene Hartley declared a personal interest due to her role as Personal Assistant to the Local Government of Parliament (the objectors had written to local MP's).

Tom Minett, Democratic Services Officer, advised both members with

respect to the regulations on declarations of interest.

36. PROPOSAL TO AMALGAMATE SWINTON FITZWILLIAM JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOLS AND OBJECTIONS RECEIVED RELATING TO THE PROPOSAL

Tom Minett, Democratic Services Officer, advised the meeting of the procedure to be followed in respect of determining this proposal.

The Committee was advised to consider the following three issues as part of the decision-making procedure, prior to consideration of the proposal, and prior to inviting the press and public into the meeting.

1. Did the Committee wish the meeting to be open to the public and press?

Resolved:- That the meeting be open to the public and press.

2. How many speakers on behalf of the objectors did the Committee consider to be a suitable number to speak to the objections?

Resolved:- That the two representatives, one from the Infant school and one from the Junior school be allowed to present information on behalf of their particular school.

3. Did the Committee feel it was necessary to arrange a site visit?

At this point recent photographs of the schools' sites, showing a comparison of the proximity of both schools were shown.

The photographs put into context the slope between, and different levels of, the two schools, in response to one of the complaints raised by the objectors.

At this point members (3 objectors) of the public and press were invited into the meeting and informed of the decision by the School Organisation Committee to visit both schools prior to further consideration of the proposal. The objectors confirmed their agreement to this decision.

Resolved:- That, despite the photographs circulated, a site visit be arranged for Thursday, 15th December at 10.00 a.m. That this visit include a visit to an amalgamated school of similar circumstances and layout.

**SCHOOL ORGANISATION COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 11TH JANUARY, 2006**

Present:-

Mrs. I. Hartley (In the Chair) (11-18 Secondary Schools), Councillor G. Boyes (LEA); Mr. B. Sampson (Church of England), Mr. D. Smart (Junior Schools), Mrs. M. Smith (Special Schools' Group), Mr. M. Sulleman (Minority Communities Group); Phil Robins (Junior and Infant Schools); Joan Troy ((11-18 Secondary Schools); and Mr. P. White (Church of England)

Also in attendance were the following officers:-

Mr. D. Hill (Education, Culture and Leisure Services) and Graham Sinclair (Children and Young People's Services)

Also in attendance were the following objectors:-

Sharon Taylor, Chair of Governors, Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior School
Harry Harrison,
Dawn Wild, Governor, Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant School
Angela Yardy (Parent Governor)
Alan Johnson (Governor), Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant School

37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Ted Kelsey, Malcolm Robertson, Ann Winfield and Councillors Austen and Havenhand.

38. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Irene Hartley be appointed Chair of this meeting.

39. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

40. TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL TO AMALGAMATE SWINTON FITZWILLIAM JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOLS AND OBJECTIONS RECEIVED RELATING TO THE PROPOSAL.

Consideration was given to the content of a report of the Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development, regarding a proposal to 'amalgamate' Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant and Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior Schools with effect from 1st September, 2006.

In order to do this both Schools will be closed and a new Fitzwilliam Primary school, with an age range of 3-11 years, will be opened. The

new Primary school will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

The school would have 350 places (R-Y6) with a Nursery unit of up to 52 places (26 FTE). (This is the combined numbers of the current two schools). The new school would have an admission number of 50.

The principal objectives of amalgamation are:-

- i) to provide a continuous primary entitlement across the key stages; and
- ii) to provide a unified management structure with a single school ethos which will be more efficient and make more effective use of resources.

Considerations for amalgamation are described in the School Organisation Plan in Section 4, 'LEA Policies and Principles'. These are where:-

- (1) It is possible to accommodate all of the children on one site, thereby removing surplus places (if applicable).
- (2) The admission limit is already no more than 60, or can be reduced to no more than 60, by the associated removal of surplus places.
- (3) Both Key Stages are on the same site.
- (4) There is a vacancy for one or both head teacher posts (and possibly deputy head teachers also) as a result of retirement or resignation.

The criteria for amalgamation has been met.

In considering the proposal, members had regard to the following:-

- statutory consultation process;
- details of the objections/concerns raised by parents/community/staff, together with the LEA's responses to those concerns;
- the relevant statutory guidance;
- the timetable for the proposal;
- the Statutory Guidance to be followed in deciding upon the issue; the procedures to be followed,
- the specific issues to be considered in respect of the proposal as set out in the papers submitted (including advantages and disadvantages);
- the submissions made by various parties – i.e. LEA, School Governing Bodies, Access Officer and letters from

- parents/community/staff;
- the content of the School Organisation Plan,
- the letters of objections to the proposal.

At the conclusion of the LEA's presentation to the meeting, the following questions were raised-

Member of SOC – Regarding the decision on whether to have one or two staffrooms, did this mean one school having an enlarged staff room or both, and if so, how soon would that be done?

Response from LEA – Mr. G. Sinclair, Acting Head of Service, Resources and Access explained that one school would have one enlarged staff room. There may be areas in both buildings where staff could make a drink, for example. In terms of when the staffroom would be available, ideally it would be ready from 1st September, 2006.

Member of SOC – Would the covered walkway between both schools be enclosed and could the walkway be fitted with a lift?

Response from LEA – Mr. D. Hill, Manager, School Organisation, Planning and Development replied that the plans currently drawn up showed a canopy across the top of the walkway. There was a system used in the Local Authority called the "jolly stair climber". This was a mechanical device which could slide underneath a wheelchair which climbed the stairs with a person in it. That would only be a temporary solution.

Member of SOC – Would children move from one school to another for dining purposes?

Response from LEA – No decision had been made. There was provision for children to eat separately. There was no reason for that to change. Both school halls were amply big enough and new school halls would not have this amount of space.

Objector - As a result of members of the School Organisation Committee having visited the site, and having seen the impracticalities of disabled access between both schools, had the Committee determined an action plan to address issues for parents of disabled children?

Response from LEA - Mr. D. Hill, Manager, School Organisation, Planning and Development drew attention to page 29 of the agenda pack which related to the DDA legislation which requires the LEA and Schools to make reasonable adjustments to allow pupils with disabilities to be treated no less favourably for a reason relating to disability. The duty does not, however, require schools to make adjustments to physical features. There was currently no pupils or staff that required disabled accessibility at both schools, but the LEA had a duty to address individual needs as that need arose.

The needs of pupils can often be met by a combination of methods and in particular where schools are on two levels, (e.g. as in most secondary schools).

No pupils currently required a lift but this would be addressed if the need arose.

Presentation by Objector on behalf of the Infants School

Objector - The Access Officer had stated that plans to the Junior school entrance had been approved, and funding approved by the LEA, to make the Junior School fully accessible as it presently stood. The amalgamation seemed therefore to be a loss of £60,000 funding that had been put into the scheme.

Whilst the meeting in November had advised that the provision of an accessible walkway between the two schools was only a part of the DDA requirements, it was felt to be the most crucial part, all other aspects being fine-tuning. The DDA legislation required the LEA to make reasonable adjustments to ensure that the disabled are treated no less favourably. Surely to be denied access was less favourable to them. The view was that the policy of amalgamation was not a reasonable adjustment. Whilst the DDA did not require adjustments to physical features, it did require strategies to be drawn up to improve access. The amalgamation did the reverse.

Already a parent had not chosen the school because of the problem with wheelchair accessibility.

The LEA's report stated that "there are currently no pupils or staff who require a lift and the LEA/School will address the needs of individual pupils and staff, as and when the need arises". The Disability Rights Commission helpline had advised that this is not good enough. Disability can happen overnight (last year there had been a child in each school in a wheelchair for three months following accidents). Reference was made to information from the Disability Rights Commission regarding improvements to the physical environment, which might include lighting, lifts and ramps, and carpeting etc.

The objector's view was that there was no comparable example in the LEA as the only access from the Infant School for a child would be by way of leaving the premises and going on an outside pathway up the hill with a member of staff. There was a lot of outside walking to do other than the canopied walkway area and a second set of steps would still remain uncovered.

The Infant School was presently well suited for disabled access. The amalgamation was felt to be a backward step.

If there was no need to transfer children between premises, how could the LEA view it as one school?

Regarding the concern on hall size which had been commented upon in the LEA's last report in November, 2005, the minimum total area for a primary school with 350 places should be 205m², whilst the TOTAL AREA was met, neither hall met it individually – therefore there could be no whole school events.

This view was apparently supported by the Council's own Access Officer who had stated that "the two schools would remain entirely separate and independent as they are now". There was no way, without breaking the Council's own exclusion rules, there could be combined events. The Fire Officer was also concerned that the LEA had a duty to plan for progressive improvements to accessibility of their buildings. The amalgamation was felt to be a backward step.

There was also no means of making economies if it was not possible to change dining arrangements.

In addition, the report implied a lack of understanding regarding the use of the staff room for whole staff meetings. A comment had been made that it was likely that whole staff meetings would occur at lunchtimes or before and after pupils arrived. The amalgamation would result in no whole school single ethos/unity. They were two separate buildings being forced to work together without providing adequate means of doing that.

Response from LEA

Mr. G. Sinclair, Acting Head of Service, Resources and Access responded as follows:-

Accessibility Issues

The LEA was clear what every school had to do in terms of the "Every Child Matters" agenda. Therefore if there was a situation where the schools had amalgamated and if the need arose, a "jolly stair climber" could be installed and if more long term plans were required, they would be done in relation to a lift into the playground between the two schools. That was possible.

In terms of not treating people any less favourably, if the LEA made sure that two buildings on one site were accessible for disabled pupils, they would still be compliant with one amalgamated school having access to both buildings.

The amalgamation was not just about access to buildings. There was also the through primary ethos in terms of common reading schemes and numeracy schemes which did not exist now.

In terms of the hall, and Government funding and rules, the hall was big enough for all children, certainly the Infant School hall.

Whether it would be big enough for all of the children and all of the parents was questionable but many schools had to manage that aspect in terms of Christmas events, for example. It was not unusual.

With regard to the staff room, there was a big enough staffroom in one of the buildings. It would be quite common in big Primary Schools or certainly Secondary Schools, for staff to be walking quite long distances to have staff meetings after school. It was not unusual.

The amalgamation was also within the context of all Primary schools throughout the Borough. From September, 2006 the LEA would have 19 separate Infant Schools, 18 separate Junior Schools and 67 through Primary Schools. This particular amalgamation was therefore not out of pattern with the rest of the LA.

Presentation from Objector on behalf of the Junior School

Accessibility – An extra walkway was not being discussed, but an extra set of stairs that linked one playground to the other school. There still had to be the consideration of the movement of staff and children in all weathers around the outside of the building.

It was understood that the LA needed time to improve disabled access but thought had to be given to making the most of the single school ethos.

Regarding the timing of the proposal, the Junior school Head Teacher had intended to retire in January last year. The Junior School had worked with an Acting Head Teacher since April, 2005. The proposal to bring in an amalgamated school in September, 2006 meant that the Junior School would have been in that position for over a year.

Another concern of the Junior School Governing Body to this amalgamation had been the process that they had had to go through.

The first time the Governing Body had been provided with some information had been in July, 2005 and it had become clear that very little work had been done to look in principle at what would happen if the two schools merged. There had been the belief that a through school would happen. As Governors, they supported the idea that a through school would be advantageous. However, the real problem was the fact that it was very difficult to establish on the Junior site. There were landscaping difficulties and it was not easy to move people around.

It was alleged that, until today, the Governors had not seen the information available to the School Organisation Committee.

The Governing Body was still worried that the LEA was not fully

committed to providing funding (a) for a staffroom that was big enough to accommodate all teachers daily and (b) guarantee provision to fund a set of steps.

This, coupled with having no permanent Head Teacher in place for over a year and a Head Teacher who would then have to start dealing with these issues and have to spend time trying to bring two schools together, and work the ethos and sort out logistical problems, would all put children at risk.

The Governing Body would like the LEA to consider the walkway and whether guarantees of funding could be given today.

The situation was one of having two Deputies in the Junior school to provide support for a Head Teacher who would spend much time between one school or the other. Both Deputies were also teachers who had a full-time commitment to teaching posts. They were not available to go out of classrooms as a Head Teacher would. Was the LEA making an expectation of a non-teaching post in the school for a Deputy Head Teacher?

With regard to the LEA saying the schools were not being compared with a new school but being asked to consider whether the existing school would benefit from an amalgamation, that was one aspect the reporting objector was passionate about. It was unfair to compare them with what a new school would be lucky to get.

In terms of moving young children up stairs, from a Health and Safety point of view it was not going to be easy with children aged 3-11 years.

In terms of the LEA saying that in a secondary school teachers had to move considerable distances to meetings, it was felt the School Organisation Committee should think about what made a school ethos in a primary school. It was about teachers having a really good understanding of their pupils moving from ages 3-11. It was the chats and ideas that they had together, both informally and on a formal basis, that made a school work. It was less of an issue in a Comprehensive school when they may be talking of inter-department needs.

Response by LEA

In making this amalgamation successful, the LEA acknowledged that the one staffroom was absolutely essential so that would be funded, and the covered stairway. The clarification of what the LEA would be funding was contained in the information in the agenda pack for this meeting.

In terms of the role of non-teaching deputies, these were decisions that the new School Governing Body would have to make when discussing their budget. Quite often in relation to a bigger school, schools are able to fund a new non-teaching Deputy.

Response from a Member of SOC

In relation to concerns raised about the movement of children, Councillor Boyes stated that under normal circumstances children in primary schools would generally work in classrooms and would not be moved about as they are in secondary schools.

AT THIS POINT THE OBJECTORS LEFT THE MEETING IN ORDER FOR VOTING TO TAKE PLACE.

Mr. T. E. Minett, Democratic Services Officer, advised the meeting regarding the procedure to be followed in relation to voting, abstentions, disagreement of a proposal and the role of the School Adjudicator.

The meeting broke into groups.

Indicative Vote:-

LEA	In Favour
Schools Group	Against
Church of England	Against
Minority Group	In Favour

Following the indicative vote, a lengthy debate took place on the following aspects of the proposal:-

- physical distance and height between schools – impact on children
- the current good educational standards within both schools and whether the amalgamation would jeopardise/improve this
- the level of objections
- the proven educational benefits of through schools to the achievements of children – single school ethos
- the work introduced for a new Head Teacher in bringing the schools together
- good experiences of other parents of disabled children who are currently attending mainstream schools within the LEA
- movement of children on a daily basis
- the proven success of through schools in Rotherham
- present management/leadership arrangements of both schools – impact of this on an amalgamation
- interaction of teaching staff between two buildings and ways of bringing them together
- short and long term issues for pupils

- staffroom issue

The meeting again broke up into their groups in order to deliberate upon the final vote.

Final Vote:-

LEA In Favour

Schools Group Abstain (Based on discussion after indicative vote)

Church of England Abstain (Based on discussion after indicative vote)

Minority Group In Favour

The meeting gave the following reasons for their decision:-

- **the proven educational/curriculum benefits to the children of ‘through’ schools – single school ethos**
- **the subsequent benefits of provision of funding and leadership which amalgamation would bring – i.e. effective use of resources**
- **coping with and overcoming the current physical distance and “mental” barrier between the two schools and developing a new school approach to pupil/staff development**

Resolved:- That the proposal as submitted by the Senior Executive Director, Children and Young People’s Services, to “amalgamate” Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant and Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior Schools with effect from 1st September, 2006, be fully approved, subject to the sides of the covered stairway (i.e. the area as shown in the drawing) between the two schools, being totally covered to the ground by the 1st September, 2006.

**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO GOVERNING BODIES – AUTUMN TERM 2005**

CONSULTATION ON ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ADMISSION YEAR 2007/08

i) Admission Numbers and Admissions Criteria

This item gives governors the opportunity to consider the admission arrangements (criteria and admission number), which will apply for admission in 2007/08. The Local Admission 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 the year is:-

Autumn Term 2005	Governing bodies consider the arrangements which will apply.
By 13 th January 2006	All relevant details to be forwarded to the LEA.
18 th January – 1 st March 2006	Period of consultation via the LEA's website.
By end of March	LEA and the Local Admission Forum consider any changes and forward any comments to appropriate Admission Authority(ies).
By 15 th April 2006	All admission authorities to determine their arrangements and notify those consulted.

Community and Controlled Schools

For these schools, the LEA is the admission authority. The proposed admissions criteria for 2007/08 are shown at Appendix 1. There are two proposed changes to the 2006/07 criteria, which are as follows:-

- 1 Remove 'Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs' from the criteria in order to make 'Children in Public Care' top priority and to include within the Admissions Booklet a statement to the effect that such children will gain a place at the school named in the statement as part of that process.

NB This corresponds to a change in advice from the DfES and follows on from some recent judgements by the Adjudicator. There is currently consultation on a proposed new draft guidance document and new draft regulations on the admission of children in public care, which makes this change essential. It will not have any adverse effect on the admission of children with special educational needs.

- 2 To include a tie-breaker (distance) which could be used where the admission number is reached mid category. This could be used as part of the initial allocation process and for any of the admission criteria (eg catchment pupils), but would most likely be in the allocation process for late applicants only as described in the co-ordinated schemes.

Admission numbers for 2006/07 and proposed numbers for 2007/08 for each school are as shown in Appendix 2.

Action: The governing body should complete and return the pro-forma to Martin Harrop, 1st Floor, Norfolk House, as soon as possible and no later than **13th January 2006**.

Voluntary Aided Schools

The governing body is the admission authority. Governing Bodies of Church of England schools should consult their Diocesan Board before consulting anyone else.

Following the successful completion of the consultation exercise for the 2006/07 academic year via the Authority's internet site, governing bodies for voluntary aided schools are relieved of the duty to consult for 2007/08, provided there are no proposed changes to the admission criteria/number. However, governing bodies need to be aware of the proposed changes to the LEA's admissions criteria in relation to Children in Public Care and Children with Statements of Educational Needs following on from proposed new guidance and the draft regulations and these will probably also require a change to the published admission criteria for each voluntary aided school.

Action: Governing Bodies to consider the need to amend the admissions criteria and also to consider the admission number appropriate for the school. Full details of the admissions criteria and admissions number to be forwarded to the LEA by 13th January 2006 in order for the full consultation with all the appropriate consultees to be carried out via the Internet where there is any proposed change. This should be done by e-mail to martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk Pro-forma to be completed and returned as for community and controlled schools.

Further General Points

All admission numbers should now be set by reference to the indicated admission number (IAN) deriving from the net capacity calculation.

An admission number higher than the IAN can be set, subject to the necessary consultation, feedback and determination.

An admission number lower than the IAN can be set, subject to the above, but would also require the publication of a notice with provision for objection to the Adjudicator.

All infant, J&I, Primary schools need to continue to be mindful of the need to maintain classes from R to Y2 at 30 or less.

If you require any further information or would wish to discuss any matters relating to admission numbers/criteria/net capacity, please contact Martin Harrop on 01709 822415.

ii) Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements

Schemes for the co-ordination of admission arrangements for Primary and Secondary schools were agreed for 2006/07.

There are no proposed changes to the schemes for 2007/08.

Action: Governing Bodies to note and to forward any comments, if any, to the LEA marked for the attention of Martin Harrop.

Admission Criteria for community and controlled schools – 2007/08

Primary Reception

Places will be allocated in the following order of priority

- i) 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.
- ii) Children who on the Closing Date are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iii) 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.
- iv) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- v) 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.
- vi) Children who on the Closing Date 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 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.
- ii) Children in attendance at Y2 in the associated Infant School.
- iii) Children who on the Closing Date are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iv) Children whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the 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**.
- vii) Children who on the Closing Date 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 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.
 - ii) Children who, on the Closing Date, are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
 - iii) 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.
 - iv) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
 - v) 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.
 - vi) Children who, on the Closing Date, are on the roll of one of the associated Primary/Junior/Junior and Infant schools as identified by the Authority.
 - vii) Children who, on the Closing Date, live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plane, (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").
- 1 Where the admission number is likely to be reached mid category, priority will be given to those children who, on the Closing Date, live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plane (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").
 - 2 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.
 - 3 Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs will automatically gain a place at the school named in the statement via that process.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Anston Brook Primary	253	36	40	40	
Anston Greenlands J&I	247	35	38	38/35	Govs to consider
Anston Hillcrest Primary	210	30	30	30	
Anston Park Infant	225	75	75	75	
Anston Park Junior	270	67	75	75	
Aston CE J&I	210	30	30		
Aston Fence J&I	140	20	20	20	
Aston Hall J&I	210	30	30	30	
Aston Lodge Primary	210	30	30	30	
Aston Springwood Primary	210	30	30	30	
Aughton Primary	195	27	30	30	
Badsley Moor Infant	270	90	90	90	
Badsley Moor Junior	360	90	90	90	
Blackburn Primary	389	55	56	55/56	Govs to consider
Bramley Grange Primary	280	40	40	40	
Bramley Sunnyside Infant	240	80	80	80	
Bramley Sunnyside Junior	320	80	80	80	
Brampton Cortonwood Infant	120	40	40	40	
Brampton the Ellis CE Infant	120	40	40		
Brampton the Ellis CE Junior	269	67	70		
Brinsworth Howarth J&I	210	30	30	30	
Brinsworth Manor Infant	240	80	80	80	
Brinsworth Manor Junior	320	80	80	80	
Brinsworth Whitehill Primary	296	42	42	42	
Broom Valley Infant	225/180	75/60	75	75/60	Revised capacity?
Broom Valley Junior	272	68	68	68	
Canklow Woods Primary	270	38	38	38	
Catcliffe Primary	170	24	25	25	
Coleridge Primary	210	30	30	30	
Dalton Foljambe J&I	141	20	30	30	
Dinnington Primary	364	52	52	52	
St Joseph's Catholic Primary (Dinnington)	196	28	28		
East Dene J&I	420/350	60/50	50	50	To reduce in line with new build capacity
Ferham Primary	210	30	30	30	
Flanderwell Primary	175	25	30	30	
Greasbrough J&I	308	44	50	50	
Harthill Primary	180	25	30	30	
Herringthorpe Infant	210	70	70	70	
Herringthorpe Junior	280	70	70	70	
High Greave Infant	180	60	60	60	
High Greave Junior	240	60	60	60	

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Kilnhurst Primary	196	28	28	28	
Kimberworth Primary	210	30	30	30	New school will have capacity of 210 (R-Y6)
Kiveton Park Infant	162	54	50	54	
Kiveton Park Meadows Junior	180	45	59	45/54/59	Govs to consider
Laughton CE Primary	105	15	15		
Laughton J&I	145	20	24	24	
Lilly Hall Junior	240	60	60	60	
Listerdale J&I	210	30	30	30	
Maltby Craggs Infant	210	70	70	70	
Maltby Craggs Junior	280	70	70	70	
Maltby Hall Infant	178	59	60	60	
Maltby Manor Infant	180	60	60	60	
Maltby Manor Junior	243	60	60	60	
Maltby Redwood J&I	315	45	45	45	
St Mary's Catholic Primary (Maltby)	210	30	30		
Meadowhall Primary	280	40	40	40	New school will have capacity for 280 (R-Y6)
Ravenfield Primary	210	30	30	30	
Rawmarsh Ashwood J&I	210	30	30	30	
Rawmarsh St Mary's CE Primary	131	18	30		
Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant	173	57	60	60	
Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior	243	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Rosehill Junior	240	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Ryecroft Infant	180	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Sandhill Primary	209	29	30	30	
Rawmarsh St Joseph's Catholic Primary	197	28	30		
Rawmarsh Thorogate J&I	210	30	30	30	
Redscope J & I	420	60	60	60	
Rockingham J&I	390	55	56	56	
Roughwood Primary	392	56	56	56	
Sitwell Infant	228	76	76	76	
Sitwell Junior	300	75	76	76	
St Ann's J&I	420	60	60	60	
St Bede's Catholic Primary	280	40	40		
St Mary's Catholic Primary (Herr)	208	29	30		

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
St Thomas' CE Primary (Kiln)	180	25	30	30	
Swallownest Primary	210	30	30	30	
Swinton Brookfield Primary	322	46	50	50	
Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant	150	50	50	50	
Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior	176	44	50	50	
Swinton Queen Primary	315	45	45	45	
Thornhill Primary	210	30	30	30	
Thorpe Hesley Infant	210	70	80	80	
Thorpe Hesley Junior	324	81	81	81	
Thrybergh Fullerton CE Primary	105	15	15		
Thrybergh Primary	261	37	50	37/40/50	Govs to consider
St Gerard's Catholic Primary	140	20	20		
Thurcroft Infant	180	60	60	60	
Thurcroft Junior	373	93	70	70	
Todwick J&I	210	30	30	30	
Treeton CE Primary	259	37	37		
Trinity Croft CE J&I	112	16	16		
Wales Primary	164	23	30	30	
Wath CE Primary	210	30	30		
Wath Central Primary	420	60	60	60	
Our Lady & St Joseph's Catholic Primary	175	25	30		
Wath Victoria J&I	270	38	40	40	
Wentworth CE J&I	104	14	14	14	
West Melton J&I	128	18	28	28	
Whiston J&I	210	30	30	30	
Whiston Worrygoose J&I	210	30	30	30	
Wickersley Northfield Primary	419	59	60	60	
St Alban's CE Primary	210	30	30		
Woodsetts J&I	205	29	30	30	

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

School	Net Capacity Figure	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	1755	300	300	300	
Brinsworth Comprehensive School	1487	255	255	255	
Clifton, A Community Arts School	1433	286	250	250	To correspond with capacity of new build
Dinnington Comprehensive School	1444	252	252	252	
Maltby Comprehensive School	1638	290	290	290	
Oakwood Technology College	1050	210	210	210	
Rawmarsh School, A Sports College	1108	221	222	221/222	Govs to consider
Swinton Community School, A Maths & Computing College	1320	226	226	226	
Thrybergh Comprehensive	704/700	140	140	140	Net capacity should be 700 for 2006
Wales High School	1520	248	248	248	
Wath Comprehensive, A Language College	1740/1800	290/300	300	300	Net capacity should be 1800 for 2006
Wickersley School and Sports College	1725/1850	279/300	300	300	Net capacity should be 1850 for 2006
Wingfield Comprehensive	845	169	170	170	Net capacity should be 850 for 2006
Winterhill	1128 (for Old Hall)	225	320	320	Net capacity should be 1600 with new build
St Bernard's Catholic High, Specialist School for the Arts	664	132	132		New capacity assessment pending. Govs to consider
Pope Pius X Catholic High	650	130	130		

ADMISSION NUMBER FOR SIXTH FORMS

School Name	Admission Number for Y7-Y11	Proposed Admission Number for Y12 2007/08 *
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	300	45
Brinsworth Comprehensive School	255	38
Dinnington Comprehensive School	252	37
Maltby Comprehensive School	290	43
Swinton Community School, A Maths & Computing College	226	34
Wales High School	248	37
Wath Comprehensive, A Language College	300	45
Wickersley Schools and Sports College	300	45

* This number is 15% of the admission number for Y7.

PRO- FORMA

ADMISSIONS CONSULTATION FOR 2007/08 ENTRY

In respect of the proposed changes to the LEA's proposed admissions criteria applicable to community and controlled schools:

- 1 Changes relating to Children with Statements of Special Educational Needs and Children in Public Care.

Agree

Disagree

Comments:

- 2 Addition of a proposed tie-breaker (distance) where the admission number is likely to be reached mid category.

This should be applied throughout the allocation process.

Agree

Disagree

This should be applied in respect of late applications only.

Agree

Disagree

Comments:

- 3 Community and Controlled Schools:

Proposed Admission Number 2007/08

Agree

Disagree

If disagree, the suggested admission number for the school is

Further comments:

4 Voluntary Aided Schools

There will be no changes to the admission criteria.

Amendments will be made to the admissions criteria to reflect the necessary changes in relation to Children with SEN Statements and those in Public Care.

The proposed admission number for the school for 2007/08 is.

NB Please complete this pro-forma and return to Martin Harrop by no later than **13th January 2006**.

For any changed admissions criteria for voluntary aided schools, please forward the full criteria via e-mail to: martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	14th March 2006
3.	Title:	Admissions to Schools 2007/08 – Consultation Report (All Wards)
4.	Programme Area:	Children and Young People’s Services

5. **Summary:** This report covers issues that have arisen as a result of the annual consultation exercise with and between schools and other LEAs. All admission authorities must determine their arrangements by 15th April 2006.

6. **Recommendations: That:**

- i) the proposed admission numbers contained within Annex 1 for community/controlled schools be confirmed for 2007/08, subject to the clarifications/amendments contained in Annex 2 Ai).
- ii) the proposed amendments to the admissions criteria for community/controlled schools for 2007/08 in respect of children with statements of SEN, the use of a tie-breaker and necessary changes relating to ‘relevant looked after children’ be confirmed.
- iii) the changes shown at Annex 2B) in respect of voluntary aided schools be noted,
- iv) the appropriate notice be published in respect of the proposed admission numbers for schools named in Annex 2C), where the admission number will be less than that indicated by the current net capacity calculation,
- v) all admission authorities be informed of the necessary changes brought about by the Education (Admission of Looked After Children) (England) Regulations 2006.
- vi) the co-ordinated admissions schemes for both Primary and Secondary schools be confirmed and forwarded to the Secretary of State as required and
- vii) this report be forwarded to the Local Admissions Forum (LAF) for consideration at its next meeting.

7. **Proposals and Details:** Annex 1 shows details of the LEA's consultation document, which was considered by governing bodies during the Autumn Term 2005. This has also been accessible on the Authority's website (along with any proposed changes notified by church voluntary aided schools) between 26th January and 1st March 2006.

The proposed admissions criteria for community and controlled schools differ from those applicable in the previous year in two respects:-

- i) removal of 'Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs' from the criteria, and
- ii) the introduction of a distance tie-breaker where the admission number is reached mid-category.

Community and controlled schools have also been consulted on their proposed admission number and voluntary-aided schools have had the opportunity to consider both their admission criteria and admission number.

All feedback received by the Authority is summarised in Annex 2, which also includes further information on the recently published Education (Admission of Looked After Children) (England) Regulations 2006. The Local Admission Forum also needs to consider this report.

8. **Finance:** There are no specific financial consequences related to the recommendations of this report, although numbers on roll do have an effect on individual school budgets.
9. **Risks and Uncertainties:** All consultees must be informed of any determination and it is possible for objections to be made to the Adjudicator.
10. **Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:** The proposed changes to the admissions criteria to be used for community/controlled schools in an oversubscribed situation could have a minor effect on the performance indicators for surplus places/parental preference, but it is impossible to quantify this. There is, however, a possible negative impact for a potentially small number of parents/pupils who might not gain a place at their preferred school. The proposal is that the use of a tie-breaker would only take place in instances where not to do so would lead to a potential contravention of the law on infant class sizes or the otherwise unsustainable use of resources.
11. **Background Papers and Consultation:** This is an annual consultation exercise undertaken by reference to statutory regulations and associated guidance – School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Education Act 2002 and subsequent regulations, DfES School Admissions Code of Practice.

There are also new regulations - The Education (Admission of Looked After Children) (England) Regulations 2006 which are relevant.

Contact Name : Martin Harrop, Principal Officer, Forward Planning,
01709 822415
e-mail: martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk

**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO GOVERNING BODIES – AUTUMN TERM 2005**

ANNEX 1

**CONSULTATION ON ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ADMISSION YEAR
2007/08**

i) Admission Numbers and Admissions Criteria

This item gives governors the opportunity to consider the admission arrangements (criteria and admission number), which will apply for admission in 2007/08. The Local Admission 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 the year is:-

Autumn Term 2005 which will	Governing bodies consider the arrangements apply.
By 13 th January 2006	All relevant details to be forwarded to the LEA.
18 th January – 1 st March 2006	Period of consultation via the LEA's website.
By end of March	LEA and the Local Admission Forum consider any changes and forward any comments to appropriate Admission Authority(ies).
By 15 th April 2006	All admission authorities to determine their arrangements and notify those consulted.

Community and Controlled Schools

For these schools, the LEA is the admission authority. The proposed admissions criteria for 2007/08 are shown at Appendix 1. There are two proposed changes to the 2006/07 criteria, which are as follows:-

- 1 Remove 'Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs' from the criteria in order to make 'Children in Public Care' top priority and to include within the Admissions Booklet a statement to the effect that such children will gain a place at the school named in the statement as part of that process.

NB This corresponds to a change in advice from the DfES and follows on from some recent judgement by the Adjudicator. There is currently consultation on a proposed new draft guidance document and new draft regulations on the admission

of children in public care, which makes this change essential. It will not have any adverse effect on the admission of children with special educational needs.

- 2 To include a tie-breaker (distance) which could be used where the admission number is reached mid category. This could be used as part of the initial allocation process and for any of the admission criteria (eg catchment pupils), but would be most likely used in the allocation process for late applicants only as described in the co-ordinated schemes. Admission numbers for 2006/07 and proposed numbers for 2007/08 for each school are as shown in Appendix 2.

Action: The governing body should complete and return the pro-forma to Martin Harrop, 1st Floor, Norfolk House, as soon as possible and no later than **13th January 2006**.

Voluntary Aided Schools

The governing body is the admission authority. Governing Bodies of Church of England schools should consult their Diocesan Board before consulting anyone else.

Following the successful completion of the consultation exercise for the 2006/07 academic year via the Authority's internet site, governing bodies for voluntary aided schools are relieved of the duty to consult for 2007/08, provided there are no proposed changes to the admission criteria/number. However, governing bodies need to be aware of the proposed changes to the LEA's admissions criteria in relation to Children in Public Care and Children with Statements of Educational Needs following on from proposed new guidance and the draft regulations and these will probably also require a change to the published admission criteria for each voluntary aided school.

Action: Governing Bodies to consider the need to amend the admissions criteria and also to consider the admission number appropriate for the school. Full details of the admissions criteria and admissions number to be forwarded to the LEA by 13th January 2005 in order for the full consultation with all the appropriate consultees to be carried out via the Internet where there is any proposed change. This should be done by e-mail to martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk Pro-forma to be completed and returned as for community and controlled schools.

Further General Points

All admission numbers should now be set by reference to the indicated admission number (IAN) deriving from the net capacity calculation.

An admission number higher than the IAN can be set, subject to the necessary consultation, feedback and determination.

An admission number lower than the IAN can be set, subject to the above, but would also require the publication of a notice with provision for objection to the Adjudicator.

All infant, J&I, Primary schools need to continue to be mindful of the need to maintain classes from R to Y2 at 30 or less.

If you require any further information or would wish to discuss any matters relating to admission numbers/criteria/net capacity, please contact Martin Harrop on 01709 822415.

ii) Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements

Schemes for the co-ordination of admission arrangements for Primary and Secondary schools were agreed for 2006/07.

There are not proposed changes to the schemes for 2007/08.

Action: Governing Bodies to note and to forward any comments, if any, to the LEA marked for the attention of Martin Harrop.

Admission Criteria for community and controlled schools – 2007/08

Primary Reception

Places will be allocated in the following order of priority

- i) 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.
- ii) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iii) 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.
- iv) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- v) 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.
- vi) 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 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.
- ii) Children in attendance at Y2 in the associated Infant School.
- iii) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- iv) Children whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the 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**.
- vii) 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 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.
 - ii) Children who, on the Allocated Date, are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
 - iii) 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.
 - iv) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
 - v) 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.
 - vi) 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.
 - vii) Children who, on the Allocated Date, live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plane, (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").
- 1 Where the admission number is likely to be reached mid category, priority will be given to those children who, on the Allocated Date, live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plane (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").
 - 2 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.

- 3 Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs will automatically gain a place at the school named in the statement via that process.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Anston Brook Primary	253	36	40	40	
Anston Greenlands J&I	247	35	38	38/35	Govs to consider
Anston Hillcrest Primary	210	30	30	30	
Anston Park Infant	225	75	75	75	
Anston Park Junior	270	67	75	75	
Aston CE J&I	210	30	30		
Aston Fence J&I	140	20	20	20	
Aston Hall J&I	210	30	30	30	
Aston Lodge Primary	210	30	30	30	
Aston Springwood Primary	210	30	30	30	
Aughton Primary	195	27	30	30	
Badsley Moor Infant	270	90	90	90	
Badsley Moor Junior	360	90	90	90	
Blackburn Primary	389	55	56	55/56	Govs to consider
Bramley Grange Primary	280	40	40	40	
Bramley Sunnyside Infant	240	80	80	80	
Bramley Sunnyside Junior	320	80	80	80	
Brampton Cortonwood Infant	120	40	40	40	
Brampton the Ellis CE Infant	120	40	40		
Brampton the Ellis CE Junior	269	67	70		
Brinsworth Howarth J&I	210	30	30	30	
Brinsworth Manor Infant	240	80	80	80	
Brinsworth Manor Junior	320	80	80	80	
Brinsworth Whitehill Primary	296	42	42	42	
Broom Valley Infant	225/180	75/60	75	75/60	Revised capacity?
Broom Valley Junior	272	68	68	68	
Canklow Woods Primary	270	38	38	38	
Catcliffe Primary	170	24	25	25	
Coleridge Primary	210	30	30	30	
Dalton Foljambe J&I	141	20	30	30	
Dinnington Primary	364	52	52	52	
St Joseph's Catholic Primary (Dinnington)	196	28	28		
East Dene J&I	420/350	60/50	50	50	To reduce in line with new build capacity
Ferham Primary	210	30	30	30	
Flanderwell Primary	175	25	30	30	
Greasbrough J&I	308	44	50	50	
Harthill Primary	180	25	30	30	
Herringthorpe Infant	210	70	70	70	
Herringthorpe Junior	280	70	70	70	
High Greave Infant	180	60	60	60	
High Greave Junior	240	60	60	60	

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Kilnhurst Primary	196	28	28	28	
Kimberworth Primary	210	30	30	30	New school will have capacity of 210 (R-Y6)
Kiveton Park Infant	162	54	50	54	
Kiveton Park Meadows Junior	180	45	59	45/54/59	Govs to consider
Laughton CE Primary	105	15	15		
Laughton J&I	145	20	24	24	
Lilly Hall Junior	240	60	60	60	
Listerdale J&I	210	30	30	30	
Maltby Craggs Infant	210	70	70	70	
Maltby Craggs Junior	280	70	70	70	
Maltby Hall Infant	178	59	60	60	
Maltby Manor Infant	180	60	60	60	
Maltby Manor Junior	243	60	60	60	
Maltby Redwood J&I	315	45	45	45	
St Mary's Catholic Primary (Maltby)	210	30	30		
Meadowhall Primary	280	40	40	40	New school will have capacity for 280 (R-Y6)
Ravenfield Primary	210	30	30	30	
Rawmarsh Ashwood J&I	210	30	30	30	
Rawmarsh St Mary's CE Primary	131	18	30		
Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant	173	57	60	60	
Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior	243	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Rosehill Junior	240	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Ryecroft Infant	180	60	60	60	
Rawmarsh Sandhill Primary	209	29	30	30	
Rawmarsh St Joseph's Catholic Primary	197	28	30		
Rawmarsh Thorogate J&I	210	30	30	30	
Redscope J & I	420	60	60	60	
Rockingham J&I	390	55	56	56	
Roughwood Primary	392	56	56	56	
Sitwell Infant	228	76	76	76	
Sitwell Junior	300	75	76	76	
St Ann's J&I	420	60	60	60	
St Bede's Catholic Primary	280	40	40		
St Mary's Catholic Primary (Herr)	208	29	30		

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
St Thomas' CE Primary (Kiln)	180	25	30	30	
Swallownest Primary	210	30	30	30	
Swinton Brookfield Primary	322	46	50	50	
Swinton Fitzwilliam Infant	150	50	50	50	
Swinton Fitzwilliam Junior	176	44	50	50	
Swinton Queen Primary	315	45	45	45	
Thornhill Primary	210	30	30	30	
Thorpe Hesley Infant	210	70	80	80	
Thorpe Hesley Junior	324	81	81	81	
Thrybergh Fullerton CE Primary	105	15	15		
Thrybergh Primary	261	37	50	37/40/50	Govs to consider
St Gerard's Catholic Primary	140	20	20		
Thurcroft Infant	180	60	60	60	
Thurcroft Junior	373	93	70	70	
Todwick J&I	210	30	30	30	
Treeton CE Primary	259	37	37		
Trinity Croft CE J&I	112	16	16		
Wales Primary	164	23	30	30	
Wath CE Primary	210	30	30		
Wath Central Primary	420	60	60	60	
Our Lady & St Joseph's Catholic Primary	175	25	30		
Wath Victoria J&I	270	38	40	40	
Wentworth CE J&I	104	14	14	14	
West Melton J&I	128	18	28	28	
Whiston J&I	210	30	30	30	
Whiston Worrygoose J&I	210	30	30	30	
Wickersley Northfield Primary	419	59	60	60	
St Alban's CE Primary	210	30	30		
Woodsetts J&I	205	29	30	30	

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

School	Net Capacity Figure	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2006/2007	Proposed Admission Number 2007/2008	Comments
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	1755	300	300	300	
Brinsworth Comprehensive School	1487	255	255	255	
Clifton, A Community Arts School	1433	286	250	250	To correspond with capacity of new build
Dinnington Comprehensive School	1444	252	252	252	
Maltby Comprehensive School	1638	290	290	290	
Oakwood Technology College	1050	210	210	210	
Rawmarsh School, A Sports College	1108	221	222	221/222	Govs to consider
Swinton Community School, A Maths & Computing College	1320	226	226	226	
Thrybergh Comprehensive	704/700	140	140	140	Net capacity should be 700 for 2006
Wales High School	1520	248	248	248	
Wath Comprehensive A Language College	1740/1800	290/300	300	300	Net capacity should be 1800 for 2006
Wickersley School and Sports College	1725/1850	279/300	300	300	Net capacity should be 1850 for 2006
Wingfield Comprehensive	845	169	170	170	Net capacity should be 850 for 2006
Winterhill	1128 (for Old Hall)	225	320	320	Net capacity should be 1600 with new build
St Bernard's Catholic High, Specialist School for the Arts	664	132	132		New capacity assessment pending. Govs to consider.
Pope Pius X Catholic High	650	130	130		

ADMISSION NUMBER FOR SIXTH FORMS

School Name	Admission Number for Y7-Y11	Proposed Admission Number for Y12 2007/08 *
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	300	45
Brinsworth Comprehensive School	255	38
Dinnington Comprehensive School	252	37
Maltby Comprehensive School	290	43
Swinton Community School, A Maths & Computing College	226	34
Wales High School	248	37
Wath Comprehensive A Language College	300	45
Wickersley Schools and Sports College	300	45

* This number is 15% of the admission number for Y7.

PRO- FORMA

ADMISSIONS CONSULTATION FOR 2007/08 ENTRY

In respect of the proposed changes to the LEA's proposed admissions criteria applicable to community and controlled schools.

- 1 Changes relating to Children with Statements of Special Educational Needs and Children in Public Care.

Agree

Disagree

Comments:

- 2 Addition of a proposed tie-breaker (distance) where the admission number is likely to be reached mid category.

This should be applied throughout the allocation process.

Agree

Disagree

This should be applied in respect of the application only.

Agree

Disagree

Comments:

- 3 Community and Controlled School:

Proposed Admission Number 2007/08

Agree

Disagree

If disagree, the suggested admission number for the school is

.....

Further comments:

4 Voluntary Aided Schools

There will be no changes to the admission criteria.

Amendments will be made to the admissions criteria to Reflect the necessary changes in the relation to Children with SEN Statements and those in Public Care.

The proposed admission number for the school for 2007/08 is.

NB Please complete this pro-forma and return to Martin Harrop by no later than **13th January 2006.**

For any changed admissions criteria for voluntary aided schools, please forward the full criteria via e-mail to: martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk

Feedback from the annual admissions consultationA) Community and Controlled Schoolsi) Admission numbers

A number of schools were asked to give consideration to a possible change to their admission number to that already in place for 2006/07. Responses have been as follows:-

School	Possible Numbers	Number preferred by Governors
Anston Greenlands	35/38	38
Blackburn	55/56	56
Broom Valley Inf	60/75	60
Kiveton Park Meadows Jnr	45/54/59	59
Thrybergh Primary	37/40/50	37
Rawmarsh School, A Sports College	221/222	222

For all of the above, the governors' preferred number is either the same as the previous number (2006/07 admission year) or, where different, it now matches the indicated admission number derived from the latest net capacity assessment for the school. There is no reason, therefore, not to agree the preferred number in each case.

Additionally, there has been a request received from Wentworth CE School (controlled) that the admission number should revert to 16. The admission number has varied between 14 and 16 over the last few years. There are four classrooms at the school and an admission number of 16 can be accommodated within the net capacity calculation.

It should also be noted that the indicated admission number for Dinnington Primary school is now 43 following a recent recalculation of the net capacity. The governors have agreed that this should be the admission number for the school for 2007/08.

ii) Admission Criteria

As stated earlier in the main report, governing bodies have been asked to consider and comment on the proposed changes to the Authority's admissions criteria, which would be used where a school was oversubscribed. The feedback can be summarised as follows:-

Changes	In Favour	Against
Removal of 'Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs' from the criteria	88.9%	11.1%
Inclusion of a tie-breaker (distance)		
i) throughout the process	89.3%	10.7%
ii) for late applications only	53.6%	46.4%

Clearly, there has been strong backing for the removal of 'children with a statement of Special Educational Needs' from within the criteria. This is necessary to comply with DfES guidance and in order to leave 'relevant looked after children' as the top criterion. There are regulations now in force regarding the latter (see below).

As explained in the consultative document, this change will have no adverse effect on children with a statement of special educational needs, who will continue to gain a place at the school named via the statementing process.

In respect of the use of a tie-breaker, there was also strong backing that this should be used throughout the process, with close to a fifty/fifty split as to whether it should be used for late applications only.

B Voluntary Aided Schools

Schools were asked to consider arrangements for 2007/08. Consultation was not required where there was no proposed change to the 2006/07 arrangements.

The following proposed changes to admission numbers were received:-

School	Previous Admission Number	Proposed Admission Number
Rawmarsh St Mary's CE	30	18
Thrybergh Fullerton CE	15	17

i) Rawmarsh St Mary's CE

The proposed number is equal to that indicated by the current net capacity calculation.

ii) Thrybergh Fullerton CE

The situation here is similar to that at Wentworth. An admission number of 17 can be accommodated within the net capacity calculation.

Additionally, there have been minor revisions to the admissions criteria for Rawmarsh St Mary's CE, St Albans CE and Pope Pius X Catholic High Schools.

C Required publication where an admission number is less than that indicated by the current net capacity calculation for the school.

There remains a requirement for a notice to be published should any admission authority wish to have an admission number, which is lower than that indicated by the current net capacity calculation. For 2007/08, this will apply to the following schools, mostly as a result of new build under the PFI scheme:-

School	Change	Comments
Clifton	250 rather than 286	will have changed capacity
East Dene	50 rather than 60	will have changed capacity
Kimberworth	30 rather than 66	will have changed age range and capacity
Meadowhall	40 rather than 75	will have changed age range and capacity
Thurcroft Junior	70 rather than 93	large classrooms

D The Education (Admission of Looked After Children) (England) Regulations 2006

These regulations were laid before Parliament at the end of January and came into force on 21st February 2006. The regulations apply to admissions in the 2007/08 academic year and subsequent years.

As a result of the regulations, admission authorities must give priority in their oversubscription criteria to all 'relevant looked after children'. A 'relevant looked after child' is a child that is looked after by a local authority in accordance with Section 22 of the Children Act 1989 at the time an application for admission to a school is made, and who the local authority has confirmed will still be looked after at the time when he/she is admitted to the school.

For schools designated as having a religious character, regulation 5 allows the admission authority (the governing body) to give first priority in their oversubscription criteria to all 'relevant looked after children', regardless of their faith. However, the regulations require the admission authority, in any event, to give higher priority to 'relevant looked after children' of the faith of the school, over other children of that faith, and to give higher priority to 'relevant looked after children' not of that faith than other children not of that faith.

Admission authorities need to make any necessary amendments to their oversubscription criteria as a result of the introduction of these regulations, particularly in respect of any previous references to 'children in public care' and, 'the school named as part of the child's Personal Education Plan' etc. Any such references are not now appropriate.