

CABINET MEMBER FOR LIFELONG LEARNING

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Tuesday, 15th April 2008

Time: 10.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th March, 2008 (copy herewith). (Pages 1 - 9)
4. LEA Governor Appointments (Paul Carney, Principal Officer to report)
5. Admissions Consultation for 2009/10 (Martin Harrop, Principal Officer, Forward Planning) (report herewith) (Pages 10 - 30)
6. Updated Admissions Policy (Martin Harrop, Principal Officer, Forward Planning) (report herewith) (Pages 31 - 33)
7. Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools (David Hill, Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development) (report herewith) (Pages 34 - 45)
8. Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools (David Hill, Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development) (report herewith) (Pages 46 - 66)
9. European Structural Funds 2007-2013 14-19 Provision (Jeanette Lane, Principal Officer External Funding) (report herewith) (Pages 67 - 71)
10. Date and Time of Next Meeting
Tuesday, 20th May, 2008 at 10.00 a.m.

LIFELONG LEARNING
18th March, 2008

Present:- Councillor Rushforth (in the Chair); Councillors Falvey and Whelbourn.

50. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH FEBRUARY, 2008

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26th February, 2008 be received as a correct record.

51. MATTER ARISING

Proposal to Consult on the 'Amalgamation' of Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools

Further to Minute No. 47 of the previous meeting held on 26th February 2008, the Director of Resources and Access responded to questions raised by the Cabinet Member on the current consultation on the proposal to 'amalgamate' Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools.

It was noted that a full report on the details of the outcome of the consultation would be submitted to the next meeting.

52. GCSE EXAMINATION RESULTS 2007

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Learning Services which set out the GCSE examination results for 2007 and how they compared to previous years, to the national average and to the results of statistical neighbours.

The Director of Learning Services reported on the key aspects of performance, as contained in the report. These are:-

A. Overview

- i. Performance at GCSE 5+A*-C across the LA rose for the fifth consecutive year
- ii. Although the overall LA improvement was constrained by the unusually large number of students in Special schools, the average GCSE profile across the 16 comprehensive cohorts rose 3.3% on 2006
- iii. On the now critical 5+A*-C including English and Maths indicator, the LA average rose 1.5% against a national average increase of 0.9%
- iv. Performance at 5+A*-G including English and Maths also rose 1.5% against a national average improvement of 0.2%
- v. 10 of the 16 schools matched Fischer Family Trust "D" measures for progress from KS2-4 and/or KS3-4, ie progress equal to that of the top 25% of students nationally
- vi. Progress and achievement at 16+ by ethnic minority students is

- increasingly positive for both boys and girls
- vii. There was important improvement in key core subject departments in the Borough's most vulnerable schools, notably in English

B. Priority areas for action 2007/8

- i. The collaborative programme focussed on 5+A*-G performance led by the Headteacher of Wingfield CS has been sustained for a second year. In 2006/7 it produced significant improvement in the 4 lowest – performing schools
- ii. A parallel initiative focussed on 5+A*-C incl English and Maths led by a Consultant Headteacher is promising significant impact in 2008
- iii. The culture of high expectations now pervasive across the secondary phase is exemplified in the aspirational targets set by schools for 2008 and 2009
- iv. Both schools under Notice to Improve have received positive monitoring visits from HMI and are on track to remove the Notice in the current year

C. Strategic focus of School Effectiveness Service

- i. Targetted support for underachievement is coordinated across the School Effectiveness Service, Consultant Headteachers and the nominated three lead consultancy schools
- ii. The School Improvement Partner (SIP) programme has sharpened school self-evaluation, increased school leadership capacity and toughened the focus on Standards and Achievement. Rotherham's practice is judged to be Outstanding by the National Strategies
- iii. Programmes promoting the development of senior leadership capacity in the secondary Phase are an area of excellence receiving regional and national recognition
- iv. Core subject consultancy demonstrated significant impact in underperforming departments in 2007 and has been further reinforced
- v. Partnership between schools and SES is unprecedentedly close, responsive and productive

The meeting discussed:-

- Building Schools for the Future
- Fischer Family Trust "D" measures
- Best practice
- Performance targets and their impact on children
- The role of Examination Boards

Specific comments were made with regard to:-

- a rise in standards of over 10% and an appreciable change in the last few years
- percentage of BME pupils achieving 5-A*-G was higher than the percentage of WBRI pupils by 2.6% in 2007

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

(2) That the improved levels of performance at the end of Key Stage 4 be noted.

(3) That all schools be encouraged to continue to improve their results, and strive to achieve outcomes at least in line with the national rate of improvement.

(4) That the Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning endorse the drive to:

- reduce the gap between Rotherham's performance and the national average performance;
- improve boys' attainment
- improve the attainment of black, minority ethnic (BME) pupils and
- improve the attainment of Looked After Children (LAC)

(5) That next year, in view of the complexity of the matter, consideration be given to the need for a "plain" English version of the report.

(6) That an Elected Member Seminar be arranged next year.

(7) That the report be submitted to Cabinet for consideration.

53. KEY STAGE 1 ASSESSMENT RESULTS: SUMMER 2007

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Learning Services which set out in detail the performance of Rotherham children at the end of Key Stage 1, in 2007.

All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). At the end of Key Stage 1 (age 7) children undertake a formal assessment, informed by Statutory Assessment Tasks (SATs) which, from 2005, have been reported as teacher assessment.

Attainment at the end of KS1 has remained broadly static over the last 4 years, reporting standards below the national averages in all aspects except L3+ mathematics and science, which are slightly above. There has been some variability between subjects and levels over the period 2004 to 2007, however gains and declines have, in the majority of instances, followed the national trend. The exception has been in reading, which remains the furthest distance from the national (Average Point Score (APS)), but 2007 results at L2B+ were slightly above the national (+1%).

The report set out:-

- Overall results for Key Stage 1
- Results for Vulnerable Groups
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Actions take
- Further actions to be taken

A discussion ensued on the following issues:-

- gender gap – overall, slightly above National average – identified gap at Foundation Stage
- ethnicity
- staff recruitment to lead on development in Key Stage 1
- programme of inspirational speakers
- need for more inspirational material
- visual learning images

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

(2) That the improvements in the Key stage 1 profile, and also the declines, when compared to the national trend be noted.

(3) That the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes at least in line with national averages, be endorsed.

(4) That the drive to improve standards, particularly in Reading, throughout this key stage, together with the attainment of boys and other vulnerable and underachieving groups, be endorsed.

(5) That the report be submitted to the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

54. KEY STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT RESULTS: SUMMER 2007

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Learning Services which set out in detail the performance in Rotherham primary schools, at the end of Key Stage 2, in 2007.

All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). At the end of Key Stage 2 (age 11) pupils undertake the externally marked Statutory Assessment Tests (SATs).

Rotherham's improvements at L4+ in 2007 exceeded those nationally in all areas, except mathematics which was in line, and regained some of the ground lost in 2006. This improvement was most significant in English. The gains made at L5+ were less successful, with only writing and science at this higher level reporting improvements above the

national.

The 2007 Key Stage 2 Level 4+ results were encouraging, most particularly following the declines reported in 2006, but they did not match the school's aggregated target of 79% for both English and mathematics at this level, for this cohort. While only writing matched the high performance reported in 2005, all L4+ outcomes were above those reported in 2004. The gap in performance between Rotherham and those nationally was 4% in all subjects/aspects except mathematics, which reported a distance of 5%. Matching at least national averages at this level remains a priority for Rotherham.

The higher performance at Level 5+ did reflect some gains from 2006 (English, writing and science), but mathematics at this level once again reported a decline. All aspects of English at L5+ present an improving trend over the last 4 years, with 2007 results reflecting the highest outcomes to date. L5+ attainment remains some distance from those reported nationally. (English -8%, Reading -9%. Writing ---4%, Mathematics -6% and Science -6%). Improving performance at this higher level is a particular focus for 2007/08.

The report set out:-

- Overall Key Stage 2 results
- Vulnerable Groups
- Ethnicity
- Comparative Data for Looked After Children
- 1998 – 2007 Key Stage 2 Comparisons
- Contextual Value Added (CVA) Summary
- Statutory Targets
- Areas for Development

Particular discussion took place with regard to:-

- good practice
- gender differences
- monitoring initiatives
- DfES floor targets
- Impact of migrant workers

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

(2) That the improvements in Key Stage 1 profile, and also the declines, when compared to the national trend, be noted.

(3) That the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes at least in line with national

averages, be endorsed.

(4) That the drive to improve standards, particularly in Reading, throughout this key stage, together with the attainment of boys and other vulnerable and underachieving groups, be endorsed.

(5) That the report be submitted to the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

55. ADMISSIONS CONSULTATION - ANNUAL CONSULTATION FEEDBACK REPORT FOR 2009/10 ADMISSION

Pursuant to Minute No. 9 of a meeting of the Cabinet Member, Lifelong Learning held on 24th July, 2007, consideration was given to a report of the Director of Resources and Access which covered issues that had 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, 2008.

Annex 1 set out the details of the LEA's consultation document, which had been considered by governing bodies during the Autumn Term 2007. This has also been accessible on the Authority's website between 1st February and 1st March, 2008.

All feedback received by the Authority is summarised in Annex 2.

The Local Admissions Forum also needed to consider this report before final determination is made by the Authority on any changes to the admissions criteria for community and controlled schools.

In addition to the report, the meeting was provided with a copy of a Ministerial statement – "Strengthening the School Admissions System" which particularly related to 2009.

Resolved:- (1) That the proposed admission numbers contained within Annex 1 of the report now submitted, for community and controlled schools, be confirmed for 2009/10, subject to the clarifications/amendments contained in Annex 2 at 1Ai).

(2) That changes relating to voluntary aided schools' admissions criteria shown at Annex 2 b ii) of the report now submitted be noted.

(3) That appropriate notice be published in respect of the proposed admission numbers for schools named in Annex 2, where the admission number will be less than that indicated by the current net capacity calculation.

(4) That the report be placed on the Authority's website.

(5) That the report be submitted to the Local Admissions Forum (LAF) for consideration at its next meeting.

(6) That the co-ordinated schemes for Primary and Secondary preferences be confirmed.

(7) That a further report be submitted to the next meeting of the Cabinet Member, Lifelong Learning to be held on 15th April, 2008 to report on any feedback from the Local Admissions Forum and to finally determine the admissions criteria for community and controlled schools for 2009/10.

56. FOUNDATION STAGE ASSESSMENT RESULTS - SUMMER 2007

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Learning Services which set out in detail the performance of Rotherham children in Foundation Stage, in 2007.

All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). The Foundation Stage Profile is assessed when children reach the end of Foundation Stage (age 5).

The report set out:-

- Overall Foundation Stage Results
- Foundation Stage Assessment Summary 2005-2007
- LA Level Foundation Stage Summary for 2005-2007
- Foundation Stage Summary for 2005 to 2007 compared to the national profile
- Foundation Stage Summary for 2005-2007
- Actions Taken
- Actions to be Taken

The outcomes for 2007 were disappointing, most particularly following the improvements made in 2006. The average score for each assessment scale reported declines, except in writing where this maintained the standard reported in 2006. The most significant declines were reported in "Calculations" (Maths Area of Learning AoL), Knowledge and Understanding of the World and Creative Development. Assessment outcomes continue to show the weakest areas of capability are within Communication, Language and Literacy (CLLD) with an ongoing weakness in writing (average score 5.2).

The meeting discussed:-

- the introduction of non-entry data and summary
- gender gap
- Ofsted inspections – 87% of schools scored as good and outstanding
- Rotherham's "Quality of Provision" higher than the National

- Profile and Statistical Neighbours
- National Primary Strategies
- Informal measures

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

(2) That the lower outcomes in the Foundation Stage profile be noted.

(3) That the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes more in line with national averages be endorsed.

(4) That the drive to improve standards, particularly in Communication, Language and Literacy, (CLLD) throughout Foundation Stage, together with the attainment of boys and other vulnerable and underachieving groups be endorsed.

(5) That the report be submitted to the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel for consideration.

(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM IN ORDER TO CONSIDER THE MATTER WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY)

57. 14-19 BOARD

Consideration was given to a report of the Senior Director, Children and Young People's Services, which set out the requirements to have a strengthened 14-19 Partnership to strategically lead on the new 14-19 reforms and commission provision to meet local needs, together with suggested Terms of Reference and Membership of the 14-19 Strategic Board.

The 14-19 reform programme presents a significant challenge to all agencies, institutions and organisations in the compulsory and post-compulsory learning and skills sector.

The three areas of reforms, as set out in the 14-19 Education and Skills, Implementation Plan, DfES 2006, are as follows:-

- ❖ Raising attainment now – getting young people on a learning programme that meets their needs, and helping them to achieve their potential
- ❖ Designing new curriculum and qualifications – reforming 14-19 learning programmes so that what young people learn, better prepares them for life and work, enabling them to participate in, and benefit from, local economic activity

- ❖ Delivering on the ground – creating local arrangements and infrastructure which are fit for purpose and capable of delivering the 14-19 educational entitlement

The report set out the statutory responsibility of Directors of Children's Services for 14-19 education within local Children's Trust arrangements, and the commissioning of work undertaken in 6th Forms.

The local 14-19 Learning Plan is an integral element to the statutory Children and Young People's Strategic Plan and will shape the commissioning of education provision and services for all 14-19 year olds in the local area.

Effective ways of gathering the views of young people on the content and delivery of the plan should be established, through membership of the partnership or otherwise.

The meeting discussed:-

- the need to establish links with the Rotherham Schools Forum and the Finance Strategy Team
- the changing role of Local Authorities being allocated resources
- representative from School Council

Resolved:- (1) That the requirement to strengthen arrangements for 14-19 provision be noted.

(2) That the intention to revise the current 14-19 Partnership membership be noted.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning
2.	Date:	15th April 2008
3.	Title:	Admissions Consultation for 2009/10: Final determination of admission criteria for community and controlled schools; Potential objection to the Schools Adjudicator in relation to proposed criteria applying to St. Bede's Catholic Primary School
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary: This report follows up the admissions consultation report considered at the previous meeting and provides the opportunity to consider comments from the LAF (Local Admissions Forum) before a determination is made.

Additionally, the LAF has considered and commented upon proposed changes to the admission criteria applying to St. Bede's Catholic Primary School, which were received after the deadline for consultation. A potential objection to the Schools Adjudicator must be considered. (All admission authorities must determine their arrangements by 15th April 2008).

6. Recommendations: That:

i) the admissions criteria applying to community and controlled schools for the 2009/10 admission year be determined as unchanged from those applicable in the previous year (2008/09);

ii) a further report be prepared in the Summer Term 2008 in relation to the annual consultation, which would include a potential further consultation on changes to the admissions criteria applying to community and controlled schools for 2010/11;

iii) a formal objection be made to the Schools Adjudicator in respect of the proposed admissions criteria agreed for St. Bede's Catholic Primary School for 2009/10 in the absence of any redetermination that would comply with the School Admissions Code.

7. Proposals and Details: 1)

Annex 1 shows the LA's consultation document which was circulated to all schools in the Autumn Term 2007. The previous report (18th March meeting) considered feedback on, amongst other things, the proposal to potentially change the priority given to siblings and also those with a specific social or medical need within the admissions criteria applying to community and controlled schools. This outlined, in particular, specific feedback from four schools and the emergence of a further sub-category (those with a sibling **and** a catchment connection) which had not formed part of the original consultation. Additionally, a very recent Ministerial Statement on admissions has suggested that the Education and Skills Bill will be amended at report stage in order that powers will be taken to enhance consultation arrangements, particularly with parents, where major changes are proposed. In the light of the above it would seem sensible to leave the criteria unchanged from those applying to the 2008/09 admissions year and to consider further consultation, as part of the annual consultation applying to the 2010/11 admissions year, when the cycle recommences later in 2008.

This course of action was noted and agreed as a sensible way forward by members of the LAF at the meeting held on 20th March.

2)

Annex 2 shows the proposed admissions criteria applicable to the 2009/10 admissions year as agreed by the St. Bede's Catholic School Governing Body.

The LA was first informed of potential changes to the criteria agreed and applying to the 2008/09 admissions year, via e-mail on 12th March 2008.

There is potential to make a formal objection to the Schools Adjudicator on two grounds:
i) appropriate consultation did not take place within the stipulated time period (up to 1st March 2008)

ii) there are a number of areas where the criteria do not appear to fully conform with the School Admissions Code – these are in relation to children with statements of SEN, those in Public Care, siblings **at the time of application** and the issue of some priority being given to those in attendance at the school's Foundation 1 unit.

The aforementioned Ministerial Statement states that 'Local Authorities have a duty under the Code to refer objections to the Schools Adjudicator and I expect them to act where it appears that determined admission arrangements do not comply with the statutory requirements'.

The LAF considered all of the above and agreed that there were indeed areas where the admissions criteria did not appear to conform with the code and that, if amendments were not made by the School's Governing Body, the Local Authority should refer the appropriate formal objection to the Schools Adjudicator. However, members wished for the Governing Body to be given an opportunity to redetermine the criteria before the final deadline of 15th April 2008. Accordingly, the clerk to the LAF has forwarded a letter to the Chair of Governors and a response is awaited.

8. Finance: There are no specific quantifiable financial consequences arising from this report.

9. Risks and Uncertainties: All consultees must be informed of any determination and it is possible, in certain instances, for objections to be made to the Adjudicator. This may be applicable in the case of St. Bede's Catholic Primary School as outlined above. LAs should make formal objections, where necessary, to conform with the School Admissions Code.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications: The School Admissions Code seeks to promote equity and fair access and admission authorities in Rotherham, if complying with the code, show their commitment to that. .

Both the Local Authority and the Local Admissions Forum will closely monitor any changes in this respect.

11 Background Papers and Consultation: The annual consultation exercise is undertaken by reference to statutory regulations and the code of practice – principally, the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Education Act 2002 and the Education and Inspections Act 2006 together with the new School Admissions Code.

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 2007**

Annex 1

**CONSULTATION ON ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ADMISSION YEAR
2009/10**

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 2009/10. The Local Admission Forum has previously considered the requirements for consultation and has agreed that the LA should facilitate this, as far as possible, by use of the Authority's Internet site.

The timetable for the year is:-
Autumn Term 2007
which will

Governing bodies consider the arrangements
apply.

By 13th January 2008

All relevant details to be forwarded to the LA.

18th January – 1st March 2008

Period of consultation via the LA's website.

By end of March

LA and the Local Admission Forum consider any
changes and forward any comments to
appropriate Admission Authority(ies).

By 15th April 2008

All admission authorities to determine their
arrangements and notify those consulted.

Community and Controlled Schools

For these schools, the LA is the admission authority. The proposed admissions criteria for 2009/10 are shown at Appendix 1. **There are proposed changes to the criteria which applied for 2008/09 and the LA is consulting on these – further details are overleaf.**

Each school's proposed admission number is shown at 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 2008.

Voluntary Aided Schools

The governing body is the admission authority. Full consultation is only required this year if there are any proposed changes to the arrangements that applied for 2008/09. If there are any proposed changes at Church of England schools, Governing Bodies should consult their Diocesan Board before consulting anyone else.

Action: Governing Bodies to consider both the admissions criteria and the admission number appropriate for the school. If there are any proposed changes, full details of the admissions criteria and admissions number to be forwarded to the LEA by 13th January 2008 to enable the full consultation with all the appropriate consultees to be carried out via the Internet. 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 2008/09.

Once again, there are no proposed changes to those schemes, except for any necessary minor amendments to dates.

Action: Governing Bodies to note and to forward any comments, if any, on the pro-forma.

Proposed changes to the admissions criteria applying to community and controlled schools

The Authority is consulting on possible amendments to its admissions criteria applying to community and controlled schools. This is in response to provisions contained within the Schools Admissions Code under Chapter 2 – Setting fair oversubscription criteria, particularly in relation to Government advice on the treatment of siblings and also in relation to those with a specified medical/social need. The following gives the background to the proposed changes.

The latest School Admissions Code was eventually published and came into force on 28th February 2007, which was one day before the end of the consultation period for 2008/09 admissions. There was sufficient time for admission authorities to make the necessary mandatory changes in respect of Looked After Children (top priority)

and any 'first preference first' criteria, which were effectively banned, but there was no opportunity to consider, and consult on, any other changes which would be seen as good practice by the Code.

Under Section 2 of the Code – Setting Fair Oversubscription Criteria there are a number of paragraphs which consider the position of siblings and also those children with a Social or Medical need.

Paragraph 2.18 'Siblings at Primary Schools' reads:

'Families must be at the heart of the admissions system and the Government expects the admission authorities for primary schools to take the needs of parents with young children into account in deciding which oversubscription criteria will be used. At primary schools it is good practice to give priority to siblings. Admission authorities **should** ensure in their oversubscription criteria that, as far as possible, siblings (including twins, triplets or children from other multiple births) can attend the same primary school, as long as they comply with the infant class size regulations.' Interestingly, in respect of secondary school aged children Paragraph 2.19 reads: 'At secondary school age, children are usually more independent but many parents will still want their children to attend the same schools. Giving priority to siblings at secondary schools that have no more than 10% selection by ability and aptitude is acceptable and can be good practice.'

On '**Social and medical need**' the Code includes at Paragraph 2.25:

'Admission authorities **must not** use this criterion to give a child a lower priority in obtaining a place at the school, but it is acceptable to give higher priority to children or families where there is a social or medical need (for example where one or both parents or the child has a disability that may make travel to a school further away more difficult).'

Rotherham has always used catchment areas as part of the published criteria and this has usually been afforded top priority, save for the mandatory requirement, now in place, which puts 'relevant looked after children' as the first criterion and the special conditions, in relation to Y3, where attendance at the associated Infant school has a higher priority. The majority of children entering community and controlled schools fall into the 'catchment area' category and the Code confirms that use of catchment areas is lawful and acceptable. However, living in the catchment area does not guarantee a place in a school as, in some instances, there will be more catchment area preferences than places available. Where that is the case, the distance tie-breaker comes into use, but it means that with reference to the current priority order, those living outside the catchment area with a sibling on roll at the school and those with a recognised social or medical need would not be offered a place. In respect of the latter, that decision would seem particularly perverse since the pupil would fall into a category which the LA (the admission authority for the school) would be agreeing would make attendance **at that particular school essential**.

In view of the above it is, therefore, recommended that the LA (as the admission authority for all Rotherham's community and controlled schools) should include as part of the consultation requirements for the 2009/10 admissions year a proposal to give a higher priority within its admissions criteria to:

- those children whose older brothers or sisters will be on roll of the preferred school (or its associated junior school in respect of Reception preferences) at the time of their admission,

- children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**,
- 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.

The above three categories would have a higher priority than:

- children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority and any other criteria with a lower priority within the published 2008/09 admissions criteria.

Appendix 1 shows the full revised criteria which the Authority is consulting on.

Proposed admission criteria for community and controlled schools – 2009/10

Primary Reception

Places will be allocated in the following order of priority:

- i) Relevant looked after children (see note 2 below).
- ii) Those children 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.
- iii) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- iv) 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.
- v) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- 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 in the following order of priority:-

- i) Relevant looked after children (see note 2 below).
- ii) Children in attendance at Y2 in the associated Infant School.
- iii) Children whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the 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**.
- vi) Children living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- 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) Relevant looked after children (see note 2 below).
- ii) Those children whose older brothers or sisters will be on the roll of the preferred school at the time of their admission.
- iii) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Authority is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular** school essential.
- iv) 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.
- v) Children who, on the Allocated Date, are living in the catchment area of the school as defined by the Authority.
- 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").

Notes

- 1 Where the admission number for any school is likely to be reached mid category, places will be prioritised within that category by reference to the distance between the home address and the school. Highest priority will be given to those living closest to the school measured in a straight line on a horizontal plane (commonly known as measurement, "as the crow flies").
2. Where any final place at a school is available and two or more pupils are judged to be living equidistant from the school (e.g in flats), the final place will be allocated by the drawing of lots by officers of the authority.
3. 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 also the local authority has confirmed will still be looked after at the time when he/she is admitted to the school.

4. 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.
5. Children issued with a statement of Special Educational Needs will gain a place at the school named in the statement as part of that process.

Appendix 2

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

School	Net Capacity	Indicated Admission Number	Admission Number 2008/2009	Proposed Admission Number 2009/2010	Comments
Anston Brook Primary	253	36	40	40	
Anston Greenlands J&I	247	35	38	38	
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	316	45	56	56	
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	179	59	60	60	
Broom Valley Junior	239	59	60	60	
Canklow Woods Primary	270	38	30	30	New build cap = 210
Catcliffe Primary	170	24	25	25	
Coleridge Primary	210	30	30	30	
Dalton Foljambe J&I	141	20	30	30	
Dinnington Primary	305	43	43	43	
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 2008/2009	Proposed Admission Number 2009/2010	Comments
Kilnhurst Primary	196	28	28	28	
Kimberworth Primary	210	30	30	30	
Kiveton Park Infant	162	54	54	54	
Kiveton Park Meadows Junior	180	45	59	59	
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	180	60	60	60	
Maltby Craggs Junior	243	60	60	60	
Maltby Hall Infant	178	59	60	60	
Maltby Manor Primary	420	60	60	60	
Maltby Redwood J&I	315	45	45	45	
St Mary's Catholic Primary (Maltby)	210	30	30		
Meadow View Primary	280	40	40	40	
Ravenfield Primary	210	30	30	30	
Rawmarsh Ashwood J&I	210	30	30	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	196	28	30		
Rawmarsh Thorogate J&I	210	30	30	30	
Redscope J & I	420	60	60	60	
Rockingham J&I	329	47	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 2008/2009	Proposed Admission Number 2009/2010	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 Primary	350	50	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	285	71	80	80	
Thrybergh Fullerton CE Primary	105	15	17		
Thrybergh Primary	261	37	37	37	
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	16	16	
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 2008/2009	Proposed Admission Number 2009/2010	Comments
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	1755	300	280	280	Subject to annual notice – lower no. than IAN
Brinsworth Comprehensive School	1487	255	255	255	
Clifton Comprehensive	1433	286	250	250	To match new build capacity
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	222	
Swinton Community School, A Maths & Computing College	1320	226	226	226	
Thrybergh Comprehensive	700	140	140	140	
Wales High School	1520	248	248	248	
Wath Comprehensive A Language College	1788	300	300	300	
Wickersley School and Sports College	1725	279	300	300	Net capacity should be 1850 – new build
Wingfield Comprehensive	845	169	170	170	Net capacity should be 850 - new build
Winterhill	1128 (before new build)	225	320	320	Net capacity should be 1600 - new build.
St Bernard's Catholic High, Specialist School for the Arts	792	158	140		Subject to annual notice no. lower than IAN
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 2009/10*
Aston Comprehensive School, A Specialist School in Maths and Computing	280	42
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.

ST BEDE'S R.C. PRIMARY SCHOOL Annex 2
ADMISSIONS POLICY 2009/10

INTRODUCTION

St Bede's Roman Catholic Primary School is a Voluntary Aided school in the Diocese of Hallam, maintained by Rotherham LA. This means that the people of the parishes of St Bede's and Forty Martyrs have contributed significantly to the building and maintenance of the school. Accordingly priority is given in this admissions policy to the children who worship in these churches.

As a Catholic school we seek to provide a Christ-centred education. As a Voluntary Aided School, the Governor Body is responsible for admissions. In the carrying out of this and all its duties the Governing Body act in close cooperation with the Schools' Department of the Diocese and Rotherham LA.

PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL IF YOU NEED ANY
HELP IN APPLYING FOR ADMISSION FOR YOUR CHILD OR CHILDREN.

Telephone No.: (01709) 740101

CO-ORDINATED SCHEME FOR ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS

The co-ordinated scheme for admissions is a mechanism that ensures that all parents resident in Rotherham LA and who have expressed a preference for St Bede's Catholic Primary School before the closing date will receive a single offer of a school place on the same day from the Authority.

In order to provide every parent with an offer of a single place the Authority works with the Governing Bodies of the Voluntary Aided primary schools within the Rotherham area, including St Bede's. Details of the co-ordinated scheme are available from the Authority.

Applications are made by the completion of the COMMON APPLICATION FORM and the Diocese of Hallam ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FORM both of which are to be found in the LEA ADMISSION BOOKLET.

PARENTAL PREFERENCE

The Local Authority Common Application Form provides the opportunity for parents/guardians to express up to three choices of schools in rank order of preference. You are invited to submit up to three ranked preferences on the Local Authority's Common Application Form. Applications will be considered on an Equal Preference basis.

DATE OF ADMISSION

The law does not require children to be admitted into school until the beginning of the school term following their fifth birthday. However, the Governing Body, who decide matters relating to admissions to the school, will admit children into Foundation 2 at the beginning of the Autumn term whose fifth birthday falls between 1st September 2009 and 31st August 2010.

ADMISSION NUMBER

The number of pupils the Governing Body can admit into the Foundation 2 unit in September 2009 is **40**.

This number is based on the capacity of the school and has been agreed with Rotherham LA.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION

When the applications for places at the school are greater than the admission number (40) the Governing Body will apply the following criteria to decide which children will be admitted.

Within each category children who are attending St Bede's Foundation 1unit at the time of the application will be given priority over children not attending St Bede's Foundation 1unit.

(Should the planned admission limit be reached mid category, the Governing Body, as the admissions authority will make a decision based on the shortest distance between the applicant's home and the main entrance of the school by the most direct route as measured by the LA).

CRITERION 1:

Children who have a statement of Special Education Need which names the school as the most appropriate place for the education of the child; and Catholic children who are in Public Care (Looked after Children).

CRITERION 2:

Children who are in Public Care (Looked after Children) whose Personal Education Plan names the school as the most appropriate place for the education of the child.

CRITERION 3:

Baptised Catholic children who live in the parishes of St Bede's and Forty Martyrs. A baptismal certificate will be required. Members of Churches which are in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church fall into this category if they live in the parishes of St Bede's or Forty Martyrs.

CRITERION 4:

Baptised Catholic children who live in parishes other than St Bede's and Forty Martyrs. A baptismal certificate will be required. Members of Churches which are in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church fall into this category

CRITERION 5:

Children whose parents are following a course of instruction to be received into the Catholic Faith, who having been christened in another denomination or having been members of another Faith. (This must be verified by the Catholic Priest).

CRITERION 6:

Children who have siblings attending St Bede's School at the time the application is made. By sibling is meant a full, half- or step- brother or sister who permanently resides at the same address.

CRITERION 7:

Children who are worshipping members of other Christian Churches (as recognised by Churches Together in England [see appendix]). Evidence of membership of the Church will be required such as the testimony of the minister that the child and at least one parent attends the Church at least once a month.

CRITERION 8:

Children who are worshipping members of other World Faiths whose parents wish them to be educated in a Christ-centred environment. Evidence of membership of the Faith Community will be required such as the testimony of their religious leader.

CRITERION 9:

Children who have special educational needs (but not a Statement) whose parents (or those with legal responsibility for the child), supported by professional expertise, believe that education at St Bede's, rather than any other school, will benefit their child.

CRITERION 10:

Children whose parents are seeking a Christ-centred education for them.

CRITERION 11;

Other applicants.

Appendix:

Churches Together in England

Antiochian Orthodox Synod
The Baptist Union of Great Britain
Cherubim and Seraphim Council of Churches
Church of England
Church of God of Prophecy
Church of Scotland (in England)

Congregational Federation

Coptic Orthodox Church
Council of African and Afro-Caribbean Churches
Council of Oriental Orthodox Christian Churches
Ichthus Christian Fellowship
Independent Methodist Churches
International Ministerial Council of Great Britain
Joint Council for Anglo-Caribbean Churches
Lutheran Council of Great Britain
Methodist Church
Moravian Church
New Testament Assembly
Oecumenical Patriarchate (Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain)
Religious Society of Friends
Roman Catholic Church
Russian Orthodox Church
Salvation Army
Transatlantic and Pacific Alliance of Churches
United Reformed Church
Wesleyan Holiness Church

Recent additions have been made to this list. A comprehensive list can be found at www.churches-together.net.

PLACE OF RESIDENCE

The child's ordinary place of residence is taken to be a residential property at which the person or persons with legal parental responsibility for the child resides on the closing date for receiving applications for admission to the school.

When legal parental responsibility for the child is held by more than one person and those people reside at different properties the child's ordinary place of residence will be taken to be that property at which the child resides for the majority of the time of the school week.

Late Applications

Late applications will be dealt with in accordance with the LA scheme.

Waiting List

Waiting lists will be dealt with in accordance with the LA Scheme.

FALSE INFORMATION

1. If it is discovered that the offer of a place at the school by the Governing body was made on the basis of false or misleading information from a parent and this offer has resulted in a child with a higher place on the admissions criteria being refused the offer of admission to the school, the offer of a place will be withdrawn. The parent's right of appeal is unchanged.

APPLICATIONS FOR PLACES AT TIMES OTHER THAN SEPTEMBER

1. Foundation 1 Unit

Where applications are received for admission to school following the offer day they will be dealt with as follows:

- a) Single admission to Foundation 1 where the year group is below the admission number (or higher admission limit where one has been set). **The parent will be offered a place.**
- b) Single admission to Foundation 1 where the year group is above the admission number (or higher admission limit where one has been set).
 - i) Where the Governing Body determines that there would not be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admission, the parent **will be offered a place.**
 - ii) Where the Governing Body determines that there would be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admission, the parent **will be refused the offer of a place.**

2. Year 1 to 6

Single admission to Year 1 to 6 where the year group is above the admission number
(or what was the standard number when the year group was the relevant year group Reception).

- i) Where the Governing Body determines that there would not be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admission, the parent **will be offered a place.**
- ii) Where the Governing Body determines that there would be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admission, the parent **will be refused the offer of a place.**

The prejudice referred to under i) and ii) may arise by reason of measures required to be taken to ensure compliance with the duty imposed on the Governing Body to comply with the limit on infant class sizes.

3. Sibling admissions

- a) Where the respective year groups are below the admission number or the standard number **the parent will be offered a place.**
- b) Where the respective year groups are above the admission number or the standard number:
 - i) If the Governing Body determines that there would not be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admissions, the parent **will be offered a place.**
 - ii) If the Governing Body determines that there would be prejudice to the provision of efficient education or the efficient use of resources by the admissions, the parent **will be refused the offer of places.**
- c) Where one or more of the respective year groups is above the admission number or the former standard number and the remainder of the year groups are below, (where the Governing Body determines that family circumstances outweigh the prejudice that would otherwise be caused by any or all of the admissions) **the parent will be offered places.**

APPEALS AGAINST THE GOVERNING BODY DECISION TO REFUSE ADMISSION

1. If a place is not available, parents have the right of appeal. Such appeals against non admission will be heard by an Independent Appeals Panel formed in accordance with the DFES Code of Practise. Details of the appeals process will be made available to all unsuccessful applicants.
2. Parents who intend to make an appeal against the Governing Body's decision to refuse admission must submit a notice of appeal within 21 days of receiving

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	15th April 2008
3.	Title:	Updated Admissions Policy For Local Authority School Nurseries or Foundation Stage One Units
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary: At the meeting held on 26th February 2008 it was agreed that a proposed revised admissions policy for LA Nurseries and Foundation Stage One Units should be circulated to all Primary Schools/Early Years Centres/Nurseries for information and comment. This report outlines the feedback and seeks a decision on approval of the policy.

6. Recommendation: That the revised admissions policy for all LA School Nurseries or Foundation Stage One Units is approved and that all establishments are informed immediately.

7. Proposals and Details:

Appendix 1 is the revised policy which was approved for consultation with Primary Schools/Early Years Centres/Nurseries. This now covers stated children, Looked After Children, siblings and those with outstanding social/medical reasons for attendance. Also, the criteria at 6), seeks to give some priority to those already attending a school's attached children's centre, which, for some children, will provide more continuity than at present.

There were just two responses to the consultation, but additionally, David Hill (Manager School Organisation, Planning and Development) was invited to a Primary Cluster Representatives meeting held on 10th March in order to provide any necessary clarification and answer any questions.

Essentially, there was full agreement and no objection to the content of the policy. There were some questions about the administration of the process that might be brought about by the additional categories included within the policy such as the identification of Looked After Children and determination of the qualification under the 'social/medical' category. Schools/Nurseries/Early Years Centres can be assured that if any such questions arise, CYPS staff will be available to help.

There were also some questions concerning the extended and more flexible early years entitlement that will be available from September 2010 and, as agreed at the previous meeting, that will be subject to a further report when further information is available from central government following the report from the 20 pilot projects.

8. Finance: There are no specific financial implications attached to the recommendations.

9. Risks and Uncertainties: The revised admissions policy should provide for more consistent and fairer administration of the admissions procedure.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications: Extended early years provision delivered more flexibly is likely to contribute to raising achievement and increasing employment opportunities for local people.

11. Background Papers and Consultation: See previous report of 26th February. Further details of the governments intended improvements to early years entitlement can be seen at

<http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/earlyyears/flexibleentitlement/>

Contact Name : Martin Harrop, PO Forward Planning
Tel : ext 2415
e-mail : martin.harrop@rotherham.gov.uk

ADMISSIONS POLICY FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY SCHOOL NURSERIES OR FOUNDATION STAGE ONE UNITS (updated and applicable to entry in the 2008/09 academic year).

An application for a **place** * (see below) in an Early Years Centre, Nursery Unit/Foundation Stage One Unit should be made to the Head Teacher.

Parents should be aware that gaining a place in the nursery class/foundation stage 1 at a school or children's centre **does not** guarantee that a place will be available in that school in the reception class or foundation stage 2.

A complete list of all the Local Authority nurseries and primary schools which have nursery/foundation units is given in Section 4 of the 'Admission to Primary School' booklet.

Children who have a Statement of Special Educational Need will be allocated a place at the school named in the Statement.

Children will be allocated a place in a nursery/foundation unit according to the following criteria which are ranked in priority order:-

- 1) **Relevant Looked After Children** ** (see definition below)
- 2) Children who live in the catchment area of the school.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Children who have a specific medical reason confirmed by a medical practitioner which the Head Teacher is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**.
- 5) Children with a compelling social reason which the Head Teacher is satisfied makes attendance **at that particular school essential**. The 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.
- 6) Children who attend integrated early education at the children's centre attached to the school
- 7) Children who live in the catchment area of a school without nursery/foundation stage 1 provision.
- 8) Children who have access to nursery/foundation stage 1 provision in their own catchment area school.

If demand for places within any category is greater than the available spaces, places will be allocated to children who live nearest to the school measured by a straight line on a horizontal plain (commonly known as measurement "as the crow flies").

Please Note

* A **place** is normally three terms part-time attendance (either a morning or afternoon session) on 5 days per week, commencing in the Autumn Term one year before entry to reception/foundation stage 2. Parents who wish to seek access to more flexible or increased provision should make contact with the Headteacher of the school to discuss the possibilities.

** 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 nursery/foundation stage 1 is made, and who the local authority has confirmed will still be looked after at the time when he/she is admitted to the nursery/foundation stage 1.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	15th April 2008
3.	Title:	The proposal is to ‘amalgamate’ Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools by the closure of Broom Valley Infant School and the expansion and change of age range at Broom Valley Junior School from 7-11 to 3-11 years.
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People’s Services Ward 2 – Boston Castle

5. Summary

Broom Valley Junior School and Broom Valley Infant School are both separate schools. The report to Cabinet Member and Advisers on 26th February 2008 approved a pre-statutory consultation on the proposal to amalgamate the two schools by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range at the Junior School. Members have previously agreed to consult as appropriate where two schools meet the considerations for amalgamation which are described in the ‘School Organisation Plan’. Pre-statutory consultations have been undertaken with School Governors, Staff and Parents, and copies of the consultation papers have also been sent to Ward Members. This report details the outcome of these pre-statutory consultations.

6. Recommendation:

It is recommended that the statutory consultation on the proposal to ‘amalgamate’ Broom Valley Junior School and Broom Valley Infant School by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range at Broom Valley Junior School as described in Appendix ‘A’ is begun and that a further report be brought to Members with details of the outcome of the formal consultation.

7. Proposals and Details

The proposal to be consulted on is:-

It is proposed to 'amalgamate' Broom Valley Infant and Broom Valley Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this, the Infant school will be closed and the Junior school will be expanded and will have its age range changed from 7-11 to 3-11 years. Broom Valley Junior will, therefore, become a 'through' primary school and will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

The new School would have 420 places (R-Y6) with a Nursery unit of up to 78 places (39FTE). (This is the combined numbers of the current two schools) The school would have an admission number of 60.

The principal objectives of amalgamation are:

- 1) to provide a continuous primary entitlement across the key stages; and
- 2) 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 described in Appendix 'A')

There will be a vacancy for the Head Teacher's post at the Infant School, both schools are on the same site and the admission number of the two schools is 60. The conditions for consultation on amalgamation are, therefore, met.

A meeting was held on the 13th March, 2008 for the Governors of both schools. Further meetings were held on the 17th March 2008 for Staff from both schools together with Union Representatives, which was then followed by a meeting for Parents from both schools.

(The minutes of these meetings are attached to this report)

A number of issues were raised at all these meetings and officers from the Authority responded to the questions asked. The following comments address the main issues raised at the meetings:

- 1) Concern was expressed about the extent of support that would be available to the school and whether there would be money available to 'buy-in' expertise. Advice given was that the School Improvement Partner (SIP) will challenge and support with particular emphasis on the 'amalgamation'. Additionally, the H/T from Redscope Primary (a school that has already gone through the process) would be joining in discussions at the school in order to give advice gained from previously experiencing the 'amalgamation' process. There would probably also be scope within the budget for the governors to consider whether or not to buy in some additional advice/expertise, but it was emphasised that this would be a decision for them. No specific model was being imposed on the governing body, but help and expertise were always available to the school from the LA.

2) There were questions about monitoring the 'amalgamation' and how it would be judged to be successful, if it did take place.

The response was that there will be quality assurance measures put into place as there would be at any other school, but these would be likely to be more frequent and specifically focussed on the 'amalgamation'. There is no single definition of a 'successful' school - many things contribute to this. Research throughout the world suggests that continuity is likely to lead to better attainment and it is important that everyone is looking towards a 'new' school rather than a simple welding of two separate schools.

3) Concern was expressed that staff may be expected to teach different age ranges. The advice given was that where teachers and support staff wished to work with a different age group they could be given the opportunity. Primary school teachers are trained to teach children aged 3-11 and it does not mean that infant teachers couldn't teach 11 year olds. Teachers are not going to be put into a class to fail, all staff are supported and the aim is to do what is the best for the children.

4) Some staff expressed concern that they were on temporary contracts and could be out of a job in September or have to reapply for a job. The advice given that jobs were not at risk as a result of the amalgamation and that the two Head Teachers were already looking to confirm the staffing establishment for September. Advice was available to all from our Human Resources Team.

5) There were a number of questions relating to financial savings and the position of the Deputy Headteachers, particularly in relation to the 'four years protection'.

In response, it was explained that there is indeed a four year protection period to support two Deputy Heads following an 'amalgamation'. Previous 'amalgamations' have seen one of the Deputy Heads securing a headship in another school, for example, but if this does not happen within that time period then it would be up to the governors to decide whether or not to support two Deputy Heads from within the school's budget.

'Amalgamation' is not simply about making financial savings. Although a 'saving' is made on one Headteacher's salary, any 'savings' are ring-fenced within the whole schools' budget and, therefore, stay within the schools sector.

6) The question of pupil numbers was raised – could more than 60 pupils be admitted in any year group leading to a larger school?

Advice was given that although numbers born within the catchment area are usually quite high, rates of attrition (movement out of the area and preferences for other schools) together with the ability to limit numbers to 60 through the admissions criteria via a 'tie-breaker' would mean that the number will not be broken. There is a possibility, however, that this might mean that in some years some pupils from within the catchment area may not gain a place at the school.

7) Will the organisation of the Key Stages (in terms of buildings used) stay as it is and could devolved monies be used for any building work?

In the short term, education of the Key Stages is likely to take place within the same buildings, but this could change in the future with, for instance, Y2 being educated within the present Junior building.

Devolved monies could be used for any of the building changes and the school would require a staff room which is large enough for all staff, appropriate office accommodation (via internal building work), a new more central main office and improvements to IT. The LA could provide support for this work.

8) All meetings were advised of the timetable for the consultation and how concerns/comments could be submitted as part of the statutory consultation.

8. Finance

Financial savings which arise are savings on staffing, mainly from the loss of a Head Teacher's post from the school's budget. The 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' procedures protect the school budget in 2008-09 and the school will enjoy additional funding in the first year of the budget because of the saving on the leaving Head Teacher's salary.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Formal objections may be lodged during the representation period following the publication of a statutory notice. A final decision should be determined by the Cabinet Member within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. The principle advantages of amalgamation arise from the continuous primary education entitlements which are: -

- Removal of the school transfer at the end of key stage 1;
- Provision of a whole school curriculum across the primary age range;
- A unified management structure with a single school ethos;
- The potential to remodel the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- A whole school approach to staff development across the primary phase; more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Report to Cabinet Member and Advisers 26th February 2008, minutes of the meetings held with School Governors, staff and parents. The School Organisation Plan and the 'School Standards and Framework Act 1998'

The statutory consultation timetable is:

Publication of statutory notices	18th April 2008
6-week period for representations and objections closes	30 th May 2008
LA decision	24 th June 2008
Implementation	1 st September 2008

Contact Name: David Hill, Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development, Ext 2536, david-education.hill@rotherham.gov.uk

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**Proposal to 'amalgamate' Broom Valley Infant and Broom Valley Junior Schools.****1 The Proposal and its Purpose**

The proposal is to 'amalgamate' Broom Valley Infant and Broom Valley Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this, Broom Valley Infant School will be closed and Broom Valley Junior School will be expanded and have its age range changed from 7-11 to 3-11 years. The school will, therefore, become a 'through' primary school, which will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools,.

The School would have 420 places (R-Y6) with a Nursery unit of up to 78 places (39 FTE). (This is the combined numbers of the current two schools) The new school would have an admission number of 60.

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 number(s) 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 will be a vacancy for one or both head teacher posts as a result of retirement or resignation.

2 Existing Situation: Numbers on roll and Capacity**2.1 Broom Valley Infant School**

Net Capacity	=	179
Admission Number	=	60 (Admission Capacity 180)
Number on Roll (2008) (NOR)	=	181
Surplus Places	=	0

2.2 Broom Valley Junior School

Net Capacity	=	239
Admission Number	=	60 (Admission Capacity 240)
Number on Roll (2008) (NOR)	=	237
Surplus Places	=	2

3 **Development of Numbers on Roll**

Year	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Infant	181	174	177	177	180
Junior	237	238	230	235	238
Total	418	412	407	412	418

4 **Advantages and Disadvantages**

The principal advantages of amalgamation arise from the continuous primary education entitlement

- removal of the school transfer at the end of key stage 1;
- provision of a whole school curriculum across the primary age range;
- A unified management structure with a single school ethos;
- the potential to remodel the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- a whole school approach to staff development across the primary phase;
- more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

The principal disadvantages of amalgamation are:

- the loss of the Head teacher of one of the schools which could impact upon accessibility to staff, parents and pupils (this may have particular relevance where schools serve areas of social and economic disadvantage);
- potential difficulties in bringing together two different sets of working practice;
- possible fear of and resistance to change amongst staff, governors and parents;
- in some (but by no means all) cases, a lack of staff expertise in teaching and management across the two key stages.

5 **Financial Implications**

Financial savings which arise are savings on staffing, mainly from the loss of a Head Teacher's post from the school's budget and the 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' procedures protect the school budget in 2008-09.

6 **Consultation Timetable**

Cabinet Member to agree to consultation	26 th February 2008
Pre statutory consultation period Including meetings with governors, Staff and families etc.	20 th March 2008
Report to the Cabinet Member	15 th April 2008
Publication of statutory notices	18 th April 2008
6 week period for representations and objections closes	30 th May 2008
LEA decision	24 th June 2008
Implementation	1 st September 2008

Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools - proposed 'amalgamation'.

Joint meeting with staff of Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools and Union Representatives held on Monday, 17th March, 2008.

Present: David Hill, David Light, Paul Fitzpatrick and Martin Harrop of the LA, together with approximately 50 staff and 4 union representatives.

David Hill introduced colleagues and welcomed everyone to the meeting before explaining the background and purpose to the proposed 'amalgamation'. This would be achieved by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range of the Junior School from 7-11 to 3-11 years.

He then spoke about existing and future pupil numbers, the financial implications and the advantages and possible disadvantages that could be brought about by any 'amalgamation' of separate Junior and Infant Schools. A summary of this information had already been circulated to all and it included the timetable which would be followed if it was agreed to publish statutory proposals. If the 'amalgamation' was finally approved, the implementation date would be 1st September, 2008.

Paul Fitzpatrick (Human Resources) stressed that the proposed 'amalgamation' wasn't about cuts in staffing. There would be sufficient funding available to maintain current structures.

Questions and comments were then invited. These were as follows:

A number of staff are employed on temporary contracts ending on 31/8/08 – what would happen?

This question had already been raised by senior school staff and the Headteacher had been reassured about the continuation of funding. As stated above, the actual 'amalgamation' process would not trigger any staffing cuts.

What about working outside of staff's current Key Stage?

The school would be a through primary school and everyone would be a member of a primary school staff.

Staff wouldn't be just simply moved around over Key Stages, but there would be opportunities for staff development which could enable such changes to take place in the future. This applies to all staff – not just to teachers.

There were no further questions or comments and the meeting was closed.

Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools – proposed ‘amalgamation’

Joint meeting with governors of Broom Valley Infant and Junior Schools held on Thursday 13th March, 2008.

Present: David Hill, Graham Sinclair, David Light and Ann Hercocock of the LA together with approximately 19 governors.

Staff from the LA introduced themselves. David Hill welcomed everyone to the meeting before explaining the background and purpose to the proposed ‘amalgamation’.

This would be achieved by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range of the Junior School from 7-11 to 3-11 years.

He then spoke about existing and future pupil numbers, the financial implications and the advantages and possible disadvantages that could be brought about by any ‘amalgamation’ of separate Junior and Infant Schools.

A summary of this information had already been circulated to all and it included the timetable which would be followed if it was agreed to publish statutory proposals. If the ‘amalgamation’ was finally approved, the implementation date would be 1st September, 2008.

Questions and comments were then invited. These were as follows:

You have talked about financial implications – what support is available over 4 years?

There is a 4 year protection period to support two Deputy Heads following an amalgamation. In previous amalgamations it has often been the case that by the end of that period one Deputy Head has secured a headship in another school.

If this does not happen it would be up to the school to decide whether or not to support two Deputy Heads.

Would there be any additional funding provided as there would be 3 distinct sites making up the amalgamated school.

This would be worked through by the Head Teacher and Governors. There would not be any loss of funding.

Would there be any financial help over the transitional period, for example extra staff might be needed for a short time.

An additional amount would arise from Hazel James leaving. 7/12 of her salary would remain with the school for one year from 1st September.

Could Devolved Capital monies be used for any building work?

The amalgamated school would need:

- A large enough staffroom to accommodate all staff
- Office accommodation (possible internal building work)

- A new, more central main entrance
- Improvements to IT

The LA could provide support for the work.

If the Infant School did close would teaching staff have to apply for jobs?

No, they would simply transfer to the new school. Broom Valley Infant and Junior are popular schools with consistent numbers so all staff would be needed.

How do you know what the numbers will be. Do you just estimate?

The school is consistently up to full capacity. We also look at birth rates and project forward.

What is the position with migrant workers?

There has been a large influx of EU migrant workers. Last year there were 400 and 250 children had places approved in schools. The migrant workers tend to live around Eastwood and Thornhill. Central schools are becoming over-subscribed and pupils are starting to move further out of the centre. They tend to be a mobile group and move in and out of the area.

Will there be funding for them?

No, unless the Authority hits trigger points. It is possible to track numbers of white Europeans. If numbers reach a certain point it can trigger funding. Support usually comes from the Welcome Centre. Graham Sinclair explained the work done there. The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant also provides support. Also, if pupils are on a PLASC return in January the school is funded for a full year.

What if they arrive at school after January?

This can happen with any pupil but usually this is balanced by pupils leaving the school. One advantage is that classes are quite large so this supports more funding.

David Light explained that an amalgamation provides opportunities for a child. Both schools are already successful and they are already developing a vision for what can be achieved. It could become a school with considerable influence. He also explained that through primaries achieve well at Y2/Y3 compared with single schools.

One Governor said that having served on both governing bodies it was obvious that both sets of staff were of a high quality and should be made to feel a vital part of the process. They need assurance that their jobs are secure.

The Junior Head explained that both sets of staff were keen on the proposal and do work together. There was to be an away-day in June at Carlton Park Hotel to discuss the vision and aims. A speaker from an amalgamated school would be in attendance.

Looking at the timetable for the process how will we be informed that you can go forward from the pre-statutory consultation period?

You will be informed by telephone. The Public Notice will have already been sent for publication with instructions to withdraw it if the decision was not to proceed with the statutory consultation process.

The timetable is very tight. How will it be possible to put plans into place from 24th June in time for September?

Planning can be done before 24th June. You can essentially work as one governing body. A working group could be set up to look at planning issues.

How often has a proposal to amalgamate not been approved?

It has not happened.

Objections have been purely based on funding but the governors who have raised these issues were not able to attend this meeting.

There is a meeting arranged with parents on Monday 17th March. Any governors not able to attend tonight would be welcome.

If the Cabinet Member did not agree to the proposal the Infant School would have to have a temporary Head Teacher until a permanent appointment was made.

At the moment there are two separate budgets. What will happen to the Infant budget when the Infant School is closed?

The budget will go straight to the amalgamated primary school.

There were no further questions and the meeting was closed.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	15th April 2008
3.	Title:	The proposal is to ‘amalgamate’ Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools by the closure of Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School and the expansion and change of age range at Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School from 7-11 to 3-11 years.
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People’s Services Ward 10 - Rawmarsh

5. Summary

Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School and Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School are both separate schools. The report to Cabinet Member and Advisers on 26th February 2008 approved a pre-statutory consultation on the proposal to amalgamate the two schools by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range at the Junior School. Members have previously agreed to consult as appropriate where two schools meet the considerations for amalgamation which are described in the ‘School Organisation Plan’. Pre-statutory consultations have been undertaken with School Governors, Staff and Parents, and copies of the consultation papers have also been sent to Ward Members. This report details the outcome of these pre-statutory consultations.

6. Recommendation:

It is recommended that the statutory consultation on the proposal to ‘amalgamate’ Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School and Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School by closing the Infant School and expanding and changing the age range at Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School as described in Appendix ‘A’ is begun and that a further report be brought to Members with details of the outcome of the formal consultation.

7. Proposals and Details

The proposal to be consulted on is:-

It is proposed to 'amalgamate' Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this, the Infant school will be closed and the Junior school will be expanded and will have its age range changed from 7-11 to 3-11 years. Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior will, therefore, become a 'through' primary school and will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

The new School would have 420 places (R-Y6) with a Nursery unit of up to 52 places (26FTE). (This is the combined numbers of the current two schools) The school would have an admission number of 60.

The principal objectives of amalgamation are:

- 1) to provide a continuous primary entitlement across the key stages; and
- 2) 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 described in Appendix 'A')

There will be a vacancy for the Head Teacher's post at the Infant School, both schools are on the same site and the admission number of the two schools is 60. The conditions for consultation on amalgamation are, therefore, met.

A Meeting was held at Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School on the 28th February 2008 for the Governors of both schools. A meeting was held at Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School on the 4th March 2008 for Staff from both schools followed by a meeting for Parents from both schools. (Copies of the minutes of the meeting with Parents were requested and these will be sent to the school for circulation)

(The minutes of these meetings are attached to this report)

A number of issues were raised at all these meetings and officers from the Authority responded to the questions asked. The following comments address the main issues raised at the meetings:

- 1) Concern was expressed at all the meeting with parents that could not a new Infant School Head Teacher be appointed rather than one Head Teacher running both schools. The advice given was that it is the policy of the Local Authority that when the opportunity arises, separate infant and junior schools are brought together. The Authority is of the view that primary schools perform better and have higher educational attainment than separate schools. If the authority were to establish a new school the Authority would always prefer a through primary school. The advice from our school improvement service is that the most satisfactory schools are 3-11 schools and one major positive aspect being that it reduces anxiety at the transition from Y2 to Y3.

- 2) There was some confusion over the future of the Infant School building and some parents had assumed that the Infant School building would be shut in September. The advice given was that the Infant School building would continue to operate in September and that there would be one Head Teacher running both the infants and juniors.
- 3) Concern was expressed that the Head Teacher would most likely be based in one building and would not know all the children and that how could one Head Teacher give enough attention to all children. The advice given was that additional funding would be provided for four years to allow the school to have two deputy head teachers and that the new Head Teacher would spend time in each building. A staffing structure has to be put in place that ensures children have regular contact with the Head Teacher and that parents have access to senior staff to voice their concerns or problems. Rotherham has approximately 70 through primary schools and has successful amalgamated 15 separate infant and junior schools.
- 4) Concern was expressed at the distance between the two school buildings. The advice given was that, due to the distance between the two schools, it would not be possible to physically link the schools and that the Authority would be look to provide an extension to the junior building to accommodate the Infant school pupils and this proposal would appear in the Primary Capital Programme. All meetings were advised that there appeared to be sufficient space on the Junior School site but plans would need to be drawn up and this would be in consultation with the Governors/Parents. Concern was raised about playground space and all meetings were advised that the plans would need to accommodate separate play areas for Foundation, Infant and Junior pupils. The authority would also look to see if any alterations needed to be made to staff or other accommodation.
- 5) Concern was expressed, particularly at the meeting with Parents that the decision to amalgamate had already been made. The advice given was that this was the first stage in the consultation process and that their views would be recorded in the minutes of the meetings. All the minutes to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning in April prior to any decision to publish 'Statutory Proposals'.
- 6) Concern was expressed that this was a cost-cutting exercise. Reassurance was given that this was not the case and that any savings made were retained within the education budget and shared amongst all schools.
- 7) Concern was expressed at all meetings that the land the Infant School was built on and the infant playing fields would be disposed off for housing. The advice given was that at present the land was still needed and that if in the future, new infant accommodation was built on to the Junior school building the Infant building and land may become surplus to 'Children and Young People's Services' requirements. If they did become surplus and the CYPS Service had no other use for the building/land it would then be declared surplus and it would be the Council which made any future determinations on

what would happen. All meetings were advised that the ancient woodland would not be affected.

- 8) Concern was expressed that staff may be expected to teach different age ranges. The advice given was that where teachers and support staff wished to work with a different age group they could be given the opportunity. Primary school teachers are trained to teach children aged 3-11 and it does not mean that infant teachers couldn't teach 11 year olds. Teachers are not going to be put into a class to fail, all staff are supported and the aim is to do what is the best for the children.
- 9) Some staff expressed concern that they were on temporary contracts and could be out of a job in September. The advice given that jobs were not at risk as a result of the amalgamation and that the two Head Teachers were already looking to confirm the staffing establishment for September. Advice was available to all from our Human Resources Team.
- 10) All meetings were advised of the timetable for the consultation and how concerns/comments could be submitted as part of the statutory consultation.

8. Finance

Financial savings which arise are savings on staffing, mainly from the loss of a Head Teacher's post from the school's budget. The 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' procedures protect the school budget in 2008-09 and the school will enjoy additional funding in the first year of the budget because of the saving on the leaving Head Teachers salary.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Formal objections may be lodged during the representation period following the publication of a statutory notice. A final decision should be determined by the Cabinet Member within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. The principle advantages of amalgamation arise from the continuous primary education entitlements which are: -

- Removal of the school transfer at the end of key stage1;
- Provision of a whole school curriculum across the primary age range;
- A unified management structure with a single school ethos;

- The potential to remodel the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- A whole school approach to staff development across the primary phase; more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Report to Cabinet Member and Advisers 26th February 2008, minutes of the meetings held with School Governors, staff and parents. The School Organisation Plan and the 'School Standards and Framework Act 1998'

The statutory consultation timetable is:

Publication of statutory notices	18th April 2008
6-week period for representations and objections closes	30 th May 2008
LEA decision	24 th June 2008
Implementation	1 st September 2008

Contact Name: David Hill, Manager, School Organisation Planning and Development, Ext 2536, david-education.hill@rotherham.gov.uk

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**Proposal to 'amalgamate' Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools.****1 The Proposal and its Purpose**

The proposal is to 'amalgamate' Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this, Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School will be closed and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School will be expanded and have its age range changed from 7-11 to 3-11 years. The school will, therefore, become a 'through' primary school, which will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools,.

The School would have 420 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 60.

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 number(s) 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 will be a vacancy for one or both head teacher posts as a result of retirement or resignation.

2 Existing Situation: Numbers on roll and Capacity**2.1 Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School**

Net Capacity	=	173
Admission Number	=	60 (Admission Capacity 180)
Number on Roll (2008) (NOR)	=	130
Surplus Places	=	43

2.2 Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School

Net Capacity	=	243
Admission Number	=	60 (Admission Capacity 240)
Number on Roll (2008) (NOR)	=	211
Surplus Places	=	32

3 **Development of Numbers on Roll**

Year	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Infant	130	136	152	160	161
Junior	211	208	197	182	184
Total	341	344	349	342	345

4 **Advantages and Disadvantages**

The principal advantages of amalgamation arise from the continuous primary education entitlement

- removal of the school transfer at the end of key stage 1;
- provision of a whole school curriculum across the primary age range;
- A unified management structure with a single school ethos;
- the potential to remodel the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- a whole school approach to staff development across the primary phase;
- more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

The principal disadvantages of amalgamation are:

- the loss of the Head teacher of one of the schools which could impact upon accessibility to staff, parents and pupils (this may have particular relevance where schools serve areas of social and economic disadvantage);
- potential difficulties in bringing together two different sets of working practice;
- possible fear of and resistance to change amongst staff, governors and parents;
- in some (but by no means all) cases, a lack of staff expertise in teaching and management across the two key stages.

5 **Financial Implications**

Financial savings which arise are savings on staffing, mainly from the loss of a Head Teacher's post from the school's budget and the 'Minimum Funding Guarantee' procedures protect the school budget in 2008-09.

6 Consultation Timetable

Cabinet Member to agree to consultation	26 th February 2008
Pre statutory consultation period including meetings with governors, staff and parents	ends 20 th March 2008
Report to the Cabinet Member	15 th April 2008
Publication of statutory notices	18 th April 2008
6 week period for representations and objections closes	30 th May 2008
LEA decision	24 th June 2008
Implementation	1 st September 2008

Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior School Proposed Amalgamation

Joint Governing Body Meeting Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools on Thursday 28th February 2008.

Present: Graham Sinclair, David Hill, Helen Rogers and Ann Hercock (Local Authority), Chris Cohen (Head of Infant), Liz Gee (Head of Junior), and members of the two Governing Bodies.

David Hill outlined the proposal to amalgamate Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School will be closed and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School will be expanded and its age range will change from 7-11 to 3-11 years. The new school will become a 'through' primary school, which will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

He spoke about existing and predicted numbers on roll, financial implications and the advantages and disadvantages of amalgamation. A summary of the information had been distributed prior to the meeting, which also included a timetable for the consultation process.

David Hill explained that it was the long term wish to build infant classrooms onto the junior building.

Helen Rogers spoke of the advantages of an amalgamated school particularly for the children making the transition from Y2 to Y3. In separate infant and junior schools there is often a 'dip' in performance. It is about continuity. Separate schools have a different ethos and curriculum. When looked at collectively attainment is usually better in through primaries.

Questions and comments were then invited which were as follows:-

Will the children have separate playgrounds?

In the past many playgrounds were rectangular with a variety of activities taking place in the same area. In recent times it is more usual to have separate, themed areas (e.g. quiet seating areas, specific play areas). The Foundation Stage and Infant play areas would be totally separate from Junior play areas.

What happens in the interim before the building work is completed?

Mrs Gee will manage along with the infant staff a process where she will be visible to infant parents. Systems will be established to ensure that the infant department does not feel as though they have been taken over. Additionally, in the first year the school will receive a financial boost.

From the outset then both schools will remain open? Parents think that the infant school is going to physically close.

Mrs Gee explained that she has had experience as an Acting Head of an amalgamated school on a split site. The school buildings were a third of a mile apart.

I am concerned about the interim period and would like to know how soon schools can be brought together. It is difficult to envisage which site would be better.

Both schools would not be knocked down. There would be an extension on to the junior school.

It is also difficult to envisage where to build the extension.

We would have to look into how much open space is required.

How long will the work take?

It would take a minimum of two years to complete.

Would the Governors have any input on the design?

Yes, there would be Governor representatives on the design team.

Can I ask about the budget – what happens in September?

In September there would be a whole school budget. Until that time the budgets would be separate but it is important for the two schools to speak together and plan for being together.

What would happen to budgets in the future? There is no split site funding in Rotherham anymore so how would maintaining two buildings be managed budget wise? There would only be one amount of grounds maintenance funding and yet there would be two premises.

Graham Sinclair said if it was found that there was a need for temporary funding, it could be arranged. He also explained about the 4 year arrangement for Deputy Heads. In all amalgamated schools only one Deputy has remained at the end of 4 years. In this case the schools would have to restructure.

What about the rest of the teaching staff?

As the total number of children would be the same, the same number of teachers would be required. This applies also to support staff.

In the case of admin staff hours worked would have to be looked at and there may have to be negotiations on both hours and roles. In the interim all will be needed in both schools.

Hazel Gee asked if they would be able to have two Learning Mentors as the Junior School had lost one. She felt they had benefited greatly from EiC funding.

Graham confirmed that as the EiC funding was separate from the school budget there is no reason why it would not be possible to have two Learning Mentors again.

When the new build is complete and the amalgamated school is in one building would this mean it would receive less funding than when it was in two buildings?

Yes because of the consequential efficiencies.

If a person objects to the proposal what do they have to do?

Anyone can submit a formal objection once the Public Notice has been published. If anyone wishes to speak to an officer from the Local Authority to discuss any concerns they are free to do so. They can also speak to Mrs Cohen or Mrs Gee who will ensure that the appropriate officer is made aware of any comments.

Is the junior site big enough, particularly with regard to car parking and catering?

There are guidelines about these which have recently been increased. There are two kitchens at the moment and Ron Parry has confirmed that in September this will remain the same.

There is no expectation to have dining halls in schools. The expectation is that children will eat in main halls. Also the DSCF is keen on schools having flexible spaces and these can be used for eating areas too.

What will happen to the Governing Body?

There are some 'shared' governors and infant governors would have the opportunity to fill vacancies on the junior governing body. There are various models for a governing body. It could be expanded and it could have associate members who would be able to contribute to discussions but without a vote.

What are the implications for staff governors?

Now any member of staff can attend a meeting as a staff governor. It is about the whole staff working together and not about the juniors 'taking over' the infants. It will be one school.

Would one of the staffrooms be expanded?

This could be considered depending on how big the existing ones are and on space available. Hazel suggested that there could be alternate meetings – one in the junior building and the next in the infant building. That way staff would get to know each other.

Will Sure Start remain at the school?

If they wish to continue there will be more space as the social workers are moving elsewhere.

The nursery here caters for Thorogate.

Parents are free to choose if there is space. There are 52 places on a part-time basis.

Could we have another meeting if required?

That would be possible.

There is much confusion amongst parents about the closure of the infant school. Some think that the infant children will have to be accommodated in the junior building from September.

This unfortunately is due to the wording of the letter which has to be like that for legal reasons. It will be made clear to parents at the meeting with them on 4th March.

There is much concern about the amount of money that has been spent at the infant school.

Children have had the advantage of being there and have benefited from them. They will continue to do so until the building work is complete and the move to the new school takes place.

There were no more questions and the meeting was closed.

Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior School Proposed Amalgamation

Joint Meeting with Parents of Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools on Tuesday 4th March 2008.

Present: Graham Sinclair, David Hill, Helen Rogers and Ann Hercocock
(Local Authority), Chris Cohen (Head of Infant), Liz Gee (Head of Junior), and 27 parents.

David Hill outlined the proposal to amalgamate Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School will be closed and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School will be expanded and its age range will change from 7-11 to 3-11 years. The new school will become a 'through' primary school, which will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

He spoke about existing and predicted numbers on roll, financial implications and the advantages and disadvantages of amalgamation. A summary of the information had been distributed prior to the meeting, which also included a timetable for the consultation process.

Questions and comments were then invited which were as follows:-

Why not just appoint a new Head Teacher for the Infant School?

It is the policy of the Local Authority that when the opportunity arises, separate infant and junior schools are brought together. The Local Authority (L.A.) is of the opinion that through primary schools are better for children. If starting new, the L.A. would always prefer a through primary school.

Helen Rogers advised that the most satisfactory schools are 3-11 schools. The positive aspect is that it reduces anxiety at the transition from Y2 to Y3. This is not just recognised by Rotherham, it is a nationwide opinion. For its size Rotherham has one of the highest number of separate infant and junior schools in the country.

Why then could we not have a through primary school with two Head Teachers?

This is not about financial savings. The benefit is one leader ensuring continuity in ethos, values, curriculum planning and the general running of the school.

I cannot see how one Head Teacher can give enough attention to all children in a 3-11 school.

Rotherham has approximately 70 through primary schools. We have amalgamated 15 separate infant and junior schools. A staffing structure has to be put in place that ensures children have regular contact with the Head Teacher and that parents have access to senior staff to voice their concerns or problems. In an amalgamated school, two Deputy Heads are supported for a period of four years.

As far as costs are concerned, schools are funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (£163m). £140m goes to schools direct. The Local Authority cannot access that amount.

It is a saving but it is a saving for all schools. During the first year of an amalgamation two schools are funded separately so 7/12 of Mrs Cohen's salary will go back to the school.

How long will the school operate with two buildings?

Plans will be published in the Primary Capital Strategy 2009-11. The aim is to add on to the existing junior school building. Parents, staff and children will be involved in the process.

There are no plans for the extension yet. What impact would there be on the junior school and the woodland. Is the infant site ear-marked for housing?

As far as the infant site is concerned it would be up to Children and Young People's Services to decide if they have an alternative use for it. If not, the site would be passed to the Council land bank and the Council would decide what the land would be used for.

So in four years this site will be flattened. Would it not be better to delay the amalgamation. We are worried about the land being used for housing.

No, Mrs Cohen leaves at the end of the school year and the children need a firm structure in place. It is not an excuse.

Where are the statistics proving that through primaries are better?

These can be provided.

How long have you known that this is the best way?

We have had a strategy of amalgamations for a very long time in this authority, and certainly for the last 13 years.

Why were the schools not amalgamated then?

At that time numbers were volatile. It would not have made sense to amalgamate when numbers may have exceeded a 2 form entry.

We need to see a plan of what the junior school would look like. It feels like the Local Authority is doing this for its own purposes.

What we are doing is making sure there is something in place. We will work with the parents, children and architect during the planning stage.

Will there be much disruption during the building work?

We have a lot of experience of building on school sites. There is ample room on the junior school site. All will benefit from gaining a newer building. The infant children will not be affected during the build.

Will the children have separate playgrounds?

In the past many playgrounds were rectangular with a variety of activities taking place in the same area. In recent times it is more usual to have separate, themed areas (e.g. quiet

seating areas, specific play areas). The Foundation Stage and Infant play areas would be totally separate from Junior play areas.

Will there be any building on the woodland area?

No, that is ancient woodland and it will not be touched.

Where will the new build be – on the school field? Where are the plans?

The plans have not been drawn up. However, the site has been measured and there would be sufficient space for the new build.

Is the junior school stopping as it is?

The junior building will be added on to and will have one main entrance.

Will the school have a new name in September?

There is no reason why the school could not be named Rawmarsh Monkwood Primary.

Why not keep the infant building?

There are many reasons. For example, the school is wood built, the site is more cramped, access is limited and the playing field is small.

What would the life expectancy of the new build be?

About 60 years.

What about parking?

Access is something that needs looking at.

What is wrong with the ethos of the Infant School?

There is nothing wrong with the ethos of either school. This is not a criticism of what has already been achieved here. What is being said is that now the Local Authority would always build through primaries now and in the future.

Would staff numbers be cut?

No, there would be the same number of children in total.

Would infant teachers be forced to teach junior children?

No but where teachers and support staff wish to work with a different age group they can be given the opportunity.

Primary school teachers are trained to teach children aged 3-11. It does not mean infant teachers cannot teach 11 year olds. They are qualified; that is not an issue. Experience is something that can be helped with. Teachers are not going to be put into a class to fail. The aim is to do what is the best for the children.

Would there be staff training for special needs? There are children here (infants) with differing special needs.

Training is an on-going process. The Head Teacher would utilise the skills of staff. It is not in anyone's interest to do anything that would lead to a weakening.

There are two issues here. Is it a management shift or is it a land grab? I was so concerned I went to see Councillor Wright. Are we going to hear what the staff and governors have said?

Another thing is the land. Other amalgamations have not involved a split site with woodland in between.

This is a political decision. If it does not go through what happens then? If people want to safeguard what we have then turn down the amalgamation.

If the Council wanted to do anything with the land there would have to be a planning consultation. It would be a change of use. It was built for educational purposes. To answer your question why is the amalgamation being proposed, it is to benefit the children.

All comments made will be presented to the Cabinet Member and will be published on the Council's website. They can also be sent to the school for people to look at.

We have turned up here tonight and there has been no information about how the Governors and Staff feel. You should have invited them all to come to one meeting. There should also have been an opinion poll.

Another option is if there is no significant objection we can amalgamate but keep the buildings separate.

There is no point mending something that is not broken.

If a Head Teacher retires we will propose an amalgamation if it meets all the criteria.

What happens in the four year period before the building work is completed?

Mrs Gee will handle it in such a way that will ensure she will have time for parents and children.

When will she find this time?

Mrs Gee explained that she has had experience of an amalgamated school on a split site. The school buildings were a third of a mile apart. Also there will be two Deputy Heads.

They will be Deputies though – not a Head Teacher. The Deputy Head of the Infants will be doing Mrs Cohen's work.

The staffing structure will be different. The Heads and Deputy Heads have already met to discuss.

All this is being done before the decision is made.

We have to plan as though it is going to happen in order to be prepared.

What is the alternative to amalgamation?

If the Council decide not to amalgamate then it will not go ahead and 2 separate schools will be retained.

I went to another amalgamated school – Wath Central and it seemed all cramped together.

At the moment there are wide open spaces here. If the junior building is extended to accommodate all of the children they might lose that. How can you know that this will not be so if there are no plans?

The Local Authority has significant experience of building new schools.

Are there any views from other amalgamated schools such as Wath Central?

There has been no negative feedback.

This is a lovely site. It will become smaller if all of the children are at the junior site. That is why we are so against it.

The idea will be to maximise the space already there. There is no line through the woodland area; it is all part of education land. The trees will not be affected. The extra build will be onto the school.

There should have been plans.

If we had had plans it would have looked like it was already a done deal.

What would happen if numbers drop? Some parents have said they will not send their children to this school if it does amalgamate.

It is unlikely that this would happen.

How strong would objections have to be?

Anyone wishing to would have to submit a formal objection after the Public Notice has been published on 18th April. There will then be a six week period during which people can object or comment. All objections/comments would then be presented to the Cabinet Member as part of the decision-making process.

Would it have been better to have a vote?

We have to follow statutory procedure and a vote is not part of this process. The only way we can understand what is happening is to come here and meet with you and now we do understand.

How can we find out what the Governors think?

The Chair of the Governing Body was present at the meeting and informed the parents that at the Governors meeting there was a debate on educational issues. Personally, he felt strongly that the amalgamation should happen but that the infant land should be left for both school and community use.

After the Public Notice is published there are six weeks to object. It is up to us to come up with a process to object. We need to put it to a vote amongst ourselves. Councillor Wright was asked if the land would be used for new housing and he could not guarantee that it would not. It is left to us to fight.

Mrs Gee was asked if she would be willing to be Head Teacher if the sites were kept separate.

She confirmed that she would.

How is it going to look for the children this September?

Day to day things would not look any different but there would be a different management structure.

Will Mrs Gee be walking through the Infant School for children to get to know her?

She stated that she already does.

Is the budget guaranteed for next year?

The budget is basically based on the number of children in school.

On a positive note I am fully behind it. I have looked at Rawmarsh Thorogate and it is a lovely school with a good atmosphere and good community spirit.

The main worry is the disturbance for children. Where would Sure Start go?

We need to discuss with Sure Start.

I work in a through primary but do appreciate the concerns. I agree that through primaries are the way to go. It would be a good idea for parents here to speak to parents of children in an amalgamated school.

Will there be anymore meetings?

No, but meetings can be arranged with parents whose children do attend an amalgamated school.

There were no more questions so the meeting was closed.

Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior School Proposed Amalgamation

Joint Meeting with Staff of Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Junior Schools on Tuesday 4th March 2008.

Present: Graham Sinclair, David Hill, Helen Rogers, Paul Fitzpatrick and Ann Hercock (LA), Chris Cohen (Head of Infant), Liz Gee (Head of Junior), members of staff of both schools and union representatives.

David Hill outlined the proposal to amalgamate Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior Schools from September 2008. To do this Rawmarsh Monkwood Infant School will be closed and Rawmarsh Monkwood Junior School will be expanded and its age range will change from 7-11 to 3-11 years. The new school will become a 'through' primary school, which will accommodate the same number of pupils as are currently accommodated within the two schools.

He spoke about existing and predicted numbers on roll, financial implications and the advantages and disadvantages of amalgamation. A summary of the information had been distributed prior to the meeting, which also included a timetable for the consultation process.

Paul Fitzpatrick, Human Resources Manager stressed that the proposed amalgamation was not about reducing staff. There was no reason why any post should be at risk. Teaching staff would remain the same as the numbers of children would not change and catering and cleaning staff would be unchanged. Admin and clerical staff could see some changes but no jobs were at risk. The new Head would probably wish to look at structures but there was no cause for concern.

Questions and comments were then invited which were as follows:-

I am employed on a temporary contract. What will happen to my post at the end of August?

This would be an issue for the two Head Teachers to consider. The Infant Head confirmed that there would still be a need for the post.

I am part of the Admin Team at the Infant School. There would be four members of staff should the schools amalgamate. What would happen to salary scales and pensions?

There would be a consultation process involving staff and unions. It is likely that there would be a new staffing structure and some role changes may take place.

According to the timetable, the Local Authority decision will take place on 24th June. This is only three weeks before the end of the school term. This does not leave much time for consultation with staff.

The two Head Teachers have been meeting regularly with staff for some weeks now. They have been encouraged to think through the process well before 24th June. For practical purposes, it has to be assumed that the amalgamation will take place.

I am the Clerk to the Infant Governing Body. The next meeting is due to take place in May. What happens after that?

The Infant Governing Body continues until 31st August 2008. It would be possible to hold another meeting after the one in May. The Head Teachers and Chair will think about how to fill the vacancies on the Junior Governing Body.

I am the Site Supervisor. What will happen to my accommodation? What would happen if the Infant site was sold off?

You could remain there even if the site was sold off or alternatively there would be negotiations to re-house you.

What is the timetable for the move to the Junior School?

This will be published in the Primary Capital Programme 2009-2011. The aim would be to plan to rebuild Monkwood school.

I currently work in the new Foundation Unit here at the Infant School? What would happen to that – it seems a waste.

There will be a new Unit based in the Junior School as part of the building work. Children have benefited from attending the Foundation Unit and will continue to do so until the move to the Junior building takes place.

Is there enough room to build on to the Junior School?

I can confirm there is sufficient space.

Would the school field be lost?

No as there is enough room at the front of the building.

Would building onto the front restrict the light going into the building?

The architect would address this.

There are concerns that the building would be too close to the road.

Every site has its risks and issues. As part of the process staff, parents and governors will all be involved and consulted.

The Junior school has experienced a lot of vandalism. If you build nearer to the road it would only encourage more.

Often a new school instils a sense of pride in the community. It would be a matter of working with the children and parents.

Some parents think that because of the wording on the letter the Infant school will close in September and their children will have to be accommodated in the junior building.

The children would remain in the Infant School building until the new accommodation was ready.

What does the Local Authority propose to do with the infant school site?

Children and Young People's Services would decide if it had a need for the buildings and site. If we did not then it would be a Council decision. The site would go into a land bank that the Council manages. Nothing would be decided in the short term.

Why build onto the junior site rather than the Infant?

There is more space on the junior site to build on. It is a cost issue and a space issue. The infant site is on three different levels which is not suitable for children, staff and visitors with access difficulties. Access to the site is also limited.

What about play areas – would they be separate ones for infant and junior age children?

In the past many playgrounds were rectangular with a variety of activities taking place in the same area. In recent times it is more usual to have separate, themed areas (e.g. quiet seating areas, specific play areas). The Foundation Stage and Infant play areas would be totally separate from Junior play areas.

Would the dining area be extended to cope with the extra number of children?

Ron Parry, the Catering Manager would be involved with this and it is something to be taken into account with the architect.

There were no more questions.

Graham Sinclair explained that the pre-statutory consultation period will end on 20th March. Anyone wishing to ask any more questions or make any comments outside this meeting should speak to the Head Teachers who will pass them on to the appropriate officers. All points will be recorded and submitted to the Cabinet Member.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Lifelong Learning Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	15th April 2008
3.	Title:	European Structural Funds 2007-2013 14-19 Provision
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary

The Learning and Skills Council have completed the initial round of tendering for activity within the new European Structural Funds 2007-2013. On Thursday 20th March 2008 Children and Young People's Services (CYPS) were informed that the tender for the 16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager role had been successful. The Response Manager, will be responsible for co-ordinating and commissioning activity which will reduce the proportion of young people age 16-19 who are NEET. The contract value is £1.5m for two years with effect 1st April 2008, with the opportunity for a further £0.5m in a third year if initial contract outputs are achieved.

In addition the European Commission have agreed that funding to support NEETs preventative activities for 14-16 year olds should be subject to single tender arrangements (non competitive) in each Local Authority District in South Yorkshire. Therefore, dependent, upon the submission of a satisfactory business plan, the LSC will award Rotherham Children and Young People's Services £1.58m ESF, over three years, for the delivery of eligible activity with effect from September 2008.

This report provides further details of the management and targeting of this funding.

6. Recommendations

- **That the information is received for information**
- **That approval is given to commence the delivery of the 16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager project**

7. Proposals and Details

Background

In February 2007 the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) became the co-financing organisation for the management of the European Social Fund (ESF) element of the 2007-2013 European Structural Funds Programme.

Within the Yorkshire and Humberside programme the European Commission had identified 'ring fenced' funding for South Yorkshire to provide transitional support following the end of the sub-regional Objective 1 Programme.

The South Yorkshire LSC immediately began extensive negotiations with a range of key stakeholders including the South Yorkshire 14-19 Group. This consultation identified a range of local and sub-regional priorities which subsequently informed the LSC's tendering process.

As part of this consultation process the South Yorkshire 14-19 Group argued that ESF monies targeted at 14-16 year olds should automatically be managed through Local Authorities who had statutory responsibility for the education of 14-16 year olds. As a result of this lobbying both Government Office Yorkshire and Humberside and the European Commission agreed that this element of the funding should be the subject of a 'single tender' (non competitive) arrangement with each Local Authority District in South Yorkshire.

In October 2007 the LSC launched the ESF Invitation to Tender (ITT) process to facilitate the procurement of a range of activity which included in the EU Structural Funds Programme 2007-2013. This included an ITT for a NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager. The aim of this role was the reduce the proportion of young people age 14-19 that are NEET from 8% by 2010 and increase the participation of young people by 2% in 2007/08 with continued year on year increases until 2010.

Rotherham CYPS had begun ESF consultation with its strategic partners in January 2007, utilising the existing Rotherham 14-19 Strategy Group to identify key priorities for Rotherham. Following the launch of the ITT process Rotherham's 14-19 key stakeholders endorsed a single partnership ITT submission led by Children and Young People's Services.

On the 20th March 2008 the LSC informed CYPS that the ITT submission had been successful and that, following pre contract negotiations, a contract would be awarded for £1.5m for a period of two years. A further allocation of £0.5m will be awarded if all contract aims and objectives are achieved.

16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager

The Response Manager role will work through a strategic steering group comprised of key 14-19 stakeholders; representatives from GOYH; LSC; Local Authority and Connexions. This steering group must align its activity with existing 14-19 Strategies, Children and Young People's Single Plan and NEET action plans. In addition Rotherham will establish a NEETs Brokerage Model which will act on behalf of all key stakeholders to:-

- Monitor and refocus activity to ensure that delivery is coherently meeting the needs of the NEETs group
- Commission and sub-contract through an Open and Competitive Tendering process

- Ensure that any commissioned activity complements, enhances and adds value to existing activity; addresses gaps provision and meet the specific needs of young people in Rotherham.

The following are the key contract objectives

- Provide enhanced support to assist 500 young people in the development and implementation of their Individual Learning Plans by March 2010
- 325 Young People progress into education, employment or training by March 2010
- A reduction of 300 NEETs by March 2009
- A reduction of NEET young people in Rotherham to 7.1% by March 2010
- 325 Young People obtaining basic skills and employability skills by March 2010
- 200 Young People obtaining vocational skills accreditation at entry level 1 and 2

14-16 NEETs Preventative Activity

As mentioned above the 14-16 element of the ESF funding allocation will be the subject of a single tender route and Rotherham's allocation will be £1.58m for a period of three years.

Representatives of CYPS have presented Rotherham's 14-19 Partnership priorities for this funding to the LSC. These priorities will inform the development of a tender specification which, it is anticipated, will become available in June 2008. Each South Yorkshire Local Authority will then complete a full ITT submission, which if approved, should be contracted by September 2008.

Rotherham's submission will focus on the early identification of young people at risk of becoming NEET; the creation of alternative learning opportunities, including additional work based learning opportunities; and the creation of education/employment routes in the areas of Land, Catering and Hospitality; ICT; Construction and Business. A more detailed report on the aims and objectives will be presented following the LSC approval of the ITT.

8. Finance

- 16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager funding is allocated £1.5m for financial year 2008/09 and 23009/10. A further £0.5m will be available if the outputs included in the initial contract are achieved.
- 14-16 NEET Preventative Activity is allocated £1.58m for a three year academic period.

Unlike the previous Objective 1 Programme this funding is 'co-financed' by the LSC and the Local Authority will not be required to identify match funding.

The External Funding Team in CYPS will act as the accountable body for all the ESF provision for 14-19 year olds. This will include support for the implementation of the Commissioning Process; performance management of contracts and the application of the EU Commission rules and regulations on eligibility with regard to the use of European Social.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Details of main risks affecting project	Likelihood of risk/threat	Consequence of risk/threat	Steps to be undertaken to minimise and mitigate risk
Inability to implement Brokerage Model and commission activity in sufficient time to meet identified output milestones	Medium	Failure to achieve contract outputs could result in withdrawal of funding from current contract and removal of £0.5m offer for year 3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 14-19 Key stakeholders already signed up to Brokerage Model Management Structure in place Secondment of Interim Brokerage Manager identified Draft Commissioning strategy currently being developed
Failure of commissioned providers to meet the financial rules and regulation of EU commission	Medium	As contract holder RMBC could be subject to the removal or repayment of grant funding if contracted providers do not meet the eligibility criteria and financial rules, regulations and audit requirements of the EU Commission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Commissioning and ongoing performance management of the external contracts will managed by the CYPs External Funding team. This team have been responsible for the management for the current ESF Objective 1 Programme and have extensive experience of management and auditing of external contracts.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Rotherham Local Area Agreement identifies the reduction in the % of NEETs to 7.1% by 2010 as one its key performance measures. CYPs Single Plan also identifies the need to develop the quantity, quality and scope of provision for the target group as an ongoing priority.

The following key strategic documents provide more specific detail:

- Rotherham Widening Participation (NEETs) Strategy September 2006-10 Page 12-14: “Ensure accurate tracking and data sharing; enhance preventative measures and early interventions; develop appropriate learning and training provision 14-19; support transition and re-engagement; ensure young people’s involvement and view influence the development of the IAG offer and the commissioning and review of provision at all stages. This proposal’s objective of a 7.1% NEET target by 2010 reflect the Government Office Target included in the Widening Participation Strategy.
- Rotherham Draft Rotherham 14-19 Learning Plan 2007-2013: “increase the proportion of 17 year olds participating in education and training; reduce the proportion of 16-18 year olds who are NEET; increase the number of young people completing an Apprenticeship; Increase the percentage of young people who progress to Higher Education particularly from more vulnerable and under-represented groups; ensure that post 16 learning option meet the needs of all young people, including young people who have learning difficulties and/or disabilities and those who have offended; ensure the validity and reliability of data; increase the percentage of young people achieving L3 by 19.”

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Rotherham Children and Young People’s Tender submission for the 16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager
- LSC Invitation to Tender – 16-19 NEET Co-ordinated Response Manager

Contact Name :
Jeanette Lane
Principal Officer External Funding
Children and Young People's Services
Jeanette.lane@rotherham.gov.uk