

Changes to the School Admissions Code

Launch Date: Tuesday 22 July 2014

Closing Date: Monday 29 September 2014

Consultation Questions

- 1. Please use the box provided to comment on the proposal to allow all state-funded schools to give priority in their admission arrangements to children eligible for pupil premium or service premium funding (see section 2 of the summary document).**

ANSWER

It would be problematic and time consuming collating information on eligibility for pupil premium particularly for Reception / FS2 pupils as this is usually collated by schools as part of the census

In Rotherham approximately 90% of applicants consistently receive their 1st preference school and analysis shows that most pupil premium eligible children make a preference for their nearest and catchment area school. This may be more appropriate in areas of the Country where a much lower percentage of 1st preferences are realised. The armed forces covenant makes provision for the allocation of places to armed forces personnel children and is not an issue in Rotherham where the criteria applies.

- 2. Please use the box provided to comment on the proposal to allow admission authorities of primary schools to give priority in their admission arrangements to children eligible for the early years pupil premium, pupil premium or service premium who attend a nursery which is part of the school (see section 3). This includes removing barriers to schools offering optional wrap-around childcare by ensuring any charges paid by parents for such childcare would not prevent their children from being prioritised.**

ANSWER

Nursery provision varies as some areas have more provision than others, it could lead to local children in particular areas being unable to obtain a place at their local / catchment area school if they were not as high in the Admission criteria. Parents / carers often choose nursery provision for very different reasons eg childcare arrangements, work location etc but have different views when statutory aged provision is concerned.

- 3. Please use the box provided to comment on the proposal to create a rolling deadline for admission authorities to comply with a determination of the schools adjudicator (see section 4)**

ANSWER

RMBC cannot see an issue with the rolling deadline as long as all interested parties have sufficient notice to implement.

- 4. Please use the box provided to comment on the proposal to bring forward the deadlines for objections, determinations and publication of admission arrangements; and to change the timing and length of consultations (see section 4).**

ANSWER

Bringing forward the deadlines for objections, determinations and publications and changing the timing and length of consultations is not detrimental to the process, so long as stakeholders are notified in advance of the shorter timeline period.

- 5. Please use the box provided to comment on the proposals relating to the admission of summer born children (see section 5).**

ANSWER

Clarifies the position for parents / carers and doesn't significantly impact on admissions.

- 6. Please use the box provided if you have any comments on the proposed minor technical drafting changes (see section 7 and Annex B).**

ANSWER

The technical drafting changes do not seem to present any difficulties. We would advise that the technical changes are drafted as "may" not "must" to allow individual authorities discretion to implement where it would be beneficial depending on their local circumstances.