

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet is asked to make the following recommendations to the County Council:

Recommendation 1

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Thames Ditton Infants Schools is agreed for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was no majority in agreement or disagreement of this proposal (24 agreed and 25 disagreed)
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings into the same school, this will only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places in the area of the school combined with the extra classes that were admitted to Thames Ditton Infants in 2009 and 2010 mean that on balance, a greater disadvantage might be caused to families in the local area than to siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- It is intended that the use of the tiered sibling criteria will only apply for 2012/13 admission whilst the school still has a year group with an extra class. As such the admission policy for the school will be reviewed for 2013/14 admissions
- This decision should feed into a wider review of the use of the Tiered Sibling criterion needs to be carried out so that the County Council has a clear County wide approach on the policy and the circumstances under which it believes it is warranted to give priority to children for whom a school is nearest as opposed to giving priority to siblings

Recommendation 2

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Thames Ditton Infant and Junior schools is agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Thames Ditton Junior School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School
5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal to introduce feeder school criterion (34 agreed and 3 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for the Junior school and when making applications for siblings
- As the Infant school has admitted two extra 'bulge' classes it is not proposed at this stage to introduce a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools as this might have a detrimental effect on families applying to the Junior school from the local area

Recommendation 3

That a reciprocal sibling link is agreed between Merrow Church of England (Controlled) School and Bushy Hill Junior School for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (27 agreed and 4 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for siblings
- This arrangement would enhance the feeder link between the two school

Recommendation 4

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Eastwick Infant and Junior schools is not implemented for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendations

- Whilst the majority of respondents supported this proposal (41 agreed and 29 disagreed), there was strong opposition from another school within the Effingham Learning Partnership
- Further analysis would need to be done on the impact that this proposal might have on other schools in the area
- This proposal would need to be considered alongside other changes that are being explored within the Effingham Learning Partnership

Recommendation 5

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Earlswood Infant School and Brambletye Junior School and associated reciprocal sibling link is agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Brambletye Junior School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Earlswood Infant School
4. Siblings
5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (24 agreed and 3 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for the Junior school and when making applications for siblings

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that Cabinet agree the proposed changes to PANs for September 2012 as follows:

- i) *Oatlands School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90
- ii) St Andrew's CofE Primary to increase its PAN from 52 to 60
- iii) *Boxgrove Primary School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90

- iv) Eastwick Infant School to increase its PAN from 75 to 82 to allow for 7 children within the school's Special Needs Support Centre
- v) Banstead Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 80
- vi) *Shortwood Infant School to increase its PAN from 27 to 30
- vii) *Spelthorne Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 60
- viii) Hale School to decrease its Junior PAN from 20 to 2
- ix) *Maybury Infant School to decrease its PAN from 40 to 30

Reasons for Recommendation

- There were no major objections to changes in PAN
- School Commissioning support all of these changes and where the school name is denoted by a star (*) the proposals are in line with separate proposals to expand or amalgamate the schools
- Where increase in PANs have been requested this will enable more children to gain admission to these schools thus increasing parental preference
- Where reduction in PANs have been requested it will enable those schools to better manage their delivery of the National Curriculum and their school budgets
- Despite representation from families and schools in the Epsom and Ewell area there are presently sufficient places within a range of Junior age providers in the area to accommodate the extra 30 children who will be leaving Wallace Fields Infant School in 2012. As such there is no planning need to provide additional spaces at Wallace Fields Junior School. The Admissions team will work with parents at Wallace Fields Infant School to make them aware of available places and support them in the application process. If however demand in the area increases and the availability of places reduces the County Council would provide additional spaces if they were required

Recommendation 7

That it is agreed to increase the number of preferences under Surrey's coordinated scheme for secondary admissions 2012/13 from three to six.

Reasons for Recommendation

- There was an overall majority in support of the proposal (101 agreed and 46 disagreed)
- Parents would be able to apply for the schools that they preferred in their true order of preference
- It would maximise a parent's opportunity to be offered a school of their preference
- It would be likely to support undersubscribed schools which may see an increase to their preference numbers
- It would make the process more equitable for parents when compared to parents living in the London boroughs
- Clear information would be published so that parents would be aware that whilst the maximum number of preferences would be six, they would not have to name six preferences if they did not choose to

Recommendation 8

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2012/13 are agreed as set out in Annex 2e

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (51 agreed and 1 disagreed)
- The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions

Recommendation 9

That Surrey's Relevant Area for admissions is agreed as set out in Annex 3.

Reasons for Recommendations

- All respondents supported this proposal
- The Relevant Area for admissions must be agreed every two years and no changes have been proposed

Recommendation 10

That the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2012 are agreed with the exception of:

- i) **Annex 2a**, Section 8, Paragraph c) i) - the admission arrangements for George Abbot School (see Recommendation 11)
- ii) **Annex 2a**, Section 11 – amendment to how reverse sibling will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place (see Recommendation 12)
- iii) **Annex 2b** - the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary's CofE Junior School (see Recommendation 13)

Reasons for Recommendations

- This would ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's Green Policies
- Despite representation from families living within Tatsfield, the introduction of a tiered sibling policy for Tatsfield Primary School would be likely to impact on preferences from outside the village. The school relies on attracting children from outside the village in order to sustain its viability and as to date all children from Tatsfield have got into the school it is not deemed necessary to make a change to the criteria at this time
- Despite representation from some families and schools in the Epsom and Ewell area who requested the introduction of a tiered sibling policy at Wallace Fields Infant and Junior schools, a wider review of the use of the Tiered Sibling criterion needs to first be carried out so that the County Council has a clear County wide approach on the policy and the circumstances under which it believes it is warranted to give priority to children for whom a school is nearest as opposed to giving priority to siblings. Any such change should be subject to full consultation and as such this will be reviewed ahead of the consultation process for 2013
- No change is proposed to the policy on multiple births because whilst in practice all Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools will try and admit children of multiple births by admitting over PAN, there would be occasions when this would not be possible, such as under Infant Class Size legislation

Recommendation 11

That it is agreed to change the admission arrangements for George Abbot School for September 2012 to those that applied prior to the Schools Adjudicator's determination in October 2010 so that priority for admission to George Abbot School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings

4. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
5. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- There was strong opposition to the proposal to retain the admission arrangements that had been determined by the Schools Adjudicator for 2011 with 62 respondents in disagreement that children in Ripley should be given priority above other children for whom George Abbot is the nearest school
- The determination of the Schools Adjudicator only applied to 2011 admissions and left the County Council free to determine its own arrangements for 2012
- Previous adjudications were not upheld which demonstrates that this matter is not clear cut and that the latest decision by the Schools Adjudicator is just one view on the matter
- George Abbot is currently well established as a school that serves the local community and the arrangements as determined by the Schools Adjudicator have the potential to lead to a more scattered intake and might disadvantage children in other rural areas who do currently get into the school
- Further analysis would need to be done on admissions within the area to ascertain if arrangements should be reviewed in order to accommodate children living in rural areas
- The County Council will continue to consider transport requests for children in the Parish of Ripley to get to their nearest school if they do not get a place at George Abbot

Recommendation 12

That it is agreed to amend the wording on how the reverse sibling criteria will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place from:

‘At the initial allocation for these schools the Year 3 applicants will be dealt with first, before the Reception applicants’;

to:

‘At the initial allocation, when a parent is applying for both a Reception and a Junior school place, neither child will be treated as a sibling under the sibling criterion until after the offer day. At that time, if a place has been offered to only one child, the waiting list position for the other child will be adjusted to reflect the fact that they expect to have a sibling in the school or a school on a shared or adjoining site at the time of admission’.

Reasons for Recommendations

- The reverse sibling policy was introduced for 2011 admissions to maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at the same school or at a school on a shared or adjoining site
- As a result of this year’s admission process it has become apparent that, logistically, this policy cannot be applied when a parent has made an application for a Reception and a Junior school place because until the allocation is run neither the parent nor the Local Authority would know whether either child might be offered a place
- Prior to their application the parent would not know which school to apply for under sibling priority and after application the Local Authority would not know to which school sibling priority might be agreed
- Reception and Junior allocations are run at the same time and there is very limited time between the date of allocation and the date that offer letters are sent to amend priority according to any siblings that may have been offered as part of the Junior allocation

- To try and do this would result in children lower down the preference list losing an offer. However within a coordinated process lower preferences are discarded as higher preferences are offered and it would not be possible to manually resolve these cases in the time allowed. Coordination of places across County borders further complicates the matter.
- The wording that has been recommended maximises the use of the reverse sibling policy as far as it can be practicably implemented and ensures that siblings that are offered as part of a Reception or Junior allocation are treated as such when waiting lists are ranked post-offer.

Recommendation 13

That it is agreed to remove the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary's CofE Junior School for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendations

- This link is not supported by St Mary's CofE Junior School, Southwark Diocese or other schools in the Oxted area
- The suggestion has been put forward that this arrangement might have a detrimental effect on other infant schools in the area
- This criteria has not previously presented any issues because all children have got into Downsway
- If it needed to be applied the sibling priority could not be assessed without the support of St Mary's
- Further analysis involving all Oxted primary schools and the Diocese should be carried out before considering whether this arrangement be reintroduced in the future

Recommendation 14

That no changes are made to the admission arrangements of the following schools, but that a further analysis is carried out ahead of consultation on admission arrangements for 2013 to identify if changes are necessary in the light of the comments that were received:

- Farnham Heath End
- Rodborough School
- Warlingham School

Reasons for Recommendations

- Only a small number of comments have been made against the admission arrangements for these schools which might not be representative of the views of schools or parents in the area of each school
- There is not currently sufficient evidence which would support a change to the admission arrangements for these schools
- Representations have been made in response to the consultation, which would mean that if any change were proposed it would not itself be subject to consultation. This would not be good practice without clear justification and a need for change