

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2015****REPORT OF: MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING****LEAD OFFICER: CLAIRE POTIER, PRINCIPAL MANAGER ADMISSIONS AND TRANSPORT****SUBJECT: ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2016 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS, COORDINATED SCHEMES AND RELEVANT AREA****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Following statutory consultation on the proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2016 and Surrey's Relevant Area, Cabinet is asked to consider the responses set out in Enclosure 5 and make recommendations to the County Council on admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools, Surrey's coordinated schemes for September 2016 and its Relevant Area.

This report covers the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Bagshot Infant School (Bagshot) – Recommendation 1
- Hammond Community Junior School (Lightwater) - Recommendation 2
- Meath Green Junior School (Horley) – Recommendation 3
- Wallace Fields Junior School (Ewell) – Recommendation 4
- Worplesdon Primary School (Worplesdon, Guildford) – Recommendation 5
- Cranleigh Primary School (Cranleigh) – Recommendation 6
- Own admission authority schools to be included in assessment of nearest school – Recommendation 7
- Start date to primary admissions round – Recommendation 8
- Surrey's Relevant Area - Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 10
- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 11
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 12

Recommendations are set out on pages 1 to 6 and further details of each proposal are set out on pages 7 to 16.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to the County Council:

Recommendation 1

That, subject to Connaught Junior School also agreeing to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School, a reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School is introduced with Connaught Junior School so that Bagshot Infant School would be described as operating shared sibling priority with Connaught Junior School

for 2016 admission.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at Connaught Junior School would benefit from sibling priority at Bagshot Infant School
- This proposal is in line with a separate proposal by Connaught Junior School to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School. This recommendation is therefore conditional on Connaught Junior School implementing this change before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- If Connaught also introduce a feeder link from Bagshot as they have proposed, it would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by Connaught Junior School and by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of Bagshot Infant School

Recommendation 2

That a new criterion for Hammond Community Junior School is introduced for September 2016 to provide priority for children attending either Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Lightwater Village School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Children attending either Valley End CofE Infant School or Windlesham Village Infant School
- f. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would introduce a feeder link for infant schools where currently none exists and in doing so would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- It would support viability of Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of Hammond Community Junior School and by Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools would not confer an automatic right to transport to Hammond Community Junior School

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link from Meath Green Infant to Meath Green Junior School is introduced for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need

-
- c. Children attending Meath Green Infant School
 - d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
 - e. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other community and voluntary controlled schools which have feeder and reciprocal sibling links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Body of the school
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meath Green Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Meath Green Junior School

Recommendation 4

That, in line with the tiered arrangements that currently exist at both schools, a tiered feeder link is introduced from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- d. Children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- e. Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- f. Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- g. Other children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- h. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of both schools
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Wallace Fields Infant School would not confer an automatic

right to transport to Wallace Fields Junior School

Recommendation 5

That admission criteria are introduced for Year 3 entry to Worplesdon Primary School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings
- d. Children attending Wood Street Infant School
- e. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- As this school now has a Year 3 Published Admission Number (PAN) the local authority has a duty to determine criteria which confirm how children will be admitted
- Other than the feeder link for children attending Wood Street Infant School, it would introduce criteria that are in line with those that exist for the reception intake to the school
- It would provide continuity and reduce anxiety for parents and children of Wood Street Infant School
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Wood Street Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Worplesdon Primary School

Recommendation 6

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for Cranleigh Primary School is removed for September 2016.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There will still be sufficient junior places for local children if the PAN is removed
- It will help support other local schools in maintaining pupil numbers
- It will alleviate funding, accommodation and staffing issues in the school
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

Recommendation 7

That the own admission authority schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school are decided each year according to the policy set out in Section 12 of Enclosure 1.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools to be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools county wide
- It ensures a transparent and open policy that parents can understand
- It does not deliver a significant difference to current practice
- It ensures historical pattern of admission is taken in to account

-
- It prevents schools from being included due to the admission of a bulge class or a non-standard admission year
 - It allows for exceptions to apply where admission authorities change their admission arrangements

Recommendation 8

That following consultation, the start date to the primary admissions round remains as 1 September for 2016 admission rather than 1 November as proposed.

Reasons for Recommendation

- Response rate from schools was insufficient to gauge whether or not there would be general support for this proposal
- This proposal will be deferred until 2017 when a more targeted consultation will be carried out with schools

Recommendation 9

That Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Enclosure 2.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The local authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area for admissions
- The Relevant Area must be consulted upon and agreed every two years even if no changes are proposed
- Setting a Relevant Area ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of those changes
- No significant change has been made to Surrey's Relevant Area but clarity has been provided for faith schools that they should consider the advice issued by their Diocese when considering which other deanery schools to consult with

Recommendation 10

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2016 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 which include the following changes:

- i. Ashford Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ii. Bishop David Brown Secondary – increase in Year 7 PAN from 150 to 180
- iii. Cranmere Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- iv. Farncombe CofE Infant School - increase in Reception PAN from 40 to 50
- v. The Greville Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Hinchley Wood Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- vii. Hurst Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- viii. Manby Lodge Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. Milford School – increase Reception PAN from 50 to 60
- x. North Downs Primary School – introduction of Year 3 PAN of 4
- xi. South Camberley Primary – increase in PAN from 110 to 120
- xii. Stoughton Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiii. West Byfleet Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiv. Worplesdon Primary – introduction of a junior PAN of 30

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where an increase in PAN is proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2015 which enables parents to have

some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 11

That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2016, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its Appendices.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will 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 existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies
- Changes highlighted in bold in sections 10, 13, 14, 19 and 20 of Enclosure 1 have been made to add clarity to the admission arrangements but do not constitute a policy change
- Changes highlighted in bold in sections 17 and 18 of Enclosure 1 have been made to comply with statutory requirements of the School Admissions Code 2014
- The change highlighted in bold in section 21 of Enclosure 1 has been made to reflect a change to Surrey's Home to School Transport policy
- Changes to PAN that are highlighted in bold in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 are referenced in Recommendation 10

Recommendation 12

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2016/17 are agreed as set out in Appendix 4 of Enclosure 1.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2016 are the same as 2015
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

DETAILS:

Consultation

1. On 21 November 2014 the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning agreed to consult on proposed changes to the admission arrangements for some community and voluntary controlled schools. This consultation ran for eight weeks from 28 November 2014 to 22 January 2015.
2. Full details of the proposed admission arrangements for Surrey's community and voluntary controlled schools, Surrey's Relevant Area and Surrey's coordinated admission schemes, including the arrangements for which there is no change proposed, are attached as Enclosure 1 and its Appendices.
3. A document which set out a summary of the main changes was made available to schools and parents and is attached as Enclosure 4.

4. The consultations were sent directly to Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Parent Governors of all Surrey schools, Diocesan Boards of Education, neighbouring local authorities, out of County voluntary aided and foundation schools within 3 miles (primary schools) or 5 miles (secondary schools) radius of the Surrey border, Surrey County Councillors, Borough and District Councillors, Parish and Town Councillors, members of Surrey's Admission Forum, Early Years establishments and Surrey MPs.
5. Surrey County Council Members and Borough and District Councillors were asked to draw the consultations to the attention of any local community or resident groups in their area who may have an interest in responding.
6. Nurseries and schools were asked to draw the consultation to the attention of parents with children at the nursery or school.
7. All consultees were also sent a suggested form of wording for parents, which they were encouraged to put on websites, noticeboards and in newsletters, as appropriate.
8. Notice of the consultations was also published on Surrey County Council's website along with an online response form.
9. Details of the proposals have been shared with members of the Children and Education Select Committee.
10. With regard to the initial consultation, 70 responses were submitted by the closing date.
11. A summary of the responses to questions within that consultation is set out below in Table A.

Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Bagshot Infant School - introduction of reciprocal sibling link with Connaught Junior School	Enclosure 1 Appendix 2	5	1
2	Hammond Community Junior School - introduction of priority for children attending Valley End and Windlesham Village Infant schools	Enclosure 1	7	1
3	Meath Green Junior School - introduction of a feeder link for children at Meath Green Infant School	Enclosure 1	6	0
4	Wallace Fields Junior School - introduction of a tiered feeder link from Wallace Fields Infant School	Enclosure 1	42	9
5	Worplesdon Primary School – introduction of admission criteria for Year 3	Enclosure 1	3	0
6	Cranleigh Primary School – removal of Published Admission Number for Year 3	Enclosure 1 Appendix 1	0	0
7	Own admission authority schools to be considered in the assessment of nearest school	Enclosure 1 Appendix 3	14	7

8	Start date to primary admissions round	Enclosure 1 Appendix 4	7	15
9	Surrey's Relevant Area	Enclosure 2	5	3

12. An analysis of the responses to the consultation is included in Enclosure 5.
13. Details of recommendations have been shared with the local Members for each area, where appropriate.

Proposed changes to local admission arrangements

Recommendation 1 - introduction of reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School with Connaught Junior School

14. The number of responses was low but five respondents supported this proposal and one was opposed.
15. The admission criteria for Bagshot Infant School would not change but Bagshot Infant School would be described as operating shared sibling priority with Connaught Junior School for 2016 admission (see Enclosure 1 – Appendix 2). In this way, families with an older child attending Connaught Junior School would receive sibling priority for a younger child to attend Bagshot Infant School.
16. This proposal is in line with a proposal by Connaught Junior School to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School. Connaught Junior School also proposes to introduce Bagshot Infant School as its main feeder school. As an academy, the governing body of Connaught Junior School is responsible for consulting on any proposals for change to their admission arrangements.
17. Implementation of this proposal for Bagshot Infant School will be subject to Connaught Junior School also implementing the reciprocal sibling link between the two schools.
18. This proposal is supported by Connaught Junior School and by the headteacher and Chair of Governors at Bagshot Infant School.
19. In line with Surrey County Council policy, if Connaught Junior School introduce a feeder link from Bagshot Infant School, the introduction of a reciprocal sibling link with Connaught Junior School would enable sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at Bagshot Infant School in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria for Connaught would provide for them to be admitted to Connaught thereby retaining their sibling priority.
20. This proposal, together with that put forward by Connaught Community Junior School, is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan which undertake to consider sympathetically the desirability of separate infant schools feeding into junior or primary provision where this reduces transport needs for young children.
21. The introduction of a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools would provide a greater chance of families keeping their children together or at schools in close proximity.

Recommendation 2 - introduction of priority to Hammond Community Junior School for children attending Valley End and Windlesham Village Infant schools

- 22. The number of responses was low but seven respondents supported this proposal and one was opposed.
- 23. The junior schools in Bagshot and Lightwater are keen to provide support to Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools to ensure that, as far as possible, parents with children at these schools can see a transition through to junior school.

24. The proposal for Hammond Community Junior School is in line with a proposal also being put forward by Connaught Junior School to provide priority for children attending Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools, after children attending Bagshot Infant School and siblings.

25. Currently, Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools have no feeder link to a junior school. Parents of children attending these schools are therefore left in some uncertainty regarding their child’s transition to Year 3. This uncertainty may lead parents to seek alternative infant provision at the outset or to seek alternative primary provision before their child finishes Year 2. Both these schools feel that this has impacted on their ability to maintain numbers at PAN.

26. In the 2014 admission round places were allocated at Hammond as follows:

a. LAC/PLAC	0
b. Exceptional	0
c. Children attending Lightwater	58
d. Siblings	13
e. Others on distance	17 (1.41km)
SEN	2

27. Children who might be displaced if the proposed criteria were introduced would be children who had previously been offered a place under criterion e) ‘Others on distance’. However, for the 2014 intake all of the 17 children allocated under criterion e) attended either Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools. As such, the allocation outcome would have been the same in 2014 had the proposed criteria applied. In this way, based on the 2014 intake, no local children would have been displaced had these criteria applied.

28. There was a similar pattern in 2013 when, again, 17 children were offered under criterion e) to a distance of 1.19km. However in 2013, two of these children attended Bagshot Infant School. These two children would have been displaced if the feeder link with Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools had existed. However, on the basis that governors at Connaught have proposed to introduce a feeder link from Bagshot Infant School from 2016, in future, any such children attending Bagshot Infant would be accommodated at Connaught Junior School.

29. On balance, it is not believed that this proposal would have a great impact on the pattern of admission to Hammond but, along with a similar proposal being put forward by Connaught Junior School, it provides for a formal link with Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools. This proposal will therefore support those schools by providing a clearer transition for children attending them and will enable this group of schools to work together more positively on transition.

30. This proposal is supported by governors at Hammond Community Junior School and by Windlesham and Valley End schools.

31. Parents with children at Valley and Windlesham Village infant schools who do not wish to apply for a Year 3 place at Hammond Community Junior School will not have to. Those parents will still have the right to apply for other schools.

Recommendation 3 - introduction of a feeder link from Meath Green Infant School to Meath Green Junior School

32. The number of responses was low but six respondents supported this proposal and none were opposed.

33. Meath Green Junior School has a reciprocal sibling link with Meath Green Infant School but there is no feeder link from the infant school to the junior school. Instead the admission criteria for the junior school currently follow the standard criteria for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

34. However most children attending Meath Green Infant School do currently transfer to Meath Green Junior School. For 2014 admission, 55 of the 70 children attending Meath Green Infant School applied and were offered a place at Meath Green Junior School.

35. Since September 2013 Meath Green Infant School has admitted 90 children, with the PAN formally changing from 70 to 90 in September 2015. As such, from 2016 onwards, there will be 90 children seeking a junior place from Meath Green Infant School which aligns with the PAN of 90 for the junior school.

36. The criteria that have been proposed are consistent with the admission criteria for most other community and voluntary controlled schools which have feeder and reciprocal sibling links.

37. This proposal is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan which undertake to consider sympathetically the desirability of separate infant schools feeding into junior or primary provision where this reduces transport needs for young children.

38. From the 2014 intake, Meath Green Junior School admitted children from the following schools:

- Charlwood Village 11
- Dovers Green 1
- Horley Infant 20
- Langshott Infant 2
- Meath Green Infant 55
- Wray Common 1

39. However from September 2016 Charlwood Infant School will become an all through primary school, allowing children in Year 2 to transfer to Year 3 at the same school.

40. Children attending Horley Infant School can apply for a place at Yattendon School which shares the same PAN of 90 and is the nearest junior school to Horley Infant. Since Langshott Infant School became a primary school in September 2014, children in Year 2 at this school can transfer to Year 3 at the same school, thus freeing up places at Yattendon for children attending Horley Infant School.

41. Whilst there is still no guarantee that all children at Meath Green Infant School who apply would be given a place at the junior school, it is quite likely that in most years those who want to transfer would be able to. In this way these criteria would provide continuity and a clearer transition for children and would reduce anxiety for parents.

- 42. Although siblings would be given a lower priority after the feeder link, for 2014 admission there were only five children who were allocated a place under the sibling criterion who did not attend Meath Green Infant School. Two of these were from Charwood Infant and one was from Langshott Infant. As these schools are now all through primary schools, the number of siblings seeking a place at Meath Green Junior is likely to fall. As not all children attending Meath Green Infant School are likely to apply for a place at Meath Green Junior, it is likely that all siblings would still be offered a place, although there would be no guarantee.
- 43. In line with Surrey County Council policy, due to the reciprocal sibling link between the infant and the junior schools, the introduction of a feeder link would also enable sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at the infant school in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the infant school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria provides for them to be admitted to the junior school thereby retaining their sibling priority.
- 44. This proposal is supported by governors at Meath Green Junior School.
- 45. Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attending the feeder school would not confer an automatic right to transport to Meath Green Junior School.

Recommendation 4 - introduction of a tiered feeder link from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School

- 46. There was general support for this proposal with 42 respondents in support and nine opposed.
- 47. Wallace Fields Junior School has a reciprocal sibling link with Wallace Fields Infant School but there is no feeder link from the infant school to the junior school. In line with the infant school, the admission criteria for the junior school are tiered to provide priority for siblings and other children who have the school as their nearest ahead of siblings and other children who do not.
- 48. However, most children attending Wallace Fields Infant School do currently transfer to Wallace Fields Junior School. For 2014 admission, 56 of the 60 children attending Wallace Fields Infant School applied and were offered a place at Wallace Fields Junior School.
- 49. This proposal is consistent with Surrey’s planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan, which undertake to consider sympathetically the desirability of separate infant schools feeding into junior or primary provision where this reduces transport needs for young children.
- 50. Wallace Fields Infant School has a PAN of 60 and Wallace Fields Junior School has a PAN of 68.
- 51. Historically, Wallace Fields Junior School has also admitted some children from Ewell Grove Infant School (6 in 2013 and 5 in 2014), either as siblings or as a nearest school on distance. Ewell Grove Infant School has no named feeder school and, although there are proposals to make this an all through primary school, there is not currently a confirmed date for this to happen. As such, although the number transferring to Wallace Fields Junior School is relatively low, the local authority is keen to ensure that any proposal to change admission arrangements is fair and does not disadvantage families

who have been unable to access Wallace Fields Infant School, but who still have the junior school as their nearest junior provision.

52. It is believed that the tiered feeder link and the fact that Wallace Fields Junior School has a PAN which is higher than that of Wallace Fields Infant School will mean that some places will still be available for children attending other infant schools if Wallace Fields Junior School is their nearest school.
53. Whilst more complex than having a straight feeder link, the proposed criteria remain consistent with the tiered sibling criteria that have been in place at both schools since 2013 (and which parents have become familiar with) and provide for children who have the school as their nearest junior provision to receive priority ahead of those who do not.
54. Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some children attending Wallace Fields Infant School might not be offered a place at the junior school, this would only apply if it is not their nearest school and these children would be unlikely to be offered a place under the existing arrangements.
55. On balance, until a permanent solution can be found for children attending Ewell Grove Infant School, the local authority considers this to be the fairest way to establish a feeder link between Wallace Fields Infant and Junior schools.
56. This proposal is supported by the headteacher and Chair of Governors at both Wallace Fields Infant and Junior Schools.
57. In line with Surrey County Council policy, due to the reciprocal sibling link between the infant and the junior schools, the introduction of a feeder link would also enable the appropriate sibling priority to be given to a child who is applying to start at the infant school in Reception even if they have a sibling who would have left the infant school by the time the younger child starts. This is because the admission criteria provides for them to be given priority for admission to the junior school.
58. Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attending the feeder school would not confer an automatic right to transport to Wallace Fields Junior School.

Recommendation 5 - introduction of admission criteria for Year 3 at Worplesdon Primary School

59. The number of responses was low but three respondents supported this proposal and none were opposed.
60. Following a period of consultation through statutory proposals, it was agreed for Worplesdon Primary School to expand so that it has a junior intake of 30 from September 2016, in addition to its existing intake of 60 at Reception.
61. As a result, it is necessary for the local authority to introduce admission criteria for this intake.
62. The admission criteria that have been proposed are in line with those that exist for the reception intake, but introduce some priority for children who attend Wood Street Infant School.
63. Wood Street Infant School has a PAN of 30. Along with Stoughton Infant School (which currently has a PAN of 60), Wood Street Infant School has feeder school priority to Northmead Primary School (which has a Junior PAN of 90).

64. However, since 2013 Stoughton Infant School has admitted 90 children and it has recently been agreed to expand this school to a permanent PAN of 90 from September 2015. In this way, from September 2016, there will not be sufficient junior places at Northmead Primary School to accommodate all children attending Stoughton Infant and Wood Street Infant schools.
65. This proposal to establish a feeder link to Worplesdon Primary School from Wood Street Infant School is therefore consistent with an associated proposal by Northmead Infant School to remove Wood Street Infant School as a feeder school.
66. In this way, if these proposals go ahead, children attending Stoughton Infant School will have feeder priority for admission to Northmead Primary School and children attending Wood Street Infant School will have feeder priority for admission to Worplesdon Primary School. This will ensure that, as far as possible, there is clear transition from KS1 to KS2 in this area.
67. At a meeting on 10 November 2014, representatives from Stoughton Infant School, Worplesdon Primary School and Wood Street Infant School gave support to this proposal.
68. Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attending the feeder school would not confer an automatic right to transport to Worplesdon Primary School.

Recommendation 6 – removal of Published Admission Number for Year 3 at Cranleigh Primary School

69. There were no responses to this proposal.
70. Cranleigh Primary School currently has a Reception PAN of 30 and a Year 3 PAN of 30. The Year 3 PAN has existed primarily to provide Year 3 places to children attending Ewhurst CofE Infant School and other rurally based children who attended Wonersh and Shamley Green and Bramley infant schools. In 2012 and 2013, Cranleigh Primary School admitted a bulge class in to Reception. Whilst these classes did not fill, they were still needed in order to accommodate children seeking a school place in the area. Now these children are on roll at Cranleigh Primary School they are entitled to remain at the school until the end of Year 6.
71. The headteacher and governors at the school have requested that the Year 3 PAN is removed for 2016 to alleviate funding, accommodation and staffing issues that the school might face as a consequence of admitting a bulge class in 2012 and 2013.
72. Whilst these factors alone would not normally lead Surrey to support a removal of the Year 3 PAN, taking account of changes to the wider area with regard to admissions and current pupil projections for the area, representatives from Surrey's School Commissioning and Admissions teams are in support of this request.
73. In September 2013 Wonersh and Shamley Green became an all through primary school and since that date the number of children in the area seeking transfer at Year 3 has fallen. Park Mead Primary School admits an additional 10 children at Year 3. These places along with existing vacancies in Year 1 at Park Mead and Cranleigh primary schools (the cohort due to transfer to Year 3 in September 2016) would indicate that there would still be sufficient junior places for local children in 2016 if the Year 3 PAN at Cranleigh Primary School was removed. Indeed, based on current vacancy numbers and

pupil projections, the removal of Cranleigh's Year 3 PAN may well help to support other local schools in maintaining their pupil numbers.

74. Cranleigh Primary School has been advised that the local authority:
- cannot rule out there being a subsequent need for an extra class in 2016
 - that if an objection was received there would be no guarantee that a Schools Adjudicator would support the removal of the Year 3 PAN
 - once removed the local authority would have to consider for 2017 whether it wished to reinstate the Year 3 PAN and any decision would be made in Autumn 2015 in light of school place planning considerations for the area.
75. The Published Admission Number determines the number of external applicants that a school will admit as part of its normal intake. In this case the number relates to the Published Admission Number for Year 3. As such this proposal does not affect children who start at the school in Reception, Year 1 or Year 2 as these children will automatically transfer to Year 3 as internal students.

Recommendation 7 – Own admission authority schools to be considered in the assessment of nearest school

76. The number of responses was low but 14 respondents supported this proposal and seven were opposed.
77. Many community and voluntary controlled schools afford priority to children who have the school as their nearest school ahead of those who do not.
78. When assessing nearest school, the local authority generally disregards boarding schools which charge a fee for their places and faith schools which have not offered any places to children who could not, or did not, demonstrate a commitment to a faith. However, although the local authority publishes a list of these schools each year, it does not publish how it decides which schools will or will not be included.
79. In order to make the decision of which schools will be included in the assessment of nearest school more transparent, it is proposed to publish the rule which will be applied to schools each year.
80. Section 12 of Enclosure 1 has therefore been updated to propose that, for 2016 admission, only schools which do not charge boarding fees and those which have offered places without regard to faith in the initial allocation of places in 2012, 2013 and 2014 will be included in the assessment of nearest school in 2016. This provides for three years historical pattern of admission to be taken in to account and will prevent schools being included due to a change in admission pattern following the admission of a bulge class or a non-standard admission year.
81. However, exceptions will apply where a faith school has changed its admission arrangements and that change has meant that they would be expected to offer places to children who do not demonstrate a commitment to faith in future.
82. This will ensure that all academies, foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools are treated consistently in this respect.
83. As a result of applying this rule for 2016 admission, the only change is that Saint Ignatius Catholic Primary School in Spelthorne would be removed from the list of infant and primary schools which will be considered in the assessment of nearest schools for admission to Reception.

84. Appendix 3 of Enclosure 1 sets out the full list of academies and foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools which will be considered to admit local children, as well as a list of some out of county school which are close to the Surrey border but which will not be considered to admit local children in 2016.

Recommendation 8 – Start date to primary admissions round

85. The number of responses was low but seven respondents supported this proposal and 14 were opposed.

86. For 2016 admission, it had been proposed to publish a later start date for the primary admissions round (Reception and Year 3). Instead of inviting applicants to apply from 1 September 2015 it was proposed to publicise a later date of 2 November 2015, which is the week after the October half term.

87. It was felt that publishing a later start date would have the following benefits:

- It would reduce the number of applications where parents make changes after they have submitted their application.
- It would enable support to be targeted to primary applicants after the secondary closing date (31 October).
- More would be known of school expansions and bulge classes so parents would be in a better position to make informed decisions.
- It would relieve some of the pressure from primary schools at the start of the autumn term and enable them to focus support in the second half of the term.
- It might reduce the pressure on parents in feeling they have to apply early, even though the closing date is not until 15 January.
- It would give parents more time to familiarise themselves with the process.
- It would give parents more time to visit schools and consider admission criteria before they have to submit their applications. This might especially benefit parents with summer born children who may not have considered school places as much as others.

88. However, in light of the low response rate and reluctance to introduce such a process change without broad support from primary schools, this proposal will be deferred until 2017 when a more targeted consultation will be carried out with schools.

Recommendation 9 – Surrey’s Relevant Area

89. The number of responses was low but five respondents supported this proposal and three were opposed.

90. The Relevant Area that Surrey intends to publish for schools for the next two years is set out in Enclosure 2.

91. The School Standards & Framework Act 1998 requires local authorities to establish Relevant Area(s) for admission policy consultations. The Relevant Area is the area in which admission authorities must consult with schools regarding their proposed admission arrangements before finalising them.

92. The Education Act 2002 requires the local authority to review and consult on its Relevant Area every 2 years.

93. The proposed Relevant Area for 2015 remains as it was determined in 2013, other than for faith schools, it no longer prescribes whether schools should consult with other schools in the same deanery if they fall outside of Surrey’s defined Relevant Area. In

response to requests from two Diocesan Boards, the Relevant Area now refers faith schools to the guidance issued by their Diocese.

Recommendation 10 - Proposed Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for other community and voluntary controlled schools

94. Whilst admission authorities are required to consult on any decrease to PAN they are not required to consult on proposed increases to PANs. Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 sets out the proposed admission numbers for all community and voluntary controlled schools for 2016 admission, with changes highlighted in bold.
95. Where an increase in PAN is proposed, the school is increasing its intake to respond to the need to create more school places which in turn will help meet parental preference.
96. The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes.
97. It is proposed that the PANs for all other community and voluntary controlled schools for 2016 should remain as determined for 2015 and this would enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences.

Recommendation 11 - Admission arrangements for which no changes are proposed

98. The local authority has a duty to determine the admission arrangements for all community and voluntary controlled Schools by 15 April each year, even if there are no changes proposed.
99. Consistent admission arrangements that do not change enable parents to have a historical benchmark with which to assess their chances of success in future years and provides some continuity for schools and parents.
100. The admission arrangements are generally working reasonably well.
101. The admission arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces the need for travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies.
102. The existing admission arrangements provide for, on average, 85% of pupils to be offered their first preference school and 95% to be offered one of their named preference schools.

Recommendation 12 - Surrey's Primary and Secondary Coordinated Admission Schemes

103. The local authority has a duty to determine its primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes by 15 April each year, even if there are no changes proposed.
104. The coordinated admission schemes are working well with all schools participating, as they are legally required to.
105. The coordinated schemes provide for all preferences to be named on one application form and for applications to be coordinated to ensure that each child only receives one offer of a place.
106. There are no changes proposed to the coordinated admission schemes.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

107. The risks of implementing these changes are low and the majority of local residents are likely to welcome the proposed changes. However, any parents who feel unfairly disadvantaged by the proposals can object to the Office of the Schools' Adjudicator.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

108. The admission criteria for the majority of community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey conform to Surrey's standard criteria. The more schools that have the same admission criteria the more the processes can be streamlined and thus present better value for money. However, where required, the admission criteria for some schools vary from Surrey's standard but these can currently be managed within existing resources.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

109. The Section 151 Officer confirms that the proposed changes to the admission arrangements will be met within existing resources.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

110. The admission arrangements comply with legislation on School Admissions and the School Admissions Code.
111. The local authority has carried out a consultation on all changes for a period of 8 weeks between 28 November 2014 and 22 January 2015, which is in accordance with statutory requirements.
112. The consultation was carried out with all persons required under The School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012.
113. A summary of responses is collated in Enclosure 5 and the local authority has given due regard to those responses in considering the recommendations to put before Cabinet.

Equalities and Diversity

114. The Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed in full and is attached in Enclosure 3. The adoption of determined admission criteria is a mandatory requirement supported by primary legislation. The policy relating to community and voluntary controlled schools does not discriminate according to age, gender, ethnicity, faith, disability or sexual orientation.
115. Measures have been taken to reference vulnerable groups both in terms of exceptional arrangements within admissions, the SEN process and the in-year fair access protocol. In addition a right of appeal exists for all applicants who are refused a school place.

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

116. The proposed admission arrangements give top priority to children who are Looked After or accommodated by a local authority and to those children who have left care through adoption, a child arrangements order or a special guardianship order.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

117. The efficient and timely administration of the schools admission process coupled with the equitable distribution of school places in accordance with the School Admission Code and parental preference contribute to the County Council's priority for safeguarding vulnerable children.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

118. The County Council attaches great importance to being environmentally aware and wishes to show leadership in cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change.
119. The admission arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest school and in doing so reduces travel and supports policies on cutting carbon emissions and tackling climate change.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- The September 2016 admissions arrangements as agreed by the Cabinet will be ratified by the full County Council on 17 March 2015.
- The new arrangements for September 2016 will be circulated to all Surrey schools via a bulletin in the early Summer Term 2015.
- These arrangements will be published in the primary and secondary admissions booklets in July-August 2015, which will be made available to parents online and in hard copy by request in September 2015.
- The information on school admissions will be circulated to the Contact Centre, Surrey County Council Libraries and Early Years.
- The information on school admissions will also be published on Surrey County Council's website in September 2015.

Contact Officer:

Claire Potier Principal Manager Admissions and Transport (Strategy)
Tel: 01483 517689

Consulted:

Nick Wilson, Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families
Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director - Schools and Learning
Sarah Baker, Legal and Democratic Services
School Commissioning Team
School Admissions Forum
Headteachers, Chairs of Governors, Parent Governors of all Surrey schools
Early Years establishments in Surrey
Diocesan Boards of Education
Neighbouring local authorities
Out of County own admission authority schools within 3/5 miles radius of the Surrey border
Surrey County Councillors, Parish Councils, Local MPs,
General public consultation via the website/schools/contact centre

Annexes:

- Enclosure 1** Admission arrangements for Community & VC schools
- Appendix 1** Proposed Published Admission Numbers
- Appendix 2** Schools to be considered as adjoining/shared sites for sibling priority
- Appendix 3** Schools to be considered to admit local children
- Appendix 4** Coordinated Schemes
- Appendix 5** Catchment map for Southfield Park Primary
- Appendix 6** Catchment map for Woodmansterne Primary
- Appendix 7** Catchment map for Oxted
- Appendix 8** Catchment map for Tatsfield Primary
- Appendix 9** Catchment map for St Andrew's CofE Controlled Infant
- Enclosure 2** Proposed Relevant Area
- Enclosure 3** Equality Impact Assessment
- Enclosure 4** Proposed changes to admission arrangements – consultation document
- Enclosure 5** Outcome of Consultation

Sources/background papers:

- School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012
 - School Admissions and Framework Act 1998
 - Education Act 2002
 - School Admissions Code 2014
 - Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning report, addendum and decision - 21 November 2014
-

This page is intentionally left blank