

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS
JULY 2018****CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN****(i) Petitions****Details of decision:**

That the response, attached as Appendix 1, be approved

Reasons for decision:

To respond to the petition.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Children – 3 July 2018)

CABINET MEMBER FOR ALL-AGE LEARNING**(i) PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FAIR ACCESS PROTOCOLS 2018/19****Details of decision:**

The Cabinet Member agreed the proposed Primary and Secondary Fair Access Protocols for 2018/19.

Reasons for decision:

1. The local authority is required to have a Protocol in place that all schools must participate in.
2. The proposed Protocols meet the requirements of the 2014 Department for Education School Admissions Code.
3. Schools have been involved in the review.
4. The Protocol will ensure that children who are out of school can be placed in school quickly.
5. The Protocol will ensure that no school is expected to admit more than their fair share of children with challenging behaviour or children previously excluded from other schools.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning – 3 July 2018)

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**(i) Public Questions****Details of decision:**

There were six questions received from members of the public. As these all related to the Proposed Closure of Ripley CofE School, the Leader took the questions as part of the item. The questions and responses are attached to this report at Appendix 2.

Reasons for decision:

To respond to the public questions

(ii) Proposal to close Ripley CofE Primary School**Details of decision:**

The Leader of the Council did not take this decision as a new option was proposed at the meeting that had not been covered in the report.

A new meeting has been scheduled Tuesday 17 July 2018, in order to explore the viability of the proposal of a collaboration with Shere CofE Infant School.

Reasons for decision:

A proposal for Ripley CofE Primary School to collaborate with Shere CofE Infant School was suggested during the meeting. This option was not covered in the report and therefore, in order to explore the viability of the proposal in line with the criteria as set out in paragraph 7 of the report, the Leader proposed a new meeting be scheduled.

(Decision taken by the Leader of the Council – 9 July 2018)

Cabinet Member for Children Decisions

3 July 2018

RESPONSE TO PETITION REGARDING CHILDREN'S CENTRES:

'From pregnancy to primary schools, Sure Start Children's Centres support children and their parents and carers. They offer services for all, but especially for families at times when life is a struggle. Surrey County Council proposes to cut £2.2m from these vital support services when families need them most. They are safe, welcoming, supportive environments for parents with young children who need help. These centres are essential to making sure everyone gets a fair start in life. They are efficiently run, providing centralised resources in local communities, and making effective use of shared locations (such as school premises), shared time (such as allowing other groups to use the centres) and trained volunteers (such as Peer Supporters at the breast-feeding support service). More cuts be matched by efficiency savings; the only outcome will be that vital support to families will have to be discontinued, increasing demand on the already struggling NHS'.

Submitted by: Katy King

Signatures: 1874

Response:

This petition describes the valuable work of Children's Centres and how they enhance the lives of families within local communities. This is not in doubt and their value is well recognised and appreciated, however, the council believes that the available resources could be used more effectively through developing a borough/district wide response which is less reliant upon existing buildings and focuses on the availability of services within a local area. The aim of the Children's Centre change programme is to retain the core offer that focuses on readiness for learning and narrowing the gap for the most disadvantaged, including the Healthy Child Programme. At present the change programme is in the first stage of current provider engagement, which it is planned to follow in September 2018 by a public consultation and a Cabinet decision in January 2019. Changes are not planned to be implemented before September 2019. As part of its medium-term financial plan, Surrey County Council has had to implement a 20% reduction in its spending on Sure Start Children's Centres.

There are some underpinning principles within the change programme that aim to prevent loss of local provision for children and families in the areas of greatest needs while mitigating the potential loss of buildings in other localities through effective outreach. These principles include:

- The new model will contribute to a more flexible, coordinated and holistic local 0 – 19 (25) early help and universal offer for families
- Strong partnerships with schools and private, voluntary and independent organisations managing children's centres, health and other partners will be maintained wherever possible
- The expertise and skills of existing staff is retained whenever possible
- Existing strengths and relationships will be built upon within local communities
- Opportunities will be provided throughout the process for local creativity and innovation in creating a sustainable model

- Surrey County Council's available resource will be allocated in response to local levels of need to tackle inequalities and disadvantage

Whilst these changes may prove challenging, the well-being and resilience of Surrey families lies at the heart of the new proposals. Through re-shaping our children's centre contracts we believe we can better meet the needs of children and families.

Clare Curran
Cabinet Member for Children
3 July 2018

1. Does SCC think a school where: progress in reading is average and writing and maths below average; where progress for disadvantaged children and middle attainers is well below average; where high achievers in writing and girls maths is well below average and girls reading is below average; where children are in large classes (some over PAN) is really going to provide better educational standards for Ripley children than a reduced PAN and working with another local school?

Schools in the surrounding areas have been graded as Good or Outstanding by Ofsted. Therefore, it would be anticipated that children will achieve better educational outcomes in other schools.

2. Despite claims over the last few years of financial unviability, the school has run a surplus. What account has the council taken in recognising that Ripley raises around £90k per year which is independent of numbers of children in the school?

It is for the Governing Body to determine how it manages the finances of the school taking into account any additional income, not the Council. The LA undertakes a monitoring role with regard to school finances.

3. GBC plans show total housing in Lovelace and Send Wards is estimated to increase by one third over the next 5 years, yet forecast demand for school places in the area shows little or no increase. How do you explain this?

The housing data is provided to the Council by Guildford Borough Council. The impact on school places takes into consideration the average number of families that move into new developments with children, that the number of children moving into the area will be of varying ages and thus spread across school year groups, and also that some of those families may already reside in the area and will already hold school places. The projections are the outcome of not only housing data, but also demographic data which does vary from year to year – an increase from housing can be balanced out by a dip in demographic demand.

4. The table in paragraph 67 shows 82 vacancies for 2018/19 Reception across 17 classes. Yet table 63 shows that in the Reception class (2017/18) there is only 1 spare place across 13 schools. A glance at these figures should flag something wrong with projected figures in the area. Published offered numbers for Reception 2018 for these schools show a very different picture - with most classes offering their maximum PAN. Please provide us with the most up to date breakdown of confirmed admission numbers in each school for Reception 2018.

Byfleet and West Byfleet (11 FE)

**Byfleet (1FE)
Pyrford (2FE)
St. Mary's (2FE)
West Byfleet (3FE)**

Additional 3 classes (please detail which schools you have included here and the number in Reception 2018 for each school)

This does not include The Marist 2FE. We have required bulge classes within this planning area. The Council has been planning to provide further additional places within this planning area. Current pupil numbers and applications have not supported this action, this has also been evidenced by the forecasts within the report. Currently whilst we have the capability to provide additional places within this planning area we are not bringing proposals forward.

South Woking (6FE)

Barnsbury (2FE)

Kingfield (1FE)

Westfield (2FE)

Additional 1 class (please detail which school you have included here and the number in Reception 2018 for this school)

Westfield Primary School has provided 3 years of bulge provision from 2014-16 with the further ability to provide permanent places. Current forecasts and pupil preference numbers as indicated in the report have not supported this continued action. The capability to provide these additional places is retained however we are not currently proposing this action.

5. Can SCC Officers, put their hand on their heart and say that none of the "local schools" outlined in the report will see expansion in the next five years? Can SCC state here and now that there will be no expansion of any of the schools listed in the report? If not, please explain.

As stated in the report, the Council has the statutory duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places. If there is a significant increase in demand for school places over the places available, in line with the Council's statutory duties, we would take action to provide additional places. The Council accepts that sometimes numbers of places have to be reduced, and then may need to increase in the future in line with demographic demand.

6. The SCC report states that there is a covenant on the school site, restricting future use of the land. It is our understanding that this covenant does not actually exist on the current site. Please provide evidence of this covenant.

The 1847 grant document states 'To hold the same unto and to the use of the said Vicar and Churchwardens and their successors for the purposes of the said Act and upon trust to permit the said premises and all buildings thereon erected to be forever hereafter appropriated and used as and for a School for the education of children and adults or children only for the labouring manufacturing and other poorer classes in the Parish of Send and Ripley aforesaid and for the residence of the Schoolmaster and Schoolmistress of the said School and for no other purpose which said School shall always be in union with and conducted upon the principles and in furtherance of ends and designs of the Incorporated National Society for promoting the Education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church and shall be at all times open to the inspection of the Inspector or Inspectors for the time being appointed'

The 1972 transfer of the land states 'TO HOLD the same except and reserved as foresaid unto the Trustees upon trust for the purposes of the School and in particular upon the Trust

declared by the Trust Deed and the said Scheme as if the same were here repeated and set out'.

Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
9 July 2018

This page is intentionally left blank