



Minutes of meeting on Thursday 7th July 2011 at Gordano School

Present

Tess Gale	Diocese of Bath and Wells (Chair)
Sally Varley	Local Authority (Planning & Access)
David Gradwell	Community SEN
Jack Dagnall	Governor (Secondary)
Bill McEntee	NS Admissions Policy Officer (Secretary)
Gary Lewis	Foundation Schools
Terri Knowlton.	NSC School Admissions and Transport
Cate Hill	Westhaven Special School
Mandy Plumridge	SEN
Tim Pollock	Somerset County Council
Luci Amos	VC Primary Schools
Justin Templer	Diocese of Clifton

1. Apologies

Anne-Marie Heath, Cllr Ann Kemp, Pete Binding, Lynne Packer, Geoff Flynn, Julie Fox, Julian Bladwin and Chris Hustwick

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

Minutes of 28th April – Agreed and signed by Chair

3. Actions and Matters arising

Item 5 – the Fair Access protocol will be ready for issue by mid September after carefully considering all responses.

All other matters are on this agenda.

4. Forum Membership (Academy representation)

It was agreed at the meeting that Gary Lewis to act as Academy rep for this meeting. It was decided to look at the membership at the next meeting.

5. Proposed School Admission Code – agree a forum response

Tess gave a presentation of the new draft Admissions and Appeals Codes.

The new codes are aimed at parents.

Some concerns from the forum on the Admissions code were that:

- Presumptions that schools can raise their admission number with no regard to the impact on other schools in the area.
- If one school expands it will affect smaller schools.
- How do you strategically plan school places.

- A concern that academies won't take vulnerable children, we can ask but not enforce.
- The In-year admissions to return to the schools
- The Admission Forum is no longer statutory, and it is up to the Local Authority whether they meet.
- Additional permitted exceptions to infant class sizes (multiple births and service personnel and crown personnel). Can offer through KS1 without having to employ extra staff.

And concerns on the Appeals codes were:

- An increase in time allowed for parents to submit appeals
- Proposal to not allow new evidence from parents on the day of appeal
- Removal of the requirement for appeal panel members to have ongoing training.
- The removal of the requirement for cyclical recruitment of new panel members
- Seems to be a cost cutting exercise
- A simpler choice for parents as more parents should be able to find a place they want

These are due January 2011 with a consultation of 12 weeks. Implication September 2013 which is in the 2012/13 school year

Consultation on the Changes to the Admission Framework Questions Changes to the Admissions Code

1. Question – General Aims of the Code

Answer No

Comments –

- Easier for parents to understand, reducing bureaucracy
- schools won't have to follow regulations
- enable more choice and diversity
- has been written for academies
- loss of justice and fairness
- has to be an allowance for unusual cases
- easy for children to secure place
- 2 tier education
- little to do with the code more to do with academy education

2. Question – Changes to PAN

Answer No

Comments –

- Doesn't take into account concerns about other schools
- We should have responsibility to other schools
- Current arrangements works well, allows Admission Authority to speak to LA who would look at other school needs
- Local Authority should be policing local need
- If this jeopardises operation of other schools and future
- Limiting choice and diversity
- Making it difficult to get funding and basic need

3. Question – Giving admissions priority to children attracting the Pupil Premium

Answer No

Comments –

- Only if all schools are included
- Needs to serve the most vulnerable children locally
- Shouldn't be special treatment – no one should be disadvantaged
- All schools receive premium

4. Question – In year co-ordination

Answer No

Comments –

- Is a lot of work
- if the local authority are properly resourced.
- To support vulnerable children the local authority should police

5. Question – Use of random allocation

Answer No

Comments – Keep as current

6. Question – Infant class size exceptions

Answer Yes

Comments –

- With caveats
- As long as exceptions are limited

7. Question – Reduction in consultation

Answer No

Comments – suggest every 3 years

8. Question – Allowing priority to children of staff

Answer No

9. Question – Changes to objections to school adjudicator

Answer Yes

10. Answer Yes

Changes to the Appeal Code

11. Answer No

Comments - Training and retaining independence of panel members

12. Answer No

13. Answer No

14. Answer No

Comments - Already doing it.

Extra Questions

1. Do you agree that the code set date primary offers back to being offered in January
The admission authority could choose for themselves and the closing date and offer date determined locally?

Answer – Supported by everyone.

2. **Infant and Junior Schools**

If they decided to federate whether it is possible for people to automatically have a place through Junior school and not have to reapply?

Answer – Everyone supported it.

7. Review of the comprehensive, effectiveness within the local context and accessibility of advice and guidance for parents and web site information produced

The admission page on the website – Bill asked for comments on it.

The parents guides 2012 – 13 – Bill asked for comments on the current ones – David Gradwell and Jack Dagnall asked for hard copies to be sent to them.

8. Any other business

Meeting dates -

6 times per year for the year ahead

A Thursday p.m. was preferred

Date and venue of next meeting - ??