



Hampshire Admission Forum

Date **07 July 2011**
Time **1.30pm - 4.00pm**
Location **Meeting Room, Intech Science Centre**

Present

Core:

Cllr Charlotte Bailey	HCC (Liberal Democrat)
Cay Byford	Contact a Family
Gemma Framp	Service Families Rep – Firm Base
Martin Goff	HCC Admissions
Joyce Johnson	Portsmouth Diocese
Amanda Rowley	Community/Secondary Heads Rep (The Wavell School)
Urszula Topp	Portsmouth RC Diocese
Diana Traill	HCC Admissions
Sylvia Vine	Hampshire Governor Association

1. Apologies

Keith Clark	Foundation Heads Rep (Purbrook Park School)
Kate Banford-Taylor	Dorset CC
Sue Barratt	Portsmouth CC
Debbie Clare	Wiltshire CC
Anwen Foy	EMTAS - Ethnic Minority & Traveller Achievement Service
Michael Hall	Guildford Diocese
Lynne Hignett	VC Primary Heads Rep (St Michael's VC Junior School)
Angela Morrow	Community Primary Heads Rep (Fryern schools – federated)
Helen Moules	West Sussex CC
Chris Pritchard	Portsmouth/Winchester Diocese
Matthew Quinn	VA Head's Rep (Oaklands Catholic Secondary School)
Lynette Reed	HCC, TEIC
Tracey Saunders	HCC, Early Years
Ross Williams	Southampton CC
Jo Williamson	HCC Choice Adviser

Action

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting on 19 May 2011 were agreed as accurate.

3. Matters arising

Item 5 of Matters arising:

Conclusion to consultation for 2012-13 : (ii) a: Address verification

Diana had spoken to Chris Pritchard about Child Benefit no longer being an appropriate means of identifying the home address (as used in many aided school policies) following changes to eligibility and many families losing this benefit. He agreed to provide the same advice for diocesan and local authority schools, that is:

where parents are separated, the address to be used on the application must be the address where the child spends the majority of their time.

Item 6 of Matters arising:

Consultation on proposed change to School Admissions Code

On agenda.

Item 4: LA Report

The final draft of the report was circulated to members in late June. The Choice Adviser has not yet had opportunity to made contact with the Local Children's Partnerships. On agenda .

CA to make
contact with
LCPs

Item 5: Future of Forum

(i) Update: Resignation of Olivia Denson

Gemma Framp invited and in attendance.

(ii) Constitution & Terms of Reference

On agenda

Item 6: Protocol for looked after children

A meeting has been scheduled to follow up the release of the protocol as misunderstandings need clarifying.

Item 8: Updates

Chris Holt, Head of School Organisation, has been invited to attend October Forum to introduce the 'School Places Plan'.

Item 9: AOB

Martin advised that the proposed Free school in Whiteley has been abandoned for September 2012 and future plans will not include secondary provision and will focus on catering for primary aged children only.

Introductions

Gemma Framp introduced herself to members and explained that she works in the Community Engagement team of 145 (South) Brigade, covering Oxfordshire, Hampshire, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire and the Isle of Wight with over 36,000 personnel living and working in them; from the Army, Royal Air Force and Royal Navy. Her team's aim is to maximise opportunities to integrate the Armed Forces with the local community by working with the local authorities and service providers. One of the important focuses is to build awareness of what the armed forces do on a daily basis, and what the unique armed forces community needs therefore are.

Joyce Johnson advised that she has now been appointed to the Diocese.

4. LA Report

Martin advised that comments from Forum members were incorporated into the final version of the report that was submitted on 30 June 2011 (as required by law), explaining that it is read by the Schools Adjudicator to provide their

summary report to the DfE.

Amanda asked whether presenting officers of admission appeals knew about the report as it may be a useful reference for them as a very informative document, non-school specific that has been validated by Admission Forum.

DT to share with P.O.s

5. Future of Hampshire Admission Forum

Diana referred members to appendix 1: Constitution & Terms of Reference explaining the changes that had been made since the initial discussions at May forum.

Amanda questioned the need for point

d) *Consideration of the effectiveness of the authority's proposed co-ordinated admission arrangements;*

as it seemed a repetition of

a) *Consideration of how well existing and proposed admission arrangements serve the interests of children and parents within the area of the authority.*

Martin clarified the differences explaining that *a)* was about serving all the children in Hampshire – **intra** co-ordination and *d)* was concerned with **inter** co-ordination with other local authorities which remained a requirement in the coalition government's proposals/consultation on School Admissions. Members suggested that both *a)* and *d)* remained but specifying the difference.

Urszula suggested that the wording in the terms of reference should make it very clear what the role of the forum would be: where the forum would have influence and where it would simply have an interest. This could be achieved by replacing words such as 'Consideration' to 'reviewing and advising' or 'recommending'.

RC & DT to amend doc

Sylvia questioned what '*locally developed*' meant in point *i)* regarding in-year Fair Access Protocols. Diana explained that the Code says that the protocol should be agreed for all schools in an area, but Hampshire is too big to be treated as one area and therefore the implementation of the protocol would be *locally* agreed. Members felt this term sounded too loose and therefore should be removed. Exploring this point further, Amanda questioned whether the pupil categories would vary from area to area. Martin advised that the list of categories would remain the same, but local area procedures would vary.

Sylvia suggested including the definitions of vulnerable children taken from the Fair Access protocol.

On the question of membership, Amanda suggested that Forum, adopt membership by ratio of school type and status, like Schools Forum. It was agreed that Forum membership will be revised as required but as a starting point the core membership should include 4 primary heads and 4 secondary heads, to include amongst them, representation from all types of school.

It was agreed that colleagues in surrounding authorities will be removed from the core membership but will always be invited as guests.

6. Draft new School Admissions Code

Martin advised that the draft of the new Admissions Code was released on the Friday morning before the school holidays, and drew members' attention to

appendix 3 containing a summary of the proposed changes. Martin encouraged members to go on the DfE website to respond to the consultation which ends mid-August with the Code being released at the end of September. *(It is expected to come into force in early 2012).*

Members to participate in DfE consultation

7. Implications of draft School Admissions Code

(i) Coming into force “early in 2012” – impact on Autumn term procedures: Forum is asked to consider whether the County Admissions Team should devolve responsibilities for handling in-year applications to schools, including waiting lists, from September rather than waiting till ‘early 2012’.

A very significant proposed change in the draft Code is that in-year applications should be handled by schools. Martin summarised how a significant change in procedure mid-year would be very difficult to achieve successfully. Martin suggested that schools were unlikely to be resistant to the idea of processing their own in-year applications (again) and if members supported the proposal to devolve the responsibility for in-year application from the start of the autumn term, then schools would be told before the end of term along with full guidance notes containing procedures so that schools could be prepared for the start of the new academic year. A mid-year transition period on the other hand would be likely to result in a poor service experience for families and children.

The Admissions Team is particularly keen that any additional workload resulting from the change in procedures should occur in the autumn term rather than later in the year when the main admissions round workload increases.

Charlotte asked for a summary of the reasons in-year co-ordination was introduced in the first place and therefore what would be lost by returning the responsibilities to schools. Martin suggested that co-ordination meant that each child was offered one place only and it was possible to know which children were out of education (CME work). Vulnerable families were better served than under the previous system. He went on to explain that the responsibilities for processing their own in-year applications came with a duty on schools to report all applications received, and their outcomes: an offer or a refusal of a place. The County Admissions Team’s role would change from processing applications to a scrutiny role of tracking applications and following up cases where no school place had been secured. The Admissions Team would also be co-ordinating with surrounding authorities where a family were applying for a school place across the County boundary: cross border applications will still be handled centrally.

DT & MG to advise schools.

Members agreed that there were more gains than loses in handing in-year applications back to schools from the start of the autumn term.

(ii) Structure of Admissions Team

Diana advised that the team needed to fall into line with the new Children’s Services administrative areas and change from having 3 area teams (South East, North & East & West) to two (Eastern & Western). The plan was to make this change over the summer.

8. Autumn Consultation 2013 on HCC’s admission policy

Diana introduced reasons for reassessing the need for a criterion giving priority for admission to junior schools for children attending the linked infant schools in

Item to be carried

the 2013 admission arrangements. A number of junior school heads had contacted the Admissions Team with concerns about the quantity of children at the linked infant school who were unable to progress to the junior school due to oversubscription.

*forward to
next meeting
RC to add to
agenda*

Martin added that the forecast of a sustained high population meant that it is likely that more children would be displaced from their catchment school, and suggested that Forum may also like to consider whether these families could be better served by the HCC policies where siblings are concerned.

9. Updates

(i) Main admission round 2011 (*service family outcomes*)

Gemma had asked if the Admissions Team could provide data on the outcomes of applications for Service families. Martin advised that a report could be produced to show main round outcomes, but because it is not a requirement for parents to disclose Forces status, it would only be a very partial indicator.

(ii) Main admission round 2012

Diana advised that the experiences of the 2011 admission round, suggested that a change should be made to the scheme for 2012. The change would simplify guidance for parents and the detail about how late applications would be treated.

(iii) In-year admissions

No update at present

10. AOB

Martin advised that he would be attending Keith Clark's retirement do and would take the card and gift from Forum members with him.

Dates of next meetings:

Day	Date	Time	Venue
Thursday	06 October 2011	1.30pm – 4pm	Intech Science Centre
Wednesday	07 December 2011	1.30pm – 4pm	EII Court East: Broadlands
Thursday	08 March 2012	1.30pm – 4pm	EII Court: Denning
Thursday	10 May 2012	1.30pm – 4pm	Intech Science Centre
Thursday	12 July 2012	1.30pm – 4pm	Intech Science Centre
Venue address details:			
INTECH Science Centre, Telegraph Way, Morn Hill, Winchester, SO21 1HZ Tel: 01962 863791		Elizabeth II Court The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UG Tel: 01962 846161	

Tea/coffee and biscuits available from 1.00 pm

There is parking at both venues.