#### HARROW ADMISSIONS FORUM

#### **1 DECEMBER 2008**

Chairman: \* Reverend P Reece

Councillors: \* Mrs Anjana Patel

Dinesh Solanki Bill Stephenson

Community School <u>Governor</u> <u>Primary</u> <u>Secondary</u>

Representatives: (Vacancy) \* Sue Jones \* Janice Howkins

Jewish School Representative: \* Mrs D Palman

Roman Catholic School † Mike Murphy

Representative:

Church of England School \* Mrs S Hinton Representative:

Church of England Diocese \* Reverend P Reece

Representative:

Catholic Schools Diocese \* Mr Billiet Representative:

Primary Elected Parent \* Mrs D Speel Governor Representative:

Secondary Elected Parent \* Mr R Chauhan Governor Representative:

Harrow Council for Racial Julia Smith Equality Representative:

Early Years Development \* Helena Tucker Partnership Representative:

Children's Services (Vacancy) Representative:

\* Denotes Member present † Denotes apologies received

## **PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**

# RECOMMENDATION 1 - Feedback from School Admission Arrangements Working Group

In accordance with the Local Government Act (Access to Information) 1985, this report was admitted late to the agenda for reasons set out on the supplemental agenda.

An officer introduced the report of the Director of Schools and Children's Development, which detailed the outcomes of a Review of the High School oversubscription criteria. The review was carried out by a Working Group, which comprised of a number of Stakeholders,

It was noted that the:-

- Working Group's main focus had been to review co-educational High School admission arrangements;
- options of making no changes or using a modified links model had been ruled out as the Working Party had not believed it was possible to develop a single model that would gain the support of parents and schools, or would not be liable to legal challenge;
- lottery and banding had been ruled out following an early sounding exercise;

- Working Group had taken account of an exercise undertaken, using distance
  as the admission option on the 2008 High School transfer group, that showed
  very little impact on the number of successful first preference applications
  compared to using the link model;
- Working Group had felt that distance, measured in a straight line, offered a fair, equitable and stable option for the present and the future.

The Forum agreed with the findings above and commented that choosing distance would offer the best long-term and fairest solution, and would avoid any further revisiting of the High School admission arrangements.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development)

To adopt the recommendation of the Working Group to consult on distance as the only option and to agree the consultation arrangements on proposed admission arrangements to apply to Harrow Community Primary and High Schools for the school year 2010 – 2011.

[Reasons for Recommendation: (1) To meet the statutory requirement to consult before determining admission arrangements;

(2) to allow consultation to proceed].

(See also Recommendation 2)

## RECOMMENDATION 2 - Admission Arrangements 2010-11

In accordance with the Local Government Act (Access to Information) 1985, this report was admitted late to the agenda for reasons set out on the supplemental agenda.

An officer introduced the report of the Director of Schools and Children's Development, which set out the proposed admission arrangements that would apply to Harrow Community Primary and High Schools for the school year 2010-11. Under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, Harrow was required to consult before determining its admission arrangements.

The officer reported that there were no proposed changes to the previous admission arrangements for Primary Schools. It was proposed to amend admission arrangements for Harrow Community High Schools, by removing the linked school arrangements from the oversubscription criteria.

There were no changes reported concerning the Primary and 12+ Transfers regarding the Schemes of Coordination, other than the relevant dates. The 11+ Transfer Scheme varied from the 2009-10 Scheme in that it would be amended in line with the Pan-London Coordinated scheme for Secondary Transfer. For families with children in both the 11+ and 12+ transfer groups who had indicated they would like their children to attend the same school and where one child was offered a place at the preferred school the other child would be given sibling priority for the same school. This would ensure that siblings were not offered different schools.

No changes were proposed to Harrow's Relevant Area, in that by definition the Relevant Area meant 'the area of the local authority or such other areas as may be determined'.

An officer concluded that all proposed admission arrangements for 2010-11 were due to be consulted on.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development)

To review the admission arrangements, adopt recommendations detailed in the report and agree the consultation process on proposed admission arrangements to apply to Harrow Community Primary and High Schools for the school year 2010-11.

[Reasons for Recommendation: (1) To meet the statutory requirement to consult before determining admission arrangements;

(2) to allow consultation to proceed].

(See also Recommendation 1).

#### **PART II - MINUTES**

## 95. Attendance by Reserve Members:

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

#### 96. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item Member Nature of Interest

All items Councillor Dinesh Solanki Councillor Dinesh Solanki declared

personal interest in that his daughter attended a Harrow School. Accordingly, he would remain in the room during discussions and decision

making on all items.

## 97. Minutes:

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2008 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## 98. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rules 16, 14 and 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution) respectively.

# 99. <u>Feedback from School Admission Arrangements Working Group:</u>

Further to Recommendation 1, it was

**RESOLVED:** To note the outcome of the review of the Working Group on high School over Subscription Criteria.

#### 100. High School Admission Issue:

An officer introduced the report of the Director of Schools and Children's Development which outlined a High School admission issue. After a brief discussion the Forum agreed to write to the School's Governors and the Director of Children's Services regarding steps that ought to be taken to address the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the report be noted;

(2) a letter be written to the school's Governors and the Corporate Director of Children's Services with a request that the Local Authority take its own steps to ensure that the school complies with legal obligations.

# 101. Review of Information Requested on In-Year Application Forms:

An officer introduced the report of the Director of Schools and Children's Services, which clarified the legal position on the inclusion or removal of certain questions from the in-year application form. The advice from the legal advisor was that if the questions were left on the form, the Forum or Council could be open to legal challenge.

**RESOLVED:** That the Forum agreed for officers to remove the relevant questions from the in-year application forms.

## 102. Admission Arrangements 2010-11:

(See Recommendation 2).

#### 103. <u>Date of Next Meeting:</u>

The Forum agreed that the next meeting of the Harrow Admissions Forum would take place on 23 February 2009 at 6.00 pm.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 6.03 pm, closed at 7.05 pm)