APPENDIX 5

HARROW ADMISSIONS FORUM **6 MARCH 2006**

Chair:	*	Councillor Bill Stephenson			
Councillors:	*	Janet Cowan			
	*	Ray			
Community School Representatives:		Governor		Primary	Secondary
		(Vacancy)	*	Sue Jones	* Allan Jones
Jewish School Representative:	*	Mrs D Palman			
Roman Catholic School Representative:	*	Mike Murphy			
Church of England School Representative:		Mrs S Hinton			
Church of England Diocese Representative:	†	Mrs K Uttley			
Catholic Schools Diocese Representative:	*	Mr Billiet			
Primary Elected Parent Governor Representative:	†	Mr H Epie			
Secondary Elected Parent Governor Representative:		Mr R Sutcliffe			
Harrow Council for Racial Equality Representative:		Prem Pawar			
Early Years Development Partnership Representative:	*	Helena Tucker			
Children's Services Representative:		(Vacancy)			

* Denotes Member present
† Denotes apologies received

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 - Admission Arrangements for 2007/8 Academic Year

The Forum considered a report of the Director of Strategy (People First), detailing the feedback from consultation on admission arrangements for the 2007/8 academic year.

The officer advised that comments received from schools had highlighted the value of the sibling link but a combination of comments had been received from parents. Some had strongly disagreed with the sibling link. A general theme occurring in comments received from parents and schools had been uncertainty about the effect of the introduction of sixth forms on the sibling link. The Forum was also advised that the government had drafted a Code of Practice but that its introduction had been deferred.

In response to a query concerning the post 16 link and whether students were technically members of their school or members of the Harrow Collegiate system, the Chair advised that there was no significant practical difference between which body students belonged to, and that from 2007 students would be members of the school. The Chair also advised that the school would be responsible for the overall admissions procedure, regardless of whether there was a franchise.

A member of the Forum commented that some families might consider it discriminatory if post 16 children were at a school and a younger child was not allowed there. An officer advised that the majority of authorities stated that both children should be attending the school to qualify for the sibling priority as this was regarded as less

discriminatory. However, in relation to sixth forms the matter was less clear due to the timescale for sixth form admissions, which could mean that when allocating places at the school it may not be known whether the older sibling had been offered a sixth form place.

A member of the Forum commented that the response received from parents indicated that most of them supported the proposed change to the sibling link. The Chair suggested deferring a decision on the sibling link in relation to the post 16 scenario until further information was available.

The Forum

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Cabinet)

That (1) the sibling link be changed so that children would have to be attending the school at the same time to qualify for the sibling priority;

(2) the Planned Admissions Number for Little Stanmore First & Middle School be reduced from 45 to 30;

(3) the single intake to Reception pilot be extended for a further year; and

(4) a proposal regarding the introduction of post 16 on the sibling link be deferred.

[**REASON:** Authorities are required to determine their admissions arrangements for 2006/07 by 15 April 2006.]

(See also Minute 79).