IN ATTENDANCE:

Core members
Kay Hammond (KH) Local Authority representative (Chair)
Doris Neville-Davies (DND) Governance representative
Suzanne Miller (SM) Parent representative
Helen Dean (HD) Guildford Diocese
Leo Morrell (LM) Southwark Diocese
Maggie Mackie (MM) Chilworth CofE (A) Infant School
Anne Cooper (AC) Bell Farm Primary School
Matthew Armstrong-Harris (MAH) Rodborough School

LA Officers
Claire Potier (CP) Principal Manager for Admissions & Transport
Kat Fry (KF) SEND Admissions Manager
Melanie Harris (MH) School Commissioning Officer
Linda Culley (LC) Secretary

**ACTION**

1. **Apologies for absence / attendance of alternate members**
   1.1 Apologies were received from:
      Chris Townsend Local Authority representative
      Nerys Roberts Parent representative
      Rachel Gibb The Priory CofE VA School
      Simon Parr Arundel and Brighton Diocese
      Mary Ryan Westminster Diocese
      Mark Scarborough Surrey County Council

   1.2 There were no alternate members.

2. **Confirm minutes of 15 June 2018 and matters arising**
   2.1 The minutes of the meeting were agreed.

   2.2 Matters arising: CP provided an updated copy of the Constitution and Terms of Reference with suggested changes made in bold. The amendments were approved and agreed.

3. **Election of Chair / Vice Chair**
   3.1 CP explained that KH had only been nominated to the Admissions Forum during that week, but she was happy to stand as Chair. SP had responded to CP’s email stating he would nominate KH and his nomination was seconded by MAH/DND. KH was confirmed as Chair.
3.2 SP had nominated CT as Vice Chair and his nomination was seconded by MAH. CT was confirmed as Vice Chair.

4. **Role of the Admissions Forum**

4.1 CP had agreed to look at paragraph 1.1 of the constitution, the role of the Admissions Forum. She stated that in future, when reports were presented to the Forum they would include information about the Forum’s role within that item. She asked if there was anything that needed to be amended or added to the constitution or reviewed and the Forum discussed how useful the meetings were and if they could be held in a different way.

4.2 KH noted the group was consultative and not statutory and asked if members felt it was a useful forum or if it could it be carried out in a different way. She also asked members about the value of the meetings for them.

4.4 The values highlighted were:
- DND felt the group brought together members from different groups to discuss admissions;
- MAH reported back to phase council and the meetings enabled him to draw issues about admissions to the attention of headteachers but he did recognise the amount of time involved;
- AC agreed that from a primary school point of view the meetings were valuable;
- HD stated that she always attended the meetings but agreed they could be covered by sending updates. Having said that, she always left with Forum meetings with something;
- MH questioned whether it was necessary to hold meetings termly, or if they could be reduced to twice a year?
- CP stated that she valued face-to-face meetings with diocesan colleagues and receiving feedback from them and schools but pointed out that a lot of the paperwork provided was for information only and the meetings were resource heavy.

4.5 KH summarised the networking value of the meetings. She suggested meeting twice a year in future and CP agreed that the meetings could be adapted to twice a year. It was agreed that meetings would be held in the summer and autumn terms – May and October.

5. **New SEND processes**

5.1 KF provided the Forum with a handout showing how admissions was managed for children with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). She explained:
- In the past, the process was not as clear as it could be;
- A project management team had implemented a new process in 2017/18 which had been evaluated. They had considered feedback about what had and had not worked to put together a more robust process;
• The new process was designed to ensure legal compliance, consistency and streamlining across the county;
• A centralised SEND Admissions Team was established in August. It was made up of three admissions officers and one manager;
• The SEND Case Workers would still be the main point of contact for families.

5.2 SM asked about parents’ experience of the process and KF responded. She explained the new way of working should fix many of the problems parents had experienced. MH stated that all SEND provision was being reviewed as Surrey had inadequate provision and there were stronger plans now in place.

5.3 CP requested KF added “working with the admissions team” to the presentation if it was going to be shared more widely as it was important that schools knew SEND and Admissions liaise.

5.4 MH pointed out there were also two officers who had been appointed to School Commissioning to deal with SEND. MAH confirmed that he had been working with Kathryn Everett and Julie Beckett and he felt there were better systems in place which provided more confidence in the process.

5.5 KH asked what happened to pupils who were assessed mid-year and KF explained that they would be dealt with through the statutory process.

5.6 KH thanked KF for updating the Forum and wished her well with the new process.

6. Update on School Commissioning
6.1 MH explained that the School Commissioning team was made up of four School Commissioning Officers and two SEND Commissioning Officers. She explained that generally the birth rate had gone down in Surrey and went on to provide an update on each area.

6.2 North East area:
Primary
Elmbridge – extra places were added at St Andrew’s, Cobham, Bell Farm and Cranmere for September 2018. Falling rolls were beginning to be seen in all areas except Walton and Hersham. More capacity might also be required in Cobham, but this should be met by Cobham Free School which would increase its PAN in 2020. If Elmbridge Borough Council planned to add more housing, schools would be consulted in the affected planning areas but no further expansions were planned for September 2019. However, there might be a need for one or two Reception bulge classes.
Epsom & Ewell – no additional places were required this year or anticipated for 2019 admissions.
Spelthorne – no action had been required, there were some pockets of additional demand, but this was very localised.
Secondary

**Elmbridge** – no additional places were created for 2018 but all schools offered over their PAN and then fell back. In the future Cobham Free School would increase its intake by 1FE and raise its PAN to 25 and there would be a new Free School in Walton which was sponsored by the Elmwey Learning Trust. It would offer 6FE and would be sufficient to meet the demand in the area.

**Epsom & Ewell** – no additional places were required this year. Secondary expansions were likely as a 4-5FE shortfall was predicted by 2022/23. Places would only be formalised at the point at which projected demand materialised as agreed with the headteachers.

**Spelthorne** – there were sufficient places, but growth was anticipated. Thomas Knyvett had expanded, and Sunbury Manor would expand to meet some of this demand. Demand in the area had been slower than forecasted. MH explained how forecasts were obtained and how these figures could change. She would shortly have the final forecast sheets that would be shared with headteachers.

6.3 **North West area:**

**Primary**

No measures were required for September 2018 reception and year 3 admissions and forecasts were on target.

**Runnymede** – whilst schools were recruiting well there were significant levels of vacancies to the north of the borough and there was no significant predicted growth in the coming years.

**Surrey Heath** – vacancies continued to exist and the only growth would be related to the Deepcut Barracks (Midenhurst) Development for 2020.

**Woking** – there were very few vacancies but there was no predicted growth.

**Secondary**

Overall it was anticipated that all schools would be full in 2019 with further growth potential 2021-25.

**Runnymede** – there had been an increase in PAN at Salesian and an increase in intake at Chertsey High. There were some vacant spaces and there were no further measures at this stage, but the forecast was for further growth overall.

**Surrey Heath** – there were vacancies and the reduction in PAN at Collingwood had been approved with the understanding that the number would increase in line with demand.

**Woking** – there was significant growth forecast. The expansion at St John the Baptist had been brought forward to 2018 and Hoe Valley had offered 150 places.

6.4 **South East area:**

Overall there would be additional demand coming through the emergent Local Plans. It seemed likely that a significant number of places would be required across all of the SE quadrant (with the
possible exception of Mole Valley). However, formalised plans were likely to be a couple of years away.

Primary – Downs Way School and St Mary’s Junior School had amalgamated to form St Mary’s Primary School with an additional 30 places in Year 3 and Hatchlands Primary Free School had opened in Redhill with a PAN of 60. Going forward Horley North West Primary Free School was due to open in Horley in 2020 with 2FE. Also, expansion and relocation of Warlingham Village Primary School by 1FE – this was unconfirmed and subject to consultation although the intention had been made public via a press release.

Secondary – there had been 1FE expansion at Oakwood School, a 1FE bulge at St Bede’s School and Merstham Park Secondary Free School had opened in Merstham with 6FE. Going forward Oakwood School was due to be expanded by a further 1FE and St Bede’s School by 2FE in 2019.

6.5 South West area:
Primary – changes for September 2018 were as follows: one Year 3 bulge at Bushy Hill to accommodate the infant bulge from Merrow and one Year 3 bulge at Shottermill Junior to accommodate the infant bulge from Shottermill Infant. Ripley CE Primary School had closed in August. The pupils that were on roll at the school had been offered places at alternative schools. A few additional temporary places had been provided at Send CE Primary School for this September, but it was not anticipated that the school would need to permanently expand due to the closure of Ripley as the projected demand for places in the area was decreasing.

Secondary - Farnham Heath End had permanently expanded by 1FE from this September. They had some capacity to accommodate the larger Year 7 and planning permission had been granted for the building works which had already started.

SEND places – the amalgamation of Walton Leigh and Manor Mead Schools was ongoing. DND asked if they would still be primary and secondary but MH suggested she speak to Julie Beckett for further information on this subject.

7. Update on appeals
7.1 CP stated the report on appeals was prepared by the Appeals Service. It provided a snapshot and did not reflect appeals for all own admission authority schools, only those that the Appeals Service had managed. The number of schools the figures referred to had been included in the report to help add to the context. Appeals took a lot of resource and time and, as the report showed, the majority of appeals were not upheld.

8. Update on objections to the OSA
8.1 Forum members were asked to note the objections to 2019 admissions arrangements that had been received by the Office of the
Schools Adjudicator (OSA). CP explained that one of the items raised in the OSA’s annual report had been reductions in PAN that were not supported by local authorities. She understood that schools were trying to adjust numbers for valid reasons, but the local authority had objected as school places were needed.

9. **DfE advice on the admission into school of children previously in state care outside England**

9.1 CP explained the DfE had provided additional advice to admission authorities regarding giving priority in their oversubscription criteria to children who had previously been in state care outside of England and who had ceased to be in state care as a result of being adopted. It followed on from Nick Gibb’s letter dated 4 December 2017. The majority of admission authorities had not changed admission arrangements for 2019 to include this and requested more advice from DfE.

9.2 The government were committed to this change. The Children and Social Work Act provided for these children, but admissions legislation did not. This DfE advice was issued in August and had been distributed to schools to consider. This had been added to the proposed changes in the local authority’s consultation on the admission arrangements for 2020 for community and voluntary controlled schools.

9.3 KH asked if it was known how many families were expected and CP explained that no records existed but the government felt the numbers would be low. It was agreed that these children warranted priority as they were the most vulnerable and evidence suggested they had a lower level of achievement. It was also acknowledged that the government were committed to this change but there were concerns about how admission authorities would be able to evidence these children. CP confirmed it would be for the parents to provide evidence for the local authority to consider.

10. **Draft admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2020 and proposed changes**

10.1 CP explained that the paper set out the proposed changes to the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2020 and she went through these proposed changes.

10.2 She explained that it was proposed to add a paragraph about children previously in state care outside England to the exceptional social/medical need criterion. She believed this approach met the advice from DfE. She would be writing to own admission authority schools to let them know so that they could make the decision for their admission arrangements but not all own admission authority schools had an exceptional social/medical need criterion. She would also suggest schools seek the advice of their Diocesan Boards. CP reported that Simon Parr had advised Catholic schools within the Arundel and Brighton Diocese not to make any changes on this issue.
until the requirement became statutory and HD and LM stated that they would probably do the same for their Diocesan schools.

10.3 KH suggested CP added wording as follows to the second paragraph of section 10 of the arrangements “Evidence will need to be provided by the applicant to demonstrate that the …………”

10.4 There were two other proposed changes:

- To slightly change the arrangements of Wallace Fields Junior School so that, for home to school distance and nearest school calculations, the measurement would be to the nearest gate at either school. The reason for this was that there were some pupils that got into the infant school as it was their nearest school but did not get in to the junior school because it was not their nearest school. It was therefore proposed to measure to both the infant and junior schools so that the schools were able to serve the same local community. This same change would also be proposed by Wallace Fields Infant School as an academy.
- There had been an addendum to the report about adjusting the published admission number for Furzefield from 60 to 58.

10.5 CP confirmed the consultation would be held from 9 October for 6 weeks.

11. Admission of children in care:
11i) Placements 2017/18
CP confirmed the report was primarily for information. Feedback was that Surrey’s placements of Children in Care worked very well.

11ii) Final protocol for 2018/19
The Forum were provided with the final copy of the protocol for admission of children in care for information.

12. Fair Access Protocols:
12i) Placements 2017/18
CP explained the report was provided for information and Forum members had no comments on this item.

12ii) Final primary and secondary protocols
The Forum were provided with the final copy of the primary and secondary fair access protocols for information.

13. New leaflets and parent information for normal round admissions for September 2019
13.1 Copies of the information for parents booklets were provided for Forum members. CP explained that it was a statutory requirement for the documents to be produced every year and the information online would be kept up to date.

13.2 SM stated that the signposting for parents to post-16 provision was not very good, and parents had missed open days. CP stated that the admissions team provided information on schools with 6th forms
only and there was another team which managed Post 16 provision but she suspected most parents were expected to do their own research. There was a discrepancy between admission requirements for schools and colleges which the DfE were aware of. MAH explained that schools also had to rely on information coming from colleges so it could be shared with parents, but he would feedback this comment to headteachers.

14. **Documents for information:**
   14.1 The following documents had been provided to the Forum for information:
   i) In year admissions procedures 2018/19
   ii) Updated guidance on the admission of children from overseas
   iii) Surrey’s annual report to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator
   iv) Admissions and transport team termly update – Autumn term 2018
   v) Updated guidance on the education of children out of their chronological year group.

15. **Update on academies and free schools**
   15.1 The up to date academies list was tabled. CP explained that the spreadsheet was provided by the School Commissioning team for information and demonstrated that the local authority kept a record of schools as they converted to academy status.

16. **Any other business**
   16.1 There were no other business items to discuss.

17. **Dates of future Forum meetings – all meetings would be held at the Surrey County Council Offices, Quadrant Court, Woking:**
   In light of the earlier conversations under item 4 there would be no Spring Term meeting and the Summer and Autumn Term meetings would be moved to May and October.
   
   - Summer Term 2019 – Friday 3 May 2019 (please note change of date)
   - Autumn Term 2019 – Thursday 17 October 2019