

Time Commenced: 5.00 pm
Time Finished: 6.15 pm

SCHOOL ADMISSIONS FORUM 28 APRIL 2004

Present: Ian Samways – Parent Governor (in the Chair)
David Keys - Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools
Carran Stevenson – Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools
Edward Hayes – Catholic Church Diocese
David Edwards – Church of England Schools
Kathy Mayer – Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools
Lance Dean - Foundation Schools
Stephen Whiteley – City Technology College
Thomas Johnston – Parent Governor
Neil Plimmer - Foundation Schools

23/03 Appointment of Chair

Resolved to appoint Ian Samways Chair for a one-year term.

24/03 Appointment of Vice Chair

Resolved to appoint Thomas Johnston Vice Chair for a one-year term.

25/03 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Hickson, Wynn and Andrew Prince – Derbyshire County Council.

26/03 Late Items Introduced by the Chair

There were no late items.

27/03 Declarations of Interest

Name	Type of Interest	Reason
Ian Samways	Personal	Governor – Littleover Community School
Carran Stevenson	Personal	Governor – Meadow Farm Community School

Name	Type of Interest	Reason
Kathy Mayer	Personal	Governor and Head – Cherry Tree Hill Infants School Governor – Castle Nursery
Lance Dean	Personal	Governor - Chellaston School
David Keys	Personal	Governor – Brackensdale School and Mickleover Primary
David Edwards	Personal	Governor – St James Church of England Infant and Junior School

28/03 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2004 were approved as a correct record.

29/03 Fair Shares Partnership Agreement

The Forum considered a report of the Director of Education detailing the Fair Shares Partnership Agreement.

Angela Jenner, Head of SEN Support Service, advised the Forum that for over a year they had been working with senior managers and section heads to come up with a managed moves agreement. This was finally agreed on 26 March 2004.

All LEA maintained schools had been involved in the process of drawing up the agreement to avoid getting to the point of permanently excluding pupils by offering a managed move.

The Forum advised that the agreement allowed for a maximum of 3 managed moves into a school per year. School managers had agreed that this was a manageable and acceptable number. It was not envisaged that this agreement would increase the scale of movement but will control it.

A Panel would decide which school will be chosen for the move. It would be envisaged that parents would be in agreement in the majority of cases.

It would still be the Governing Body of the School that would make the final decision, the Panel could only recommend to the governors of the school and hope that they agree with the recommendation.

Members of the Forum were concerned that using a Panel of Senior Mangers from Schools might lower the number of head teachers that could be approached to deal with exclusions.

Angela Jenner responded that in most cases it was envisaged that the Panel for considering managed moves would be delegated to other senior managers so this problem would not arise.

The Panel were advised that although this agreement was hoped to reduce the number of exclusions the LEA did realise that there were still occasions where exclusions would be necessary.

Angela Jenner advised that she would need to report back to the Forum on a regular basis with updates on how the managed moves process was working.

Resolved

- 1. To approve the agreement and recommend its implementation by secondary schools from September 2004**
- 2. To receive a progress report on the Managed Moves process in the spring term 2005.**

30/03 Determined Admissions Arrangements

Cathy Ford advised the Forum that the determined admission arrangements had been requested from all schools. The return date had been extended to 28 April 2004. The admissions team were still waiting for two schools to submit their admission arrangements. There were a few instances where the LEA were looking to submit their objections to the adjudicator these were:

Ecclesbourne School	Children Looked After (CLA) were not top The School have retained the criteria that children of permanent staff had priority. The School were using the measurement 'as the crow flies' and not the shortest walking route. The Forum were asked to endorse the LEA submitting their object to the adjudicator. The Forum were advised that Derbyshire County Council were expected to put this to the adjudicator
Catholic Faith Schools	The LEA were looking for clarification of the view of the Catholic Diocese with regard to Children Looked After. Edward Hayes advised that he had taken advice from the regional headquarters and the view was that CLA's who were Baptised Catholic would be top followed by other Baptised Catholic Children then other Children Looked After. Cathy asked for the Forums agreement that

any schools that did not comply with this could be taken to the adjudicator.

Merrill College

The Forum were advised that the admission arrangements had not yet been received from Merrill College. Agreement was sought to go to the adjudicator if Merrill College's Over Subscription Criteria was in breach of the Code of Practice.

Chellaston School

The Forum were advised that the admission arrangements had not yet been received from Chellaston School. Agreement was sought to go to the adjudicator if Chellaston School's Over Subscription Criteria was in breach of the Code of Practice.

Resolved to support the decision of the LEA to submit their objection to the adjudicator in relation to Ecclesbourne School and to support any LEA objection in relation to

**Catholic Faith Schools
Merrill College
Chellaston School**

should their oversubscription criteria not comply with the Code of Practice.

31/03 Extended Absences

The Forum received an oral report from Sue Wheat, Education Officer, Attendance and Welfare, on the guidance for dealing with extended absences and removing pupils from a school register.

Sue explained the law on this and the process for referring to the Education Welfare Service (EWS) prior to removing a pupil from the roll. The Forum were advised that under no circumstances should a pupil be removed from the roll if that child's whereabouts was known.

Sue advised that a major concern was taking a child off the roll and losing them. It was also a concern that in some instances the EWS only found out about pupils that had been removed from a roll by default – truancy patrols and by other means. It was vital that the EWS were advised beforehand so that checks could be made.

Resolved to note with some concern the lack of reporting extended absences and removal of children from roll prior to the event. The Forum encouraged the LEA to make schools aware of their concerns and remind schools of the rules and their responsibilities.

32/03 Arrangements for the Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place in July, the date to be advised, to discuss the draft Parent Booklet for the Coordinated Admissions Scheme.

Chair of the next meeting of the Forum
At which these Minutes were signed