

Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Monday 14 March 2011

7.00 pm

Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Membership

Councillor David Hubber (Chair)
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel
Oyewole (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Althea Smith
Councillor Cleo Soanes
Reverend Nicholas Elder
Colin Elliott
Leticia Ojeda
Sharon Donno

Reserves

Councillor Patrick Diamond
Councillor Victoria Mills
Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Nick Stanton
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact Julie Timbrell on 020 7525 0514 or email: julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Annie Shepperd

Chief Executive

Date: 4 March 2011



Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Monday 14 March 2011
7.00 pm
Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
	PART A - OPEN BUSINESS	
1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT	
	In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to an agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.	
3.	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS	
	Members to declare any personal interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.	
4.	MINUTES	1 - 8
	To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 12 January 2011.	
5.	ADULT EDUCATION	
6.	REVIEW OF CHILDHOOD OBESITY AND SPORTS PROVISION FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CHILDREN	9 - 15
7.	REVIEW OF PARENTING SUPPORT - PART ONE: SCHOOL ADMISSIONS	16 - 33
8.	WORK PROGRAMME	
	DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE	

Item No.

Title

Page No.

START OF THE MEETING.

PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS

**DISCUSSION OF ANY CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START
OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.**

Date: 4 March 2011



EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Education and Children's Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Wednesday 12 January 2011 at 7.00 pm at Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

- PRESENT:** Councillor David Hubber (Chair)
Councillor the Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Althea Smith
Councillor Cleo Soanes
Colin Elliott
Leticia Ojeda
Sharon Donno
- PUBLIC PRESENT:** Ibrahim Bah; Southwark Youth Council
Abu Rojas; Southwark Youth Council
Montina Ewohime; Southwark Youth Council
Tevin Coward; Southwark Youth Council
Alex Fefegha; Southwark Youth Council
- OFFICER SUPPORT:** Julie Timbrell; Scrutiny project manager
Davina Baily, Southwark Youth Service
Pauline Armour; Assistant Director, Children's Services
Malcolm Ward, Southwark safeguarding manager
Chris Davies, Independent Chair, Southwark Childrens Safeguarding Board

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Adele Morris and Reverend Nicholas Elder.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were no urgent items.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

4. MINUTES

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2010 were approved.

5. SOUTHWARK YOUTH COUNCIL

5.1 The chair welcomed the Southwark Youth Council (SYC) delegation to the meeting. He drew members of the committee's attention to the paper that the delegation had prepared (circulated with the papers) and invited the young people to present and officers to assist with providing information.

5.2 A member of the delegation asked if the council was still intending to deliver the Children's and Young Peoples Plan (CYPP). Pauline Armour; Assistant Director of 05 -11 Services & Inclusion replied that the council still have the plan, however there have been some changes, particularly around schools. Following new priorities set by the coalition government there will now be more emphasis on schools concentrating on academic achievement, and that means that other partners will need to take more of a lead on priorities such as safeguarding, employment and healthy living.

5.3 The chair suggested that the committee and Southwark Youth Council monitor the implementation of the CYPP every three months, and that members of the SYC attend the meeting and ask questions. Members of SYC said they would welcome this.

5.4 The chair noted the idea for workshops in schools led by members of the community on social issues such as gangs. The chair suggested that this proposal be put to the cabinet lead for children's services, Cllr Catherine McDonald, for comment.

5.5 A young person from the delegation asked how young people will know that they will not be hit the hardest by the cuts. The Assistant Director of 05 -11 Services & Inclusion replied that the cuts are very difficult, and we are all being asked to make savings, however children's services will not be hit harder than other areas of the council's work. We are looking at what we can take money out of that will impact the least. Members of the delegation responded that they are sometimes unsure how serious the council is when it comes to involving young people in decision making and SYC members pointed out that sometimes feedback is not received.

5.6 Members of the delegations are asked for feedback following the visit by the cabinet lead for children's services to their recent meeting. A range of options were put forward by the cabinet lead and SYC would very much like to know the

outcome of these discussions. Committee members commented that the budget process is still ongoing; however they asked that officers present facilitate feedback to SYC, as it becomes available.

- 5.7 The chair also said that a letter would be written by the committee asking for feedback from the cabinet lead on the proposals put forward by SYC in the papers circulated.
- 5.8 A member of the scrutiny committee asked the delegation for more details on the incentives scheme to promote and encourage youth participation in the community. The youth participation project officer, Davina Bailey, noted that there is an accreditation programme and this is motivational, however other young people might want something more tangible and this would vary depending on different age groups. Councillors Cleo Soanes and Rosie Shimell suggested that members of SYC develop some practical suggestions for an incentive scheme and offered to assist SYC in this. Members of SYC welcomed this.
- 5.9 A member of SYC said that one the biggest issues for young people is the high level of street crime and said that it would be very helpful to talk to a senior police officer about this .
- 5.10 The delegation drew attention to their request for more opportunities to promote children's services and youth activities on Southwark Council's website and through Southwark Life. The chair indicated this would be put to the cabinet lead for children's services.
- 5.11 A member of SYC commented that young people would like more work experience opportunities.
- 5.12 The delegation drew attention to the promise that young people would have control of 20% of the youth budget through devolved decision making.
- 5.13 The chair of the committee thanked the delegation for coming. Members of the committee and SYC welcomed the opportunity to build a relationship and it was agreed that members of SYC would be invited to the meeting after next , for the item on the CYPP .

RESOLVED

The committee and Southwark Youth Council (SYP) agreed to monitor the Children's and Young People Plan (CYPP) together. There will be an introductory session where officers will be invited to present on the CYPP and then progress on the plan will be followed up with a regular quarterly item on the agenda. SYP will be invited to attend and monitor the plan with the committee.

SYC made four suggestions and that the committee agreed would go to the cabinet lead, Cllr Catherine McDonald, for her view on opportunities for progression:

- 1 Young people would like an incentives scheme to promote and encourage youth participation in the community. Youth representatives and committee members agreed to

explore what this might mean practically.

2 The youth council proposed workshops in schools on social issues. This might be linked to citizenship classes and be run by, for example, ex gang members and young mothers and young fathers.

3 Representatives would like increase communication and avenues for participation and suggested the council set up a text service that would alert young people in the borough to service provision. SYC also want better publicity using, for example, the website and Southwark Life.

4 The youth council requested feedback on budget proposals following on from earlier consultation carried out by the cabinet lead, Cllr Catherine McDonald.

6. SAFEGUARDING

6.1 The chair welcomed Chris Davies, independent chair, Southwark Safeguarding Children Board and Malcolm Ward, Southwark Council's Safeguarding Manger to the meeting to present and take questions on the annual safeguarding report.

6.2 The independent chair said that he would like to introduce himself and explained that he had been a social worker since 1971 and had been a director of social work for many years, for a number of local authorities. He also advised a select committee and said he understood the role of local scrutiny committees.

6.3 It was explained that the annual safeguarding report was a draft, and subject to consultation and therefore committee feedback very much welcomed. Feedback on the presentation would be useful, as well as comment on whether you think we have identified the right issues and priorities.

6.4 The independent chair and committee members noted the press coverage as a result of publication of the draft report by scrutiny. This was welcomed as raising awareness.

6.5 The independent chair noted that parts of Southwark are not easy to bring up children well; poor housing, poverty, cultural diversity and high levels of crime can make this a tough job for parents and professionals.

6.6 The draft safeguarding report was referred to. It was noted that there is good engagement by partners and the community around safeguarding issues. The board is well attended by most partners who participate in a wide range of service development and delivery activities, both within and across organisations. The strong cultures of partnership working and shared responsibility around safeguarding have been key to supporting children at risk of harm.

6.7 The draft safeguarding report also identified the priorities for development (page 13 of the agenda pack) as there is no room for complacency.

6.8 The independent chair noted that the board's role is to make it easier for social

workers, police and other concerned adults to safeguarding children better. Our job is to facilitate this process. Procedures can make it easier, but some can make it harder.

- 6.9 The chair invited members to pose questions. A member noted that the report said most partners contribute well, however who does not attend? The independent chair commented that sometimes attendance can be patchy and this varies across organisations as personal change. We do have an executive sub group of chief executives and this is well attended.
- 6.10 A member asked about links with G.Ps and schools and the chair responded that we do have links, but these are through third parties and with the end of the PCT G.Ps are becoming more and more important so we will need to look at direct links with practices. Alongside this there are moves by the coalition government towards school independence, so the board's relationship will be less about 'command and control' and more about influencing.
- 6.11 A member remarked that the independent chair's opening statement about Southwark being a difficult borough could be a cause for concern, explaining that she had just done an interview with the BBC and there is a chance that the media could exploit a statement like that.
- 6.12 The independent chair explained that he had not included that statement in the report for concerns it could be taken out of context. However all the measures indicate that for some parts of the Borough it is a challenging environment.
- 6.13 A question was asked about engaging with children and young people and the independent chair commented that for children who are suffering the best thing we can do is support adults who are around children. He commented that it was great that this item followed on from Southwark Youth Council and reported that he intends to visit this group about the boarder issues. The independent chair also reported that he had met with Speakerbox; which is a group bringing together young people who have been in care.
- 6.14 A member drew attention to recent flyers distributed locally which appeared to be targeted at young people, and sought to dissuade potential witnesses from giving information to the police by questioning their safety. The member asked what assurance young people could have around their safety?
- 6.15 The independent chair commented that we have been involved with young people involved with gang activity, and wanting to leave. Housing, community safety professionals, and other have gone to considerable efforts to protect young people. He reported that we do work with a wider group of police, witness protection, youth workers e.t.c. who have a responsibility for community safety and the welfare of young people.
- 6.16 There was a question about a rise in the number of young people in care and it was explained that the national trend is rising, so this is not surprising. However you have to be careful with these statistics and as there are not huge numbers, so one or two families can make a big difference.

- 6.17 A member commented on the report's aspiration to reduce the number of inappropriate referrals. The independent chair commented that one of the things that is distinctive about Southwark is that we have a high volume of referrals and the sheer volume can make it difficult to manage. Some agencies can be a bit indiscriminate and we want people to refer more thoughtfully. For example the police have a policy of referring all domestic violence incidents to social services. This can be hard to manage and we are having discussions.
- 6.18 There was a query about changes to public health arrangements and if challenges are anticipated. The independent chair commented that there may be more to gain and there is a potential to strengthen education. However there are many changes due and this can be difficult to predict and manage for frontline officers.
- 6.19 The chair thanked the independent chair and the safeguarding manager and requested that they come back in a year with the next annual report

RESOLVED

It was agreed that the committee would receive the next annual safeguarding report next year.

7. REVIEW OF CHILDHOOD OBESITY AND SPORTS PROVISION FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CHILDREN

- 7.1 The chair drew members attention to the questionnaire circulated and invited comment. Members requested that the questions request more information on meals that parents provide as well as asking a mix of quantitative and qualitative questions. This will be amended and circulated for comment.
- 7.2 Catherine McInnis, Assistant Director Leadership & Learning Support, offered to consider how the questionnaire might be used by the free school meal pilot. This was welcomed by the committee.
- 7.3 The recommendations submitted by officers were welcomed.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed they would continue to pursue the above topic by:

Making a note of the recommendations submitted by officers with a view to incorporating them into the later report.

Amend and develop the draft questionnaire for parents. This will then be utilised in two ways:

- 1) Distributed via social media and other networks to get the views of parents on the topic.
- 2) to inform a questionnaire for parents in the free school meal pilots

8. REVIEW OF PARENTING SUPPORT - PART ONE: SCHOOL ADMISSIONS

- 8.1 The chair noted that we had a visit scheduled to the Southwark Governors Forum, but he could not make it and asked the vice chair to attend, and this was agreed.
- 8.2 Pauline Armour, Assistant Director of 05 -11 Services & Inclusion, suggested that we approach other parent partnerships for their views, as well as head teachers in each quadrant. The committee welcomed this suggestion.

RESOLVED

The review will seek evidence from:

- 1) Early Years Parents Forum at 12noon January 25th, 10am-1pm at 1st Place Children's Centre, Chumleigh Street, Burgess Park, SE5 0RN
- 2) Admissions Forum Monday 7th February at 4pm. Exact time and venue to be confirmed
- 3) Southwark Governors Forum feedback from governors requested via the bulletin sent out in January.

Other parent networks will be pursued for feedback on the school admission process.

Children's Services will provide details of head teachers in each quadrant with a view to holding interviews with schools to get their perspective on the admissions process.

9. TRAINING

- 9.1 The scrutiny project manager reported that officers were able to deliver the safeguarding training internally and a date on the afternoon of the 28th March had been provisional scheduled. Members welcomed this development, but requested an evening and a weekend slot, rather than the daytime, because of work commitments.

RESOLVED

The committee welcomed the planned safeguarding training and requested two slots, one at the weekend and one in the evening.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

10.1 The vice chair tabled a paper (attached to the minutes) outlining concerns around adult education. It was agreed this was an area of concern and the committee should start a review at the next meeting.

RESOLVED

The committee will review adult education and an initial scoping document will be produced.

CHAIR:

DATED:

[



Survey on childhood obesity and sports provision for secondary and primary children

Introduction

Southwark Council’s children’s services and education scrutiny committee is doing a review on childhood obesity and sports provision for secondary and primary children and would like to gather the views of parents and carers on this topic.

Scrutiny committees are made up of elected councilors from all political parties as well as parent governor representatives and a head teacher representative. Scrutiny committees make recommendations to on how to improve council and local services.

The scrutiny committee will use the answers to these questions, and other evidence, to write a report making recommendations for improvements.

Section 1: Meals your child eats

1 Does your child eat breakfast before attending school in the morning?

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
Yes				
No				

If yes, please describe the breakfast you provide?

2 Do you provide a packed lunch for your child?

Yes	
No	

If yes, please describe the pack lunch you provide?

3 Does your child eat a school meal?

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
Yes				
No				

If yes, how satisfied are you with your child's school meal provision?
1 to 10 (where 10 is very satisfied and 1 very unsatisfied)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Do you have any comment about school meals?

4 Please tell us what are your child's top three favorite meals you provide at home?

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
a				
b				
c				

Section 3: Your child's weight

8 Is your child?

		Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
a	Underweight				
b	A healthy weight				
c	Overweight				
d	Obese				
e	Don't know				

9 Are you concerned about your child's weight?

Yes	
No	

10 If you needed help for your child's weight, would you know how to get it?

Yes	
No	

Please tell us if there anything that could be done to make it easier for parents and carers to get help if their child's weight is a problem?

11 Have you ever received any professional assistance to help your child achieve a healthy weight?

Yes	
No	

If so, do you have any comments on the experience?

Section 4: Sports provision for children and young people

- 12 How satisfied are you with the sports provision for children and young people in school?

1 to 10 (where 10 is very satisfied and 1 is very unsatisfied)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Do you have any comments on sports provision in schools?

- 13 How satisfied are you with the sports provision for children and young people in the community?

1 to 10 (where 10 is very satisfied and 1 is very unsatisfied)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Do you have any comments about sports provision in the community?



Survey on sports provision for children and young people

Introduction

To be completed – include definition of 'sport'.

Sports provision for children and young people

- 1 How many hours of sports does your child do at school? (Please include classroom time and time spent at any lunchtime or after school clubs)

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
1 hour				
2 hours				
3 hours				
4 Hours				
5 hours or more				

- 2 How satisfied are you with the sports provision for children and young people in school?

1 to 10 (where 10 is very satisfied and 1 is very unsatisfied)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

- 3 Do you have any comments on sports provision in schools?

- 4 How many hours of sports does your child do at home and in the community? (Please include time spent at any clubs or activity classes in the community as well as time spent playing sport with family or friends)

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4
1 hour				
2 hours				
3 hours				
4 Hours				
5 hours or more				

- 5 How satisfied are you with the sports provision for children and young people in the community?
1 to 10 (where 10 is very satisfied and 1 is very unsatisfied)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

- 6 Do you have any comments about sports provision in the community?

--

SCHOOL ADMISSIONS REVIEW

Consultation with Parent Participation Forum (PPF)

Location: 1st Place Children and Parents' Centre, Chumleigh Gardens, Burgess Park. SE5 ORN.

Visit date: Tuesday 25 January 2011, 12 noon - 12.30pm

Members present: Cllr David Hubber, Education and Children's Services scrutiny sub committee chair.

PPF contact: Danna Johnson / Gillian Reeve
Parent Development Co-ordinator
Children's Services Department
Sure Start Children's Centres Development Team

Officer support: Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny project manager

Introduction to Parent Participation Forum (PPF)

The aim of the group is to build on the work of local forums and partnerships where parents play an active part in decision-making and consultation, to create a Southwark-wide early year's forum for parents. The Forum is developed and supported to feed into and contribute to the planning and development of services for children, young people and families. The Forum particularly relates to and responds to the priorities and targets originally set by the 0 – 6 sub partnership, and Children's Centres Development programme. Delegates from the PPF feed information to and from the Early Years Strategic Partnership. Members are trained as Parent Mentors and Advocates, Project Evaluators, and contribute to the development of information and materials for Southwark parents. The group meets monthly. Membership currently runs at 45 parent members, of who 90% are bi-lingual.

Questions asked

1. Do you think you had the right kind of information available to help you choose the right school for your child and make an application? What worked well? What could be improved?
2. How did you find the application process - either online or by submitting a CAF form? What worked well? What could be improved?
3. Did you feel you had enough support to select a school and make an application? What worked well? What could be improved?

Comments in response to the questions

A parent commented that they found it difficult to get information, and thought this was because they used a university nursery rather than a local nursery.

One of the outreach officers commented that parents found the booklet difficult to navigate, particularly if English is not your first language.

There were several comments that parents whose first language was not English found the whole admissions process particularly difficult to understand.

The guide should be made easier to navigate.

There was not enough information about special needs in the guide.

Suggestions to improve communication included a short version in different languages.

Parents thought increased reminders would be very helpful and there should be more of them.

There was a suggestion that Health visitors & and the council use existing details on birthdates and contact information to communicate with families as their child approaches school age through a direct mail out or email.

Parents suggested that Children's Centres also used their records to contact parents and carers to send information to parents – however it is important these databases are updated

Health visitors doing the 2 ½ year check could give out information.

It was noted that many of the more excluded parents need to be reached as they do not use centres and nurseries. There pilot project using an outreach worker. This worker supports parents through the whole admissions process.

Sessions in children's centres were very useful (it was noted that many did this already).

The good practice of Kintore Way children's centre and nursery was noted and held up as an example; staff held information sessions, reminded parents at the door when parents entered and left the building, sent letters and made booklets available.

Most parents found the electronic admission process very good. However there were a few comments about glitches; a parent with two children's applying in the same year (not twins) only got confirmation, information and an offer of a place for one child. There was a comment that the process worked well if you had one child at one address, but failed if you were none standard.

One parent filled in a form, but there was a problem. In the end that application was a late application. Her son was supposed to start in January, but he is still on the waiting list. The school offered is not suitable as the child has asthma.

A parent commented that the phone support received was very good

There was praise for the school preference advisors one to one support

An outreach officer arranges presentations from the school preference advisor and these were very useful.

One parent noted that it can be confusing when you ring up schools to find out your child's place on the waiting list; as the place can go up as well as down.

There were a few glitches noted:

- One parent received a letter requesting a form be completed and returned to indicate that they were still interested in the offer; however the deadline for this to be returned was after the letter was received.
- The Guide to starting primary school says that Surrey Square primary school requires supplementary form, but the parent reported that it did not.

There was a comment that there needed to be more awareness and knowledge of 'special guardianship orders'.

Information should be more widely available in libraries, one stop shops, playgroups, and one o'clock clubs and after school care clubs. There was a suggestion that one worker in each setting should be trained up.

Mouth to mouth is very important and parents would be empowered to do this – members of the PPF are trained as parent mentors

Members of the Forum recommended that that the booklet comes to the Forum for feedback.

Summary

The main concerns for parents are:

- The guide should be made easier to navigate.
- There should be more information in the guide on special needs
- Consider producing a short version in different languages
- Bring next year's draft guide to the forum for feedback
- Increase / maintain support for parents where English is not their first language – the admission process is particularly difficult for this group
- Continue the work of the school preference advisor – both outreach and one to one support
- Use networks and contact details more smartly to decimate information and send reminders (health visitors, children centres, nurseries)
- Use face to face contact – health visitor 2 ½ year check ups with parents, parent mentors at the forum, nursery school attendance)
- Train workers and keep booklets on the admissions process at settings such as libraries , one stop shops and community centres

- Fix the glitches in the system

SCHOOL ADMISSIONS REVIEW

Consultation with the School Admission Forum

Location: Notre Dame School, 118 St George's Rd, SE1 6EX

Visit date: 7 February 2011, 4pm

Members present: Cllr, The Right Reverend, Emmanuel Oyewole vice chair
Education and Children's Services scrutiny sub committee chair.

School Admission Forum contact:

Anita Hawksley; Admissions & Benefits Manager.
Glen Garcia; Head of Pupil Access.

Officer support: Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny project manager

Introduction to Schools' Admission Forum

It is compulsory for every local authority to establish an admissions forum. This is a requirement of Section 85a of the [School Standards and Framework Act 1998](#). However the **Education** Bill 2011 seeks to implement the legislative proposals of the white paper published in November 2010, The Importance of Teaching. If passed this will remove the requirement on English Local Authorities to establish an admissions forum for their area.

What the forum does

The forum has a key role in ensuring the admissions system is fair, that it promotes social equity and does not disadvantage children. It also ensures that the admissions system is straightforward and easy for parents and carers to understand. Forums also monitor the local authority to ensure that we are complying with the schools admissions code.

Questions asked

- Do you think Schools and parents have the right kind of information available to help choose the right school for their child and make an application? What worked well? What could be improved?
- Do you feel you parents enough support to select a school and make an application? What worked well? What could be improved?
- How do you think the application process worked for Schools and parents - either the online form or the paper CAF form? What worked well? What could be improved?
- How did the allocation of places go? How good was the process? What was the quality of communication with the local authority like? What was the

quality of communication with the parents like? What worked well? What could be improved?

- As a whole how do you think the admissions process worked for your school? What worked well? What could be improved?

Comments in response to the questions

There is a good process at the moment which is needed because it is a complex process, a matter of expressing a preference rather than making a choice. Parents and carers are given quite a lot of information which they need.

School preference advisors are trying to make sure they are making the right preference for their child.

There are significant difficulties for parents where English is not the first language, and they do not have significant language skills. We provide supplementary forums to help this process. Open nights at school have proved popular; and this has been particularly effective at helping parents whose first language is not English, understand the process.

One of the problems is that the admissions team are very keen to go and meet parents but do not have the resources to attend One Stop shops. This can take substantial officer time as they will be diverted from their administration tasks if they leave the office. Tooley Street would be the most ideal location to take appointments as officers could meet parents without losing valuable time travelling and waiting.

The school preference advisor has managed to:

- Seen 721 parents
- Present to 38 groups
- Support 100 parents and carers on the telephone

Every school has to provide a prospective, online and in paper.

We have had a poster campaign with dates and deadlines advertising the process.

A catholic school head teacher explained that outreach has been done with chaplains with minority congregations.

The process is now coordinated across London and that is helpful. There is now one closing date.

The online process works well, although some parents can get confused. If we see an application has not been submitted we contact parents.

This is a stressful process, but driven by the government agenda around choice.

The Schools' Admission Forum have coordinated the process and instituted improvements. There is much more confidence in the robustness of the system.

Another key to the success of the process is the fact that schools in Southwark are very good, so parents are very likely to get a place in a very good school, even if this is not their first choice. It is important this is communicated so that parents feel assured their child will get a good education, even if they don't get their first choice.

An improvement could be to introduce a common test for secondary school entry.

Offer day can be particularly difficult for parents and a time when support is needed. It would be good to consider what happens in those first few days to reduce, rather than exacerbate stress.

Extra supplementary information giving explaining waiting lists would be appreciated.

The school preference advisor holds a surgery soon after offer day and people have 10 minute slots.

We work with parents right from offer day up until the 11th hour.

One tricky part of the process that can confuse parents is that they have to respond to both the school and the local authority to accept or decline a place. Parents think if they have communicated that to the Local Authority or school then both will know, but this is not the case.

Summary

- The process is complex
- The admission forum is helpful in coordinating admissions
- There are particular difficulties for parents where English is not the first language, and they do not have significant language skills. Supplementary forums, such as open days explaining the processes and outreach, are important in overcoming these difficulties
- The school preference advisor has supported significant numbers of parents
- An improvement could be to introduce a common test for secondary school entry.
- More support around offer day and including additional information explaining waiting lists and managing your place would be helpful
- An improvement could be to introduce a common test for secondary school entry.
- It can confuse parents is that they have to respond to both the school and the local authority to accept or decline a place

SCHOOL ADMISSIONS

School governor question and answer session

1.-Do you think you, and other parents had the right kind of information available to help you choose the right school for your child and make application?

ALISON: -I find ok.

LETICIA: -This process it was totally new for me. I understand English but it cost me to understand the purpose of it. I found it kind of confuse.

What worked well?

ALISON: -I read the Admissions Guide to starting secondary school and I made the process.

LETICIA: -I asked for my Head's support to explain me my choices.

What could be improved?

ALISON: -System must to considerate first Languages of parents.

LETICIA: -I suggest an introductory, early meeting with all those parents that for First time will facing the process. Could be since their children be in Year 5 -an early detection- and I'm talking that this meeting could have place in Tooley Street, with your Team, directly. Could be so "nutritious" for both parts

2.- How did you find the application process –either on-line or submitting a CAF form?

ALISON: -Online, easy, simple....everything is there.

LETICIA: -Submitting a CAF form, easy, after Head's support of course.

What worked well?

ALLISON: -On line is safer, you avoid the risk to missing by post.

LETICIA: -I tried to ensure that my application be in some one hands...now, by experience on this issue, next time I'll do online.

BOTH: -The terrible thing was to visit 5 or 6 schools, on the Open Days....sometimes we had to visit 2 or 3 schools in the same day....It's stressful. And the same situation when children made their Admission Tests.

What could be improved?

ALISON: -Better transition process...as a mother of a SEN girl in a wheelchair, I found that it wasn't possible to make the tour because of the access. Schools were so busy. I suggest to draw up a program on separate schedule for people with SEN.

LETICIA: *-To do only 1 time the Non Verbal Reasoning Test. Why repeat it in another school? The result of this first test could be considered and shared for all 5 or 6 schools as criteria to admission.*

3.- Did you feel you had enough support to select a school and make an application?

ALLISON: *- Yes. I'm just begging for those people that don't understand English totally.*

LETICIA: *-Yes. I'm blessing to my Head Teachers. They offered their support to every one in a previous meeting for parents with children in year 6.*

What worked well?

ALLISON: *-The fact that all the information it is on your Web Site.*

LETICIA: *-I understood how hard responsibility must to be for you, looking for deliver a service of Excellence.*

What could be improved?

ALLISON AND LETICIA: *As we mentioned above, be proactive: to anticipate, calling those parents of "First Time in the process" for a general meeting to explain and clear rudes.*

4.- Thinking about your governance role: how do you think the admissions process worked for your school?

ALLISON: *-It's fair.*

LETICIA: *-Fine. And at the end I know, every child will have his/her place guaranteed at any Secondary School...No matter which...They will have a place there.*

What worked well?

ALLISON: *-Everything is ok.*

LETICIA: *-Pro-active attitude of my Head-Teachers...and finally, it is a easy process to do.*

What could be improved?

ALLISON: *-To put more attention on those SEN children, p.e. autism. Create a culture of respect and equality to them in Secondary Schools.*

LETICIA: *-Effective Communication...being pro-active, making a loudly campaign of the process in the community, which must to be easy to assimilate and to understand.*

I hope you find helpful this information.

Sincerely,

Leticia Ojeda.

SCHOOL ADMISSIONS

Southwark Governors Association (SGA) submission

Choosing your child's primary school is an important decision?

What should you do?

1. Visit, the schools that your child is eligible for
2. Book an appointment to visit the schools.
3. See if you like the school.
- 4 do you like the head and the Staff
- 5 Do you like the atmosphere in the school?
- 6 Arrange a visit for as many schools that you can and make your own mind up about whether you like the school.
7. When you get your form from the local authority right your choice of school in order, starting with the one you like most.

It is not sensible to make your child travel a long way to school. This can be tiring and stressful. Remember your child is familiar with the area nearby and he will feel secure to know you are not far away.

8. Once your form has been completed send it to the Local authority.

It is sensible to keep your choices to yourself. This is not a joint effort with your friends it affects you your family and your child... Wait and see which school you are allocated. The schools have nothing to do with admissions. So wait and see where your child is placed. You will always have the power to disagree with your placement. Remember schools will fill up quickly.

My suggestion is that schools are carefully placed in list clearly showing what school is available in each area. The more transparent the system appears the fewer parents will worry about their places. Also the fewer tribunals will occur. There is a great deal of mistrust because unfortunately in Southwark everyone is very aware of the salaries that are paid. That is why an open system is important. Also language is vital, I am afraid education is blighted with language no one else understands. This causes the lack of trust. I do feel that this approach would also work for year 6 placements.

Descriptions of schools should be brief and to the point.

Admission policy should be clear and precise.

The admission department must be aware of their position and react as quickly as possible. This needs to be a fluid situation. School budgets are reliant on having their places full. Schools should be aware of the situation and the department must regularly up-date the school.

1. INTRODUCTION

The **Education Bill 2011** seeks to implement the legislative proposals of the white paper published in November 2010, **The Importance of Teaching**, [see Document Summary Service DSS 10/11 18, December 2010]. The Bill received its House of Commons second reading on 8 February. Once fully enacted, with any changes resulting from its passage through Parliament, the Bill will become the **Education Act 2011**.

It is a very wide-ranging Bill. Key areas are:

- the introduction of **targeted free early years care** for children under compulsory school age;
- changes to provisions on **school discipline** and **restrictions on the public reporting of allegations** made against teachers;
- **abolition of five quangos**: the General Teaching Council for England, the Training and Development Agency for Schools, the School Support Staff Negotiating Body, the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency and the Young Person's Learning Agency, and **new powers to the Secretary of State** as a consequence of some of these changes;
- **removal of certain duties** on school **governing bodies**, **local authorities** and **further education institutions**, including the duty on local authorities to appoint **school improvement partners**;
- changes to the arrangements for **setting up new schools**, and amendment of the Academies Act 2010 to make provision for **16 to 19 academies** and **alternative provision academies**;
- measures relating to school **admissions**, school **meals**, composition of school **governing bodies**, school **inspection**, school **finance** and **permitted charges**.

As is commonly the case with such Bills, its text is predominantly a series of detailed changes and amendments to previous legislation: in this case, 17 earlier Acts from the *Children Act 1989* to the *Academies Act 2010*. Section 2 of this Summary provides a complete overview of all ten parts of the Bill. *Italicised square bracketed paragraphs in smaller type* give selected supplementary details of many key provisions, drawing mostly on the *Explanatory Notes* published simultaneously with the Bill on 26 January 2011, and sometimes on the *Overarching Impact Assessment for the Education Bill 2011*. Throughout, the abbreviation *SofS* means the Secretary of State for Education.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE 10 PARTS OF THE EDUCATION BILL

Part 1: Early Years Provision

- **Permits** the introduction of **free** early years provision for children of **two years of age from disadvantaged backgrounds**.
[Extension to particular targeted 2-year olds of existing entitlement to 15 hours per week for all 3- and 4-year olds. It also allows for the entitlement for all children to be based on **criteria other than age alone** (such as family economic circumstances), which could affect existing entitlements of 3- and 4-year olds. Also gives SofS **wide powers of control** over the nature of the provision, for whom it must be made available, and how and when it must be provided].

Part 2: Discipline

- **Extends** the power of members of staff at schools and further education institutions to **search pupils without their consent** for an item that has been, or is likely to be, used to commit an offence or cause injury to the pupil or another, or damage property, and to search for **items banned under the school rules**.
[In particular, extends range of 'searchable' items to include 'any other item which the school rules identify as an item for which a search may be made', thereby laying an important responsibility on how school rules are formulated. Includes amended regulations about use of force in item seizure. Also, introduces new powers regarding electronic devices, allowing for examination and erasure of data or files if 'there is a good reason to do so', the latter being determined with regard to guidance from the SofS].
- **Reforms** the process for reviews of **permanent exclusions**.
- **Repeals** the duty on schools to give 24 hours' written **notice of a detention** to parents.
- **Repeals** the duty on all schools to enter into a **behaviour and attendance partnership** with other schools in their area.

Part 3: School Workforce

- **Abolishes:** the **General Teaching Council for England (GTCE)**; the **Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA)**; and the **School Support Staff Negotiating Body (SSSNB)**.
*[Relevant functions of the GTCE and the TDA to be undertaken by the Secretary of State and where appropriate by Welsh Ministers, and gives the necessary powers to make schemes for the transfer of staff from these bodies to the Secretary of State. **GTCE will continue until 31 March 2012**. GTC (Wales) continues unaffected. By amendments to the Education Act 2002 the SofS will henceforth consider allegations of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, or conviction of a relevant offence, and decide whether to prohibit the person from teaching. All prohibition or conditional orders will continue for the specified period or until revoked, and any investigations of teachers under way prior to commencement (i.e. before 31 March 2012) may be continued by the SofS. SofS will also take direct responsibility for Induction arrangements. Regarding TDA functions, SofS will have power to give or arrange financial assistance for initial training (e.g. training bursaries) and in-service training. Welsh Ministers will take over functions currently exercised by TDA in Wales, effectively making them independently responsible for all school workforce training and development in Wales. While the **SSSNB** is to be abolished, neither the Bill nor Explanatory Notes indicate what, if anything replaces it, though the SSSNB has never actually 'implemented any initiatives to change the way that the pay of support staff is decided'].*
- Introduces **restrictions** on the public reporting of **allegations made against teachers**.

Part 4: Qualifications and curriculum

- **Requires** sampled schools to take part in **international education surveys** when directed by the Secretary of State.
[This signals a commitment to ensure 'access to a regular and consistent supply of valuable and reliable international comparisons data, to measure the progress of our system against the best in the world'].
- Amends the governance structure of the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) and revises its **standards objective** to include international comparison.
[The effect of the latter is to expand Ofqual's qualifications standards objective to require that Ofqual ensures that qualifications it regulates 'indicate a consistent level of attainment with comparable qualifications' it does not regulate within or beyond the UK].
- **Abolishes** the **Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA)**, and provides for the relevant functions of the QCDA to be transferred to the Secretary of State and gives the necessary powers to make schemes for the transfer of staff from this body to

the Secretary of State.

*[This places extensive powers of curriculum regulation in the hands of the SofS, enabling him/her to make further **changes to subordinate legislation by ministerial order**, and removes references to the QCDA from other legislation. It also changes the way in which the SofS must consult before making certain regulations or orders relating to the National Curriculum: providing an opportunity to submit evidence/representations before publishing a summary of views and a draft proposed order or regulation, followed by 'at least one month for further evidence and representations', before making the order 'with or without modifications']*.

- **Amends** legislation relating to provision of **careers education and guidance**.
*[Provides for a new requirement for maintained schools and pupil referral units in England to secure **independent** and **impartial** careers guidance for pupils in the school year in which they reach the age of 14 until they have ceased to be of compulsory school age. 'Independent' means that 'a school cannot fulfil the duty by asking a teacher or another person employed by the school to provide guidance to all pupils...[but] would not prohibit a teacher from offering some careers guidance']*.
- **Repeals** the duty on local authorities (LAs), schools and governing bodies to secure **access to the diploma entitlement** for 16 to 18 year olds and pupils in the fourth key stage, *[i.e. 14-16 year olds]*.
*[Reference to the formal Impact Assessment of the Education Bill 2011 (pages 19-20) indicates that the intention of this part of the Bill is to **remove the obligation** on all LAs and others to ensure that **all Diploma lines** are available at **every level** for **all 14-19 year olds** in their area, and to enable them instead to 'respond flexibly to local demand and need' to fund '**appropriate Diploma provision only where it is needed**']*.

Part 5: Educational Institutions: other provisions

- **Repeals certain duties on the governing bodies** of maintained schools in England and repeals the duty on local authorities to appoint a **school improvement partner** in each maintained school.
*[Clause 30 (England only): removes obligation on governing bodies and others ('relevant partners') to co-operate with the LA to **improve children's well-being** under Section 10 of the Children Act 2004; instead, they will be able to decide for themselves how to engage in arrangements to improve well-being.*
*Clause 31 (England only): removes requirement for schools forums and governing bodies of maintained schools to have regard to the **children and young people's plan** prepared by their local children's trust board.*
*Clause 32: repeals the duty for maintained schools in England to prepare and publish a **school profile** which is required to contain information provided by the SofS for inclusion and other prescribed information.*
*Clause 33: removes duty on LAs to appoint **School Improvement Partners (SIPs)** for each school they maintain].*
- Makes **changes** to the duties of local authorities in relation to **school admissions**. In addition, the schools adjudicator will no longer be able to make modification to a school's admissions arrangements in response to a **complaint or a referral**.
*[Clause 34 (School Admissions): a) removes requirement on English LAs to establish an **admissions forum** for their area; b) restricts power of the **School Adjudicator** in the area of requiring changes to be made to a maintained school's admission arrangements following referral of a specific matter relating to those arrangements; c) removes requirement that LAs provide to the adjudicator **reports on admissions** to schools in their area, and removes from SofS the power to regulate the content of those reports, with the Schools Admissions Code instead to specify requirements for such reports].*
- **Introduces a cap on the amount** local authorities and the governing bodies of maintained schools in England are allowed to charge for the provision of **school meals, milk etc.**

- Makes **changes** to the arrangements for the **establishment of new schools** by introducing a **presumption** that when local authorities set up new schools they will be **Academies** (including free schools).
[The Explanatory Notes for this part of the Bill are reproduced in full in Section 3 of this Summary].
- Makes **changes** to the **composition of school governing bodies** and, with a related clause in Part 6, makes it possible for one or more, but not all, of the **schools in a federation to become an Academy** without first having to go through the statutory process to leave the federation.
- **Provides** for changes to the **inspections framework** for schools, and for the exemption of certain categories of school and further education institution from routine inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate, the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. Where a school or further education institution asks Ofsted to carry out an inspection in circumstances where such an inspection is not required, and Ofsted agrees to do so, this Part **allows the Chief Inspector to charge** the school or college for the cost of carrying out that inspection. It also makes changes to the inspection of **boarding provision**.
[This section includes the explicit direction that school inspections under Section 5 of the Education Act 2005 'must in particular cover: the achievement of pupils at the school; the quality of teaching in the school; the quality of the leadership in and management of the school; and the behaviour and safety of the pupils at the school'. In addition, 'the Chief Inspector must consider: a) the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils; and b) the extent to which the education provided at the school meets the needs of the range of pupils at the school, and, in particular, the needs of pupils who have a disability for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010, and pupils who have special educational needs'].
- Makes **provision** for the Secretary of State to direct a local authority to issue a **warning notice** to a school on grounds of performance or safety concerns, and **extends the Secretary of State's power to close schools to all schools** eligible for intervention, rather than (as at present) only those deemed by Ofsted to be in need of special measures.
[Clause 43 substantially extends the situations in which the SofS can direct the closure of a school (beyond the current reason that it 'requires special measures'): e.g. where a school has failed to comply with a performance standards or safety warning notice, and where a school has been identified as requiring significant improvement and has been issued with a notice to improve].
- **Repeals the power for parents to make complaints** about schools to the Local Commissioner.
- Contains **measures on school finance**, and **allows nursery schools (and schools with nursery classes) to charge** for early years provision that is not funded by the local authority. It enables the Secretary of State to issue **directed revisions** to local authority schemes for financing schools and requires the Secretary of State to **consult** local authorities and others before a direction is given. It also allows the governing bodies of maintained schools to fund the costs of **premature retirement** and **dismissal of community staff** from their budget shares.
- **Repeals and amends** a range of **duties placed on further education corporations** and repeals the change of the name of pupil referral units to short stay schools.

Part 6: Academies

- **Amends** Academies legislation. It allows the establishment of **16 to 19 Academies** and **alternative provision Academies** and **removes the requirement for Academies to have a specialism**.
[Clause 51 makes a number of specific amendments to the Academies Act 2010, and inserts four new sections into it, which are fully explained in Explanatory Notes paragraphs 247-257. The Explanatory Notes also include the following in paragraph 252: 'The government intends to use this legislation to allow providers to set up free schools

for those aged 16 to 19].

- Makes some **changes** to the **consultation requirements** for the setting up of an Academy, and to the way a school in a federation becomes an Academy (Clauses 54-55).
- **Protects** the existing position in relation to **discrimination in employment practices** for faith schools which convert to become Academies, but makes provision for this to be changed (by order of the Secretary of State) after conversion.
*[A key part of this relates to the **appointment of 'reserved teachers'**. Reserved teachers are 'those who have been selected for their fitness and competence to give religious education in accordance with the tenets of the religion or religious denomination of the school and are appointed on such grounds'. Under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (SSFA 1998) their number **must not exceed one-fifth** of the total number of teachers including the principal, and the Bill now extends this regulation to all voluntary controlled and foundation schools with a religious character who have converted into Academies].*
- Makes **changes** to the legislation relating to **school land**, to **increase the Secretary of State's ability to make land available for free schools**.
[Clause 59: the Bill's provisions are highly detailed, and reference should be made to Clause 59 and Explanatory Notes paragraphs 285-299].
- **Allows** for **schools adjudicators to consider and determine objections** to Academies' admission arrangements.

Part 7: Post-16 Education and training

- **Abolishes** the **Young People's Learning Agency for England (YPLA)**, and provides for the relevant functions of the YPLA to be transferred to the Secretary of State, and gives the necessary powers to make schemes for the transfer of staff from this body to the Secretary of State.
- **Replaces** the duty on the Chief Executive of Skills Funding to secure an apprenticeship place for certain young people with a duty to **fund apprenticeship training** (through securing the provision of proper facilities) for certain groups who have secured an apprenticeship place.
- Makes **changes** to the law relating to the issue of **apprenticeship certificates**.
[Clause 66: the effect is that the Chief Executive of Skills Funding is no longer the English certifying authority; instead it will be the person designated for that purpose by the SofS, or the SofS him/herself].
- Makes **changes** to the **skills entitlements**.
*[This is particularly obscure in the Bill and not explained at all in the Explanatory Notes. However, reference to the Impact Assessment for the Education Bill 2011 and to the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009, Part 4, Section 88, reveals that the intention is to **remove free entitlement** to Level 3 and Level 2 provision for those aged 24. It previously applied to anyone aged 19 but less than 25].*
- Gives a **power** to the Secretary of State to direct the Chief Executive of Skills Funding to consult with specified people or descriptions of persons on matters associated with the **performance of the Chief Executive's functions**.
- **Retains** the commencement of **raising the participation age** legislation in 2013 (to age 17) and 2015 (to age 18) whilst removing the requirement to commence **enforcement procedures** on young people, parents and employers in relation to raising the participation age on a certain date.

Part 8: Student finance

- Includes **measures** that form part of a package of higher education reforms announced in an oral statement in the House of Commons on 3 November 2010 and later refined in a written statement on 8 December 2010, in response to the Browne Review. It will apply the

tuition fees cap for full-time courses on a pro rata basis to **part-time courses**, and **increases the cap on the interest rates** that can be charged on new student loans.

*[The Impact Assessment says: ‘There are proposals in the Bill to **give the Secretary of State the power to set interest rates on student loans through secondary legislation**. We expect to use these powers to set real interest rates as part of a wider range of proposals, which include increasing the earnings threshold for loan repayments from £15,000 to £21,000 and increasing the new threshold annually in line with earnings instead of inflation.... The financial effect on graduates depends on their future earnings, as well as the level of contribution the HEIs will charge graduates. Analysis indicates that taking all the proposed changes into account, up to around 25% of graduates (the lowest earners) will be repaying less in net present value terms (assuming debts of £30,000) than under the current repayment system (which assumes debt of £21k)’. By 2014/15 the government anticipates **savings** of up to £3070m, and **costs to students rising** up to £2390m].*

Part 9: Powers of National Assembly of Wales

- Gives the National Assembly for Wales framework **powers** in relation to **professional standards** for the school workforce, **regulation** of the school workforce, and the **recruitment and training** of the school workforce; and in relation to the **funding of pre-16 education** or training.

Part 10: General

- Supplementary provisions about orders and regulations, interpretation of the Act, financial provision, extent, commencement and the short title.

3. NEW SCHOOLS

[This section of the Summary reproduces the Explanatory Notes for Clause 36 in full (paragraphs 182-188). Clause 36 gives effect to Schedule 10 which makes amendments to Part 2 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, (EIA 2006), dealing with the establishment of new schools].

Schedule 10

182. *Paragraph 2* inserts new section 6A into EIA 2006, placing a **duty on local authorities to seek proposals** for the establishment of an Academy where they are of the view that there is a need for a new school in their area. The local authority must specify a date by which proposals must be submitted and after that date must notify the Secretary of State of the steps taken to satisfy this duty and the proposals that have been submitted or if there have been no proposals. The notification to the Secretary of State must identify a site for the school and any other matters prescribed by regulations.
183. *Paragraph 3* amends section 7 of EIA 2006 so that before publishing proposals for a competition for the establishment of a new school the local authority must obtain the consent of the Secretary of State. In addition, section 7 is amended to **remove the ability of the local authority to publish any of its own proposals for a new foundation or community school** in a section 7 competition. In consequence, *paragraph 5* repeals section 8 of EIA 2006, which prescribed the circumstances in which the local authority could enter its own proposals for a new school in a competition.
184. *Paragraph 4* inserts new section 7A into EIA 2006 which provides for the local authority (with the consent of the Secretary of State) to withdraw, or for the Secretary of State to direct the withdrawal of, a section 7 notice at any time before the end of the period that proposals may be submitted. The effect of this new provision is that **a competition can be halted at this early first stage**.
185. *Paragraphs 6 and 7* make amendments to sections 10 and 11 of EIA 2006 which deal with publication of proposals outside a competition. The amendments to section 10 (proposals that require the Secretary of State's consent) provide that the following proposals for a new school can be published with the consent of the Secretary of State:
- local authority proposals for a community or foundation school to replace one or more maintained schools (except infant and junior amalgamations, which do not now require consent), excluding those providing education suitable only for persons over compulsory school age;
 - proposals for foundation, and voluntary controlled schools by other proposers (except those within section 11(2) as amended).
186. Under the amended section 11 of EIA 2006 the following proposals will be able to be made **without the Secretary of State's consent**:
- Local authority proposals for a new community or foundation primary school to replace a maintained infant and a maintained junior school;
 - Proposals for the establishment of a new voluntary aided school;
 - Proposals for a new foundation or voluntary controlled school resulting from an existing religious school changing or losing its religious designation; and a new foundation or voluntary controlled school with a religious character replacing an existing religious school, resulting from the reorganisation of faith schools in an area.
 - Local authority proposals for a new community or foundation school where following publication of a section 7 notice no proposals are approved by the local authority, no Academy arrangements are entered into, or no proposals are received.
187. *Paragraphs 10 to 17* make amendments to Schedule 2 to EIA 2006 which deals with the consideration and approval of proposals under Part 2 of EIA 2006 by the local authority or the adjudicator (in respect of local authority proposals). These amendments are consequential on the amendments made by paragraphs 3 to 9.
188. In addition, **these paragraphs have the effect that Academy proposals are no longer submitted to local authorities for approval**. Instead, any **Academy proposals entered into a section 7 competition will be referred to the Secretary of State**, for him to decide if he wishes to enter into Academy arrangements with the proposer. Where there are both Academy and non-Academy proposals in a competition, the Secretary of State must first decide the Academy proposals and notify the local authority if he enters into Academy

arrangements as a result of the proposals. If the Secretary of State decides against entering into Academy arrangements in such a case, the non- Academy proposals will be considered by the local authority. Even if the Secretary of State approves the Academy proposals, paragraph 7A of Schedule 2 also enables him to direct that all or any of the non-Academy proposals be considered by the local authority. In such a case, it would be possible for a section 7 competition to result in the approval of both Academy proposals (by the Secretary of State) and non-Academy proposals (by the local authority). This might happen, for example, where Academy proposals are for a small school but the local authority has identified a need for a larger school in its area.

The Education Bill 2011, the Explanatory Notes, and the Impact Assessment are all accessible online and downloadable as pdf files through links at: <http://www.education.gov.uk/> > About the Department > Education Bill.

© Document Summary Service 2011. University of Bristol Graduate School of Education, 35 Berkeley Square, Bristol, BS8 1JA.

This page is intentionally blank.

**Children's Services and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2010/2011
Distribution List**

	Copies		Copies
<u>Members and Reserves</u>		<u>Council Officers</u>	
Councillor David Hubber (Chair)	1	Julie Timbrell, Scrutiny Team [spares]	6
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole (Vice-Chair)	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Lorraine Lauder	1	Romi Bowen, Strategic Director of Children's Services	1
Councillor Adele Morris	1	Rory Patterson, Assistant Director of Specialist Children's Services and Safeguarding	1
Councillor Rosie Shimell	1	Mike Smith, Assistant Director of Community Services	1
Councillor Althea Smith	1	Elaine Allegretti, Children's Trust Development Manager, Children's Services	1
Councillor Cleo Soanes	1	Pauline Armour, Assistant Director of Access & Inclusion	1
		Eleanor Parkin, Policy Officer, Children's Services	1
Councillor Patrick Diamond (Reserve)	1	Christine McInnes; Assistant Director: Leadership, Innovation, Learning Support	1
Councillor Vikki Mills (Reserve)	1	Sarah Feasey, Principal Lawyer, Strategic Services	1
Councillor Martin Seaton (Reserve)	1	John Bibby, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor Nick Stanton (Reserve)	1	Alex Doel, Cabinet Office	1
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton (Reserve)	1	Steven Gauge, Opposition Group Office	1
		Paul Green, Opposition Group Office	1
<u>Education Representatives</u>			
Revd Nicholas Elder	1		
Colin Elliott	1		
Leticia Ojeda	1		
<u>Other Members</u>			
Councillor Catherine McDonald	1		
Councillor Lisa Rajan	1		
Local Studies Library	1		
		TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	37