



# Portsmouth

## CITY COUNCIL

### **Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel**

**REVIEW INTO ADMISSIONS TO SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL HAVING REGARD TO THE NUMBER OF PUPILS LIVING IN THE CATCHMENT AREA AND ATTENDING FEEDER SCHOOLS WHO FAILED TO GAIN A PLACE AT THE SCHOOL FOR SEPTEMBER 2011.**

**Date published: 7 November 2011**

**Under the terms of the Council's Constitution, reports prepared by a Scrutiny Panel following referral of a Notice of Motion to the City Council should be brought back to Full Council as set out in Standing Order Number 32 (d) which requires the matter to be reported back to the City Council within three scheduled council meetings unless the Council expresses an earlier date at the time of the referral.**

Councillor Steve Wemyss.  
Chair, Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The feeder schools for Springfield and their current school populations are:

	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	
Court Lane Junior	121	120	120	120	120 is the Planned Admission number for each year.
Solent Junior	90	90	89	91	90 is the Planned Admission number for each year.
Highbury Primary	25	37	25	49	45 is now the Planned Admission number for each year.

The first two are oversubscribed and many children go to non-feeder schools outside Springfield's catchment. In 2009/10 there were 255 children in Springfield catchment. 241 applied to Springfield.  $241/255 = 94.5\%$  participation rate.

Therefore, the anticipated number of applications from the above schools is:

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/17
Court Lane Junior	120	120	120	121	120	120
Solent Junior	91	89	90	90	90	90
Highbury Primary	49	25	37	25	25	25
Total	260	234	247	236	235	235
@ 94.5% =	246	221	233	223	222	222

However, for 2011/12 there were actually 31 children living in the Springfield catchment (14 of whom had attended feeder schools) that were unable to be offered places. This, in itself, is an indicator of the number of children having to attend out of catchment junior schools, such as Medina Junior School. It also demonstrates a further adjustment is required to the above numbers. 246 is 26 in excess of the Planned Admission Number for Springfield, yet the actual excess was 31. This is an additional adjustment of 19%. The above figures will therefore have to be revised thus:

2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/17
Court Lane Junior	120	120	120	121	120
Solent Junior	91	89	90	90	90
Highbury Primary	49	25	37	25	25
Total	260	234	247	236	235
@ 94.5% =	246	221	233	223	222
+ non-feeder school adjustment=	251	221	235	224	222

This shows that Springfield school will remain over-subscribed for the next 6 years if there is no development in the area.

However, there are also a number of significant developments anticipated/ taking place within the Springfield catchment. Only those anticipated within the next 5 years have been included below. Using the criteria that the City Council's planning office use to determine the contribution from developers, these sites will be expected to produce the following increase in numbers:

			primary pupils	secondary pupils
Highbury campus	158	3 bed houses nearing completion	71	51
Southern Dairy depot	150	3 bed houses	68	48
SEB /SEE depot	150	3 bed houses	68	48
Cosham Cinema	50	flats	2	2
		total	209	149
		number of pupils per year group =	30	30

These figures should then be added into the above table in the periods they are likely to impact:

Springfield total admissions	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/17
Court Lane Junior	120	120	120	121	120	
Solent Junior	91	89	90	90	90	
Highbury Primary	49	25	37	25	25	
total	260	234	247	236	235	
@ 94.5% =	246	221	233	223	222	
+ non-feeder school adjustment=	251	221	235	224	222	
Highbury campus		10	10	10	10	10
Southern Dairy depot			10	10	10	10
SEB/ SEE depot			10	10	10	10
Cosham cinema			1	1	1	1
Grand total	251	231	266	255	253	253
Planned admission number	220	220	220	220	220	220
Numbers over-subscribed	31	11	46	35	33	33

The conclusion is that Springfield school will remain over-subscribed for the foreseeable future, as will the primary schools in the area. Some children will, as a consequence, have to travel distances in excess of the Department for Education (DfE) guidance to attend school.

**The conclusions and recommendations of the panel are set out on pages 25 - 27 of this report.**

**The recommendations are:**

**That the panel recommend to the City Council that :**

**(a) The City Council ask the Springfield School governors to consider a school building programme to increase the numbers on roll from 220 per year group to 240, supported by capital funding from monies received under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

**(b) The bid by the City of Portsmouth Boys' School to become a co-educational University Technical Academy (UTA) for 11-19 year olds be supported.**

**Note the reasons for this proposal are as follows:**

- **It would address the issue regarding surplus places at the City of Portsmouth Boys' School.**
  - **The proposed change would be in the interests of efficiency and efficient use of resources.**
  - **A greater parity of school places for boys and girls in the Highbury area of the city could be achieved.**
  - **It would constitute forward planning for school places in the light of proposed future residential development at Tipner.**
- (c) Should the City of Portsmouth Boys' School not be successful in their bid to become a UTA the City Council should recommend that the governors of City of Portsmouth Boys' School be asked to consider allowing the school to become co-educational. Should they accept that, and should they so wish it, a co-educational school could have a defined catchment area, which should include the Highbury estate and allow for the proposed future residential development at Tipner. In that case, the City Council be requested to examine how it may assist the school in funding the changes necessary for the school to become co-educational.**
- (d) Should the Governors of the City of Portsmouth Boys' accept (c) above, if the City Council believes there is still a requirement for an all-boys' school then the cabinet member with responsibility for schools be requested to consider ways in which that might be achieved.**
- (e) The City Council requests head teachers to include within the Fair Access Protocol a requirement that added to the definition of "Hard to Place" children are: "children of service personnel who are about to move to or have moved to, or within, Portsmouth as a result of Services deployments".**
- (f) Portsmouth makes provision for applications from Services Personnel to be processed if the families have proof of posting, even if they do not have an address in Portsmouth inline with the new Admissions Code to be published in 2012**
- (g) Representations be made to the Government to the effect that, if necessary, the Published Admission Number of a school may be adjusted to accommodate children of forces personnel.**

## **Review of Admissions to Springfield School having regard to the number of pupils living in the catchment area and attending feeder schools who failed to gain a place at the school for September 2011.**

### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present to Full Council the recommendations of the Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel following its review into admissions to Springfield School having regard to the number of pupils living in the catchment area and attending feeder schools who failed to gain a place at the school for September 2011.

### **2. Background**

- 2.1 At the City Council meeting on 22 March, a Notice of Motion (below) proposed by Councillor Simon Boshier and seconded by Councillor Steve Wemyss relating to Springfield School was considered by the City Council. The City Council requested that the Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel review the admissions to Springfield School and report back to Full Council.

This year to date, 31 children living in the catchment area for Springfield School have been unsuccessful in obtaining a place at the school, despite 14 of them attending one of the feeder schools. The parents of the majority of them will be appealing, although their prospects for success are not good.

Children of families in the extreme east of Farlington have suffered under the admissions policy relating to distance travelled to school. The roads they live in, although in the catchment area, are the furthest from Springfield resulting in them being refused admission because the school is oversubscribed (and has been for the last 5 years and is expected to be for the foreseeable future). However, the other schools within the city are much further away than Springfield and these children face the prospect of travelling past their preferred school, Springfield, to those other schools to continue their education. This can only contribute to traffic congestion and diminish the educational experience of the child, perhaps leading to lower attainment.

Boundaries with Havant, Purbrook and Farlington Marshes mean that families living in the east of Farlington will be further penalised by the construction of any new properties located closer to Springfield than them. Yet the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies the potential for at least 500 new properties within the Springfield catchment area. Two sites, the former Dairy site in Station Road and the Scottish and Southern Electricity site in Lower Drayton Lane, are expected to be developed with over 200 new properties and both are within 600 yards of Springfield. This will only make the situation much worse for many families.

This Council therefore requests the Education, Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel to review the admissions to Springfield School and identifies ways in which this ongoing situation might be resolved and report back to Full Council within the terms laid down in Standing Orders.

- 2.2 The Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel comprised:

Councillors Steve Wemyss (Chairman)  
Margaret Adair  
Peter Eddis  
Paula Riches (Vice Chair)  
Caroline Scott  
James Williams

Standing Deputies were Councillors Sarah Dinenage, Margaret Foster, David Fuller, Jacqui Hancock, Luke Stubbs and Alistair Thompson.

- 2.3 On 14 June 2011 Councillor Lee Mason replaced Councillor James Williams as a Panel Member.
- 2.4 The panel met formally on five occasions between 10 June and 7 November 2011.
- 2.5 A list of meetings held by the panel and details of the written evidence received are attached as appendix one. The minutes of the panel's meetings are published on the council's website and copies of all the documentation reviewed by the panel are available from Customer, Community & Democratic Services upon request.

### **3. To understand the admission arrangements for September 2011 secondary school transfers.**

#### Background to the School Admissions Process

- 3.1 Portsmouth City Council is the admissions authority for the city's community and voluntary controlled schools and is also responsible for co-ordinating the admission to the city's other maintained schools/academies where the school/academy is its own admissions authority (e.g. the Catholic voluntary aided schools) and with neighbouring admissions authorities (e.g. Hampshire County Council).

#### Equal Preference Scheme

- 3.2 Local authority school admissions are governed by legislation and the School Admissions Code. The Local Authority (LA) is required to operate an "Equal Preference" scheme which allows applicants to express more than one preference. All the preferences must be considered individually under each school's admissions policy and if more than one place could be offered, the applicant is offered a place at the school which they have ranked higher.

#### Parental Preference

- 3.3 The law also allows parents to express a preference as to the school they wish their child to attend. The LA must do everything it can to meet that preference within the limits of "efficient education and the efficient use of resources". However, the right to express a preference is not a right to a place at a particular school.
- 3.4 Parental preference is based upon:
  - Local perception of the school
  - Distance from the school
  - Economy i.e. numbers prepared/able to pay for private school
  - Religious preference e.g. Roman Catholics to Oaklands or St Edmund's Schools.

- Single sex – City of Portsmouth Boys’ or City of Portsmouth Girls’ Schools.

3.5 The LA and the schools assist parents to decide on their preferences by publishing information about the schools, producing prospectuses, arranging visits to feeder primary and junior schools and holding open evenings.

3.6 Where popular schools are oversubscribed, the DfE acknowledges that it is not possible to meet all first preferences.

#### Published Admission Numbers

3.7 The LA is required to set a “Published Admission Number” (PAN) each year for all of its schools. This is the maximum number of pupils a school can admit. The PAN is decided having regard to the “net capacity calculation” which is a standard measurement devised by the government. This takes into account the physical accommodation in the school, teaching spaces and age range of the school.

3.8 The net capacity for Springfield school is 1,100 and the PAN for 2011/12 for year 7 is 220 (which is also the PAN for the other year groups in the school, so the total capacity is 1,100).

#### Over Subscription Criteria

3.9 When a school is oversubscribed (there are more applicants than spaces available), the admission policy criteria is applied to all applications (a copy of the policy is attached as appendix two). The criteria give priority to the following applicants: if they are a looked after child or live in the catchment area of the school. None of the criteria give a guarantee of a place at a particular school. The criteria are applied in the order that they are published and applicants are then ranked and the places allocated. The policies use distance from home to school as the final criterion. This is measured in a straight line.

#### Waiting Lists

3.10 Unsuccessful applicants are automatically placed on the waiting list and are asked to confirm if they wish to remain on the list. A child’s place on a waiting list can change at any time as the law requires that the lists are maintained in accordance with the LA’s admission criteria. Therefore, if a child moves into the area and lives nearer to the school than a child already on the waiting list, then they may be placed higher on the list than a child who may have been on the list for a longer period.

#### Springfield School Allocations 2008 – 10

3.11 In 2008 the school was oversubscribed; however, all catchment applicants but not all feeder school applicants were successful. In 2009, 23 catchment children were unsuccessful on initial allocation; however 10 of those were admitted from the waiting list before the start of the school year. In 2010 the school was again oversubscribed but all catchment applicants were successful in gaining a place.

#### Independent Appeal Process

3.12 A parent has the right to appeal to an Independent Appeal Panel (IAP) against the refusal of a school place and they are informed of this right.



4. **To enquire into the allocation of secondary transfer places for Springfield for the September 2011 cohort.**

Springfield School Admissions 2011

4.1 The following table shows how places were allocated for Springfield school for September 2011 and the successful criteria.

There were 518 on time applications considered for the school.

SEN (School named on Statement)	3 ( 2 in catchment)
Looked After Children	0
Medical/Physical/Psychological	2 ( both in catchment)
Religious and Philosophical	0
Catchment area	215
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>

4.2 The final places offered on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011 (allocation day), according to the above criteria, were to applicants living in the catchment area and attending a feeder school. As the number of applicants under these criteria exceeded the number of places available, distance from home to school was used to prioritise applications. (Priority was given to those living nearest to the school.) The last applicant to be successful under this criterion lived 0.899 miles away from the school.

4.3 There was a high number of unsuccessful applicants for the school: of those, 31 lived in the catchment area and had Springfield School as their first preference school. Fourteen of these catchment children also attend feeder primary/junior schools. These children were all allocated a school place, either at one of their other preference schools or at the next nearest school to their home.

The Waiting List.

4.4 Since the initial allocation, four of the unsuccessful catchment children have been allocated from the waiting list. If the school falls below its PAN and therefore has vacancies, places will be allocated from the waiting list (this can happen if places are not taken up at the start of term or if families move out of the area).

4.5 As at 4 November, there were 29 children on Springfield School's waiting list for year 7.

Independent Appeal Panel Hearings for September 2011 Cohort.

4.6 The first batch of 2011 appeals for Springfield School was heard between 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> April. The admission process is scrutinised by the IAP and it has the power to admit all the appellants if it does not consider that the LA has demonstrated that the process is lawful and been properly implemented. The IAP decided that the admissions for Springfield school for September 2011 were lawful and properly implemented. It went on to consider each appellant's case to decide if their individual circumstances were such that they should be admitted over number

despite the prejudice to the school. There were four successful appellants; however, the details of their appeals are confidential. Further appeals for Springfield School relating to the September 2011 cohort were held in July and September but no appellants were successful.

- 4.7 The school is required by law to admit any successful appellants over its PAN.
- 4.8 The school is then either required to “manage” that number down to the PAN within the academic year (by not admitting any from the waiting list should a pupil leave) or to increase the number of classes.
- 5. To look at the catchment area having regard to the location of feeder schools and numbers on roll in year 6.**

#### Feeder Schools

- 5.1 Solent Junior, Court Lane Junior and Highbury Primary are the feeder schools for Springfield School. Both Court Lane Junior and Solent Junior are oversubscribed schools. As attendance at a feeder school is one of the admissions criteria, parents living in the catchment area who are unsuccessful in obtaining a school place at one of these primary schools, are then faced with an additional hurdle when applying for a secondary school place at Springfield School.
- 5.2. People who live on the Highbury estate live closer (in terms of travel distance, rather than a straight line) to the City of Portsmouth Boys’ School. One option for boys is to go to this school; but this option is not available for girls. Hence families on this estate composed of male and female siblings are more likely to select Springfield as their preference rather than City of Portsmouth Boys’ School.
- 5.3 The Head Teacher of Springfield School mentioned that research had been carried out in relation to future demand for education for the under 5s and it was found that new dwellings in the area tended to be purchased by families with children due to the known reputation of the schools in the area.

#### **6. Numbers on Roll in Year 6**

- 6.1 The year 6 Numbers on Roll for 2010/11. The data is from the January 2011 School census (as at 20/1/2011) and so may have changed since then; however, these are the numbers that have been verified as part of a national duplicate check and are the ones used for funding.

Court Lane Junior:	120
Highbury Primary:	49
Solent Junior:	91

- 7. To look at the catchment area having regard to the location of residential areas and planned housing developments for the area.**

#### Map of the Catchment Area

- 7.1 A map of the catchment area was presented to the Panel and is included in appendix 3.

### The Housing Requirement in the Portsmouth Plan

- 7.2 The housing figure in the plan is essentially an estimate of the capacity of the city to accommodate future housing demand, arising from:
- A natural increase in population (without migration)
  - An increase in the number of households
  - The number of households currently on the City Council's housing register.

### The Demand for Future Housing

- 7.3 The demand for future housing is estimated at an additional 19,000 new homes by 2027. In order to determine to what extent this demand could be met, a survey of the city was undertaken to identify all sites with a potential for housing (the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – see section 5.6 7.4), in addition to more detailed work on the strategic sites of Tipner, Port Solent and Horsea Island. This work indicated how much housing could be provided in the city.

### 7.4 Status and Purpose of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

The SHLAA is designed to assess whether the city has a flexible supply of land for housing. It identifies sites that have the potential to provide housing, assesses how many units these could accommodate and suggests a timeframe for when the sites could become available.

- 7.5 However, the SHLAA does not set planning policy. It does not give the sites identified any additional planning status and does not imply that there is a presumption in favour of granting permission for residential use on the sites. Consequently, planning applications will be treated on their own merits at the time of the planning application and will be determined against the appropriate development plan and other relevant material considerations.

- 7.6 The SHLAA site assessments did not consider the capacity of the schools in the area of each site. It is clearly stated in the SHLAA that there may be additional constraints on some sites that were not identified at the time of the assessment. Accordingly, the identification of a site in the SHLAA for a certain number of dwellings does not indicate whether or not the school in that area has the capacity to take in the additional number of students from that development. This is a matter for consideration at the planning application stage.

- 7.7 The SHLAA identifies the following sites in the Springfield School catchment area:

Site	Potential form of development	Potential net additional units	Estimated timescale for delivery
Margaret House, Waterworks Road	Flats	20	0-5 yrs
107 Havant Road	Flats	24	6-10 yrs
Broadway Garage, Havant Road, Drayton	Flats	35	6-10 yrs
Scottish & Southern Energy (S&SE) Depot, Lower Drayton Lane	Houses	100	0-5 yrs
Southern Dairy Depot, Station Road, Drayton	Houses	100	0-5 yrs
Cosham Cinema, High street	Flats	50	0-5 yrs
Corner of High Street (Cosham) and Havant Road	Houses & Flats	50	6-15 yrs
Cosham Bingo Hall, High Street	Houses & Flats	60	6-15 yrs
Cosham Masonic Hall, Park Lane	Houses	14	11-15 yrs
Jewsons, Knowsley Road, Cosham	Houses & Flats	58	6-15 yrs
Meridian Milano car sales, 111-113 Havant Road	Houses	12	11-15 yrs
Nursery School adjacent to 1 Portsdown Avenue	Houses	5	11-15 yrs
45-49 and rear of 53 Havant Road, Drayton	Houses or Flats	9	6-10 yrs
1 Magdala Road 61 High Street	Flats	6	0-5 yrs
<b>Total</b>		<b>543</b>	

7.8 The panel heard that, notwithstanding the above, the City Council had already received a planning application for 158 homes on the Southern Dairy site and as the S&SE site was of a similar size, it was not unreasonable to anticipate an application for a similar number of dwellings. The panel also heard how 165 homes were already being built on the Highbury College campus that had not been included within the above figures, and are well within the Springfield catchment area.

#### Education Infrastructure Capacity in Relation to Housing Growth

7.9 Education provision was one of the topics reviewed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which was prepared to accompany the Portsmouth Plan. This information is the most up to date. Pupil projections available at the time indicated that pupil numbers in secondary education would trough in January 2016 at 8,500 and would rise to 8,900 in January 2018. These projections have been independently verified

by a leading national advisor in planning school places within the Partnership for Schools (Pfs).

7.10 In detail, secondary pupil projections to 2025/26 currently are as follows:

Academic Year	2009/10	2011/12	2013/14	2015/16	2017/18	2019/20	2021/22	2023/24	2025/26
<b>Secondary NOR/NOR Forecast</b>	9,106	8,809	8,515	8,546	8,924	9,480	9,693	9,697	9,552
<b>Secondary Net Capacity</b>	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310	10,310
<b>Secondary Surplus</b>	1,204	1,501	1,795	1,764	1,386	830	617	613	758
<b>Secondary Surplus %</b>	11.7%	14.6%	17.4%	17.1%	13.4%	8.1%	6.0%	5.9%	7.4%
(i) It is important to note that there is a health warning regarding the forecast figures for the latter years i.e. 2017/18 and beyond as they are based on a more generalised forecasting model.									
(ii) DfE/ Ofsted consider 6-8% surplus capacity to be a reasonable level.									
(iii) Portsmouth City Council pupil planning judged "good" by Ofsted (+ 1%)									
(iv) Building Schools for the Future pupil planning up to 2018/19: Independently verified by national expert; Checked and approved by government									

7.11 These numbers show that the city in aggregate has sufficient secondary school places for the next decade. The figures do not specifically consider the capacity of individual schools. The IDP does acknowledge generally, however, that continued growth in pupil numbers post 2018 might require a review of the capacity of some schools to reflect the current demand. The IDP does not specify the nature of this review, but does state that, in order to cover the cost of any additional school places required as a result of new development, the City Council will continue to negotiate financial contributions towards education. Where additional schools or school places are required as a consequence of development, as far as possible the cost should fall on the landowners and/or developers, by way of contributions. Such contributions will be expected from all developments that create a shortfall in capacity.

#### Education Contributions from Developers

7.12 In September 2008, the City Council adopted an updated Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which includes a formula for calculating developer contributions towards education provision. Contributions are only collected if there is insufficient capacity in the catchment area for the notional number of pupils expected from a development. The Education Service is consulted on residential applications and indicates whether a contribution towards education, either for primary, for secondary or for both should be sought. The Springfield School catchment area is one where contributions are currently required.

7.13 The contributions acquired should be used to fund additional temporary or permanent classroom space or associated facilities needed in order to meet the additional demand on the school as a result of the proposed development.

7.14 £75,000 was collected in 2009/10 from the Highbury College site development of 165 units. This sum was negotiated in 2007/08 before the SPD had been adopted.

Officers are currently discussing how this money should be spent. There have been no other major sites in the Springfield School catchment area since the SPD update was adopted that have contributed to education. Some minor applications have recently been granted and have planning obligations for education contributions attached to them.

## **8. To obtain information about pupil and capital planning.**

### Background

8.1 The City Council has a duty to provide sufficient school places with the DfE expectation that it is reasonable for secondary pupils to travel up to three miles to school.

### Secondary Pupil Projections

8.2 The secondary pupil projections for the city are as set out in the table below. The city therefore in aggregate has sufficient secondary school places for the next decade.

8.3 Springfield School currently has an admission limit of 220 in all year groups. For September 2009, there were 255 Year 6 pupils in the Springfield School catchment area. 241 Year 6 pupils applied for Springfield School from the catchment area i.e. 94.5% participation rate.

### Year 6 Pupil Projections (January 2010)

January 2011	264 pupils
January 2012	212 pupils
January 2013	241 pupils
January 2014	213 pupils

### Pupil Projections based on the Likely Impact of Planned Housing Developments

January 2011	259-266
January 2012	210-217
January 2013	237-244
January 2014	211-218

### DfE Perspective

8.4 The DfE recognises that there is a limit to satisfying parental preference. Portsmouth City Council's projections demonstrate adequate secondary school provision. Portsmouth City Council's rates of successful first preference secondary school applications are amongst the highest nationally.

### Planning for School Places at a Local Level.

8.5 Demand for school places is dependent upon the following factors:

- Number of young people in the catchment area
- Level of planned new building
- Parental preferences

### Number of Young People in the Catchment Area

- 8.6 Portsmouth City Council uses three indicators to forecast numbers of young people in each catchment area:
- School Census i.e. known pupils in existing Portsmouth schools
  - Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts (HCC SAPF) based on censuses, planning applications, demographic changes to household sizes, etc.
  - HCC Chelmer forecasts – these are longer term forecasts with data at a Local Authority level.

Level of Planned New Building.

- 8.7 It is difficult to estimate the demand for secondary school places resulting from housing developments as it depends on the type of housing. In general, public sector housing developments give rise to a higher demand for more places than private housing developments. Developments containing three and four bedroom houses result in higher demand than developments containing flats or two bedroom houses, as can be seen from the yields table in paragraph 8.9.
- 8.8 The Scottish & Southern Energy depot and the Station Road sites were mentioned as housing development sites with the potential to provide approximately three hundred additional dwellings in the Springfield School catchment area, although the actual achievable number of dwellings will only be determined by the approval of a planning application. This development would bring more families into the Springfield School catchment area thus increasing the demand for school places. The Assistant Head of Planning Services advised that a planning application for some one hundred and fifty dwellings on the Station Road site had been put forward but permission had been refused due to reasons of access and the site being in a flood zone.
- 8.9 The panel was advised that pupil yield resulting from new developments is dependent on:
- Timing
  - Nature of house/ apartment
  - The mix of private/ social accommodation.

**Child Yields Assumed for Planning Obligations:**

<b>Number of bedrooms (flat or house)</b>	<b>Pupil yield per unit</b>
1 bedroom	0.013
2 bedrooms	0.082
3 bedrooms	0.772
4+ bedrooms	0.936

- 8.10 The panel discussed the potential for development in the Springfield School catchment area and the following points were made:
- There was the potential for planning applications for up to three hundred houses to be built on the Southern Electric and Station Road sites, although there is currently no evidence that the sites could accommodate more than the 200 dwellings identified in the SHLAA. Assuming that many of these residences would have three bedrooms, an approximate calculation can be made using the

formula set out in the Portsmouth SPD. The formula to calculate child yield per each new residential dwelling for three bedroomed houses is 0.772 per dwelling. Therefore, based on that calculation, 300 three bedroomed houses should generate an additional 231.6 pupils across all year groups.

8.11 Over the next five years there is the potential for more new residential dwellings to be developed in the city. One area of Cosham High Street has been earmarked for high rise development and more development was proposed for the Highbury site.

## **9. To consult the Head Teacher and Governing Body to seek their views.**

### Comments by the Head Teacher and the Chair of the Governing Body

9.1 The panel was advised that the Head Teacher and the Governing Body believe that there is a limit to expanding “good” schools and beyond that limit performance will suffer.

### Percentage of Out of Catchment Pupils and Turbulence

9.2 The current position is that 8.4% of current pupils live outside the catchment area. These pupils are generally children who were originally living in catchment when allocated a place at the school but the families had moved away during the children’s school career. If a family moves outside the catchment area but within travelling distance to the school, the children tend to remain at Springfield School. The school experiences a very low turnover of pupils (turbulence).

### Independent Appeal Panels

9.3 Over the last four years, 122 parents had appealed to an Independent Appeal Panel against the decision not to grant their child a place at the school. Of the 122 appellants, 40 were successful. It was estimated that 50% of the successful appellants lived out of the catchment area.

9.4 As already mentioned, recent Independent Appeal Panel hearings for the September 2011 intake have resulted in four appellants being successful in gaining a place at the school resulting in the September year 7 cohort numbers being four over the PAN. This has an impact on the waiting list with the result that five children would have to decline a place before the start of the autumn term or leave during the school year before any could be admitted from the waiting list.

### Fair Access Protocol

9.5 The impact of the LA’s Fair Access Protocol (attached as appendix 4) was discussed. The head teacher stated that 12-15 additional children since 2006 were directed into the school by the LA via this protocol which provides for ‘hard to place’ pupils to be shared among all the city’s secondary schools. Increasingly, once a child is designated ‘hard to place’, parents request Springfield School. Hard to place admissions put extra pressure on the waiting lists resulting in parents having to wait even longer for a school place to become available. The problem of these additional pupils for Springfield School is compounded in that being a successful school it is required to take more of these pupils than schools facing challenges. Schools which have recently come out of the special measures category are not required to take any ‘hard to place’ pupils for the following two years.



- 9.6 The Admissions (Exclusions & Reintegration) Manager commented that the Fair Access Protocol was specifically implemented in order that no school would be overburdened with pupils deemed to be 'Hard to Place'. In order to achieve a fair distribution, over-subscribed schools will necessarily be obliged to take additional pupils over their PAN. The parental preferences do not reflect an increasing demand for Springfield School under the Fair Access Protocol and indeed the numbers of entrants under the Fair Access Protocol who are placed in Springfield School by the Inclusion Support Panel remains very low (one in the last academic year and one so far during this academic year). This is significantly lower than other secondary schools; for example, Admiral Lord Nelson School, also being an oversubscribed school, took five this academic year and five in the previous year. Since January 2006, the average number of pupils taken by a secondary school is 28; Springfield School is the lowest with 14 (less than three per academic year) and the range is 14-38. Whilst being in special measures affords a level of protection, there has not been a secondary school in this situation since January 2006 and, indeed, Mayfield and Miltoncross schools which did have notices to improve, took 37 and 31 pupils respectively.
- 9.7 The Fair Access Protocol is locally determined and 'hard to place' pupils are referred to the Fair Access Panel. It was pointed out that the Fair Access Protocol could be changed but it would have to be locally agreed. It is necessary to have an equitable rather than an equal share out of 'hard to place' pupils. The idea is to prevent schools facing challenging circumstances from having to take more challenging pupils.

#### Suggestion to Change to a Double Shift School

- 9.8 During the Panel's discussion of the possible solutions to over subscription, operating a shift system was suggested. This would involve changing the structure of the school day with for example, the lower school attending for the early part of the school day and the upper school attending for the latter part of the day. This would enable the school to be enlarged without having to undertake expensive building works. Increasing the number of pupils would attract additional funding to pay for the necessary additional staff.
- 9.11 The following issues were highlighted by the Head Teacher and the Chair of the Governing Body:
- This would cause difficulties for parents in arranging child care to fit in with their work patterns, especially if a younger child goes to school in the morning and is at home in the afternoon and an elder child is at home in the mornings and at school in the afternoons. Generally, it is anticipated that parents' attitudes to this proposal would be extremely negative.
  - Parents would not feel comfortable going out to work and leaving their 14 year old to get himself/herself to school.
  - Past experience in relation to changes to the school day have met with considerable dissatisfaction from parents.
  - There would be a lunch time overlap and the school dining room would not be able to accommodate more pupils.
  - It would not be reasonable to schedule unpaid time off for staff during the middle of the day.

### The Creation of a Solent Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) School

- 9.12 The Head Teacher commented on the STEM proposal for a school for 300 pupils on a site in the city and the suggestion that it would create a niche market and possibly reduce some of the demand for places at Springfield School. She stated that the STEM school option would not involve LA control. The school would have links to the dockyard and local businesses. It could be argued that it is disadvantageous to pupils in that it would involve a change of school half way through their secondary education. As Springfield School is already a specialist technology school, it would seem unlikely that the STEM would attract pupils from the northern part of the city and would therefore be unlikely to have any impact on demand for places at Springfield School.

### Creation of a University Technical Academy (UTA)

- 9.13 Reference was made to proposals to convert the City of Portsmouth Boys' School into a UTA. However, it was pointed out that City Boys' School was a trust school and therefore consultation and agreement with the trust would have to be obtained undertaken.

## **10. Written submission from representatives of the Royal Navy.**

### Background

- 10.1 At its first meeting on 10 June, the panel invited representatives from the Royal Navy to attend as witnesses or to send a written submission. The Naval Families Federation (NFF) operates from Castaway House in Portsmouth, alongside the principal Royal Navy charities. It was established in 2003 to give Royal Naval and Royal Marines' families an independent voice and to assist those families in dealing with the impact of separation and mobility issues which affect service families but are not commonly experienced by the civilian population.

### Written Submission from the NFF

- 10.2 The NFF was contacted and has provided the following written submission.
- 10.3 Within the Springfield School catchment area there is an area of service families' accommodation that could include families with children in the secondary stage of education. Due to the requirements of service postings, these families are often required to move at any point during a school year with minimum notice. As service postings do not necessarily occur around school application times, this is a matter of considerable concern to service families. There is inevitably the increased potential for disruption to the education of children from services families together with the added complication of not necessarily being able to obtain a place at a local school. A service family living in service accommodation does not have complete control over their postings and allocations to accommodation are based purely on the size of house to which they are entitled and to an area local to where the service person is posted.
- 10.4 The Government has agreed to provide additional funding to state schools in England that have service children on their school roll. The Service Pupil Premium is £200 per service child registered on the school roll in January when the Annual Schools Census is conducted. These funds are to be used by the school to provide

the extra support needed to mitigate the effects of frequent changes of school and the effects of separation from a serving parent deployed on operations. Deployment for the Royal Navy can mean being away from the family onboard a ship anywhere in the world from 4 – 7 months at a time, which is very different from, say the Army, where the service person may be able to be at home on a daily basis. (Currently there are also over 4,000 members of the Royal Navy and Royal Marines that are stationed in Afghanistan.). A specific problem with mobility of service children can be the differences in curriculum within the UK. This is compounded with moves between England and Scotland, for example, a pupil in Scotland currently in year 8 moving to Hampshire would then be in year 9.

- 10.5 Within the MOD is a department specifically for education of service children called CEAS (Children's Education Advisory Service). Further details can be found at the following web address.  
<http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceFor/ServiceCommunity/Education/ChildrensEducationAdvisoryService.htm>
- 10.6 In May this year an Ofsted Report on 'Mobile Service Children' was published that highlighted areas of concern for service families with children and education including their distinctive needs  
[http://www.nff.org.uk/pdfdocs/childreninservicefamilies\\_may2011.pdf](http://www.nff.org.uk/pdfdocs/childreninservicefamilies_may2011.pdf).
- 10.7 There are government proposals for special arrangements to support access to schools if a place is required part way through an academic year as a consequence of a posting. This includes the facility to apply for a school place on receipt of a posting notice and for schools to exceed admissions numbers to make a place available for a service child.
- 10.8 The government is introducing a new fund of £3m per annum over the next four years; from 2011-12 to 2014-2015, to support state schools catering for significant numbers of service children or the children of reservists. This is intended to help ensure that schools are equipped to deal with exceptional or changing circumstances as a result of troop movements and/or operational deployments. The fund will be designed to help state schools and the military families they serve, cope with unpredictable needs and will be in addition to the regular extra funding they will receive via the service children's pupil premium.
- 10.3 The Head Teacher of Springfield School advised that the school was currently in receipt of a small grant to account for the number of service families in the area but this only amounted to the equivalent of 15 children. Applications from forces families are treated sympathetically in that closing dates can be extended.
- 11. To research whether other local authorities have experienced similar situations and actions they have taken to deal with the issue.**
- 11.1 Some preliminary internet research was carried out on the panel's behalf in an attempt to find out what solutions (if any) had been employed by other LAs in dealing with oversubscription in some schools.

### Brighton and Hove City Council.

- 11.2 Brighton and Hove City Council introduced a random allocation system, as part of its oversubscription criteria for Secondary Admissions in September 2008. Random allocation was introduced in conjunction with fixed catchment areas, which give all parents priority for at least one school near to them.
- 11.3 At oversubscribed schools, once exceptional circumstances and sibling links have been taken into account an electronic ballot is used to allocate places, first within the catchment area and then from outside, rather than the old system of home to school distance measurement.
- 11.4 However, it is reported that the Secretary of State for Education considers this so called lottery system to be unfair and is in favour of ending the practice.

### Education Appeals Support Initiative (EASI).

- 11.5 Contact was also made with the EASI group to ask if any information was available regarding action taken by LAs to deal with over subscription issues. A lead member of the group commented that the over subscription scenario faced by Springfield School was a common problem for many schools throughout the country.

## **12. To identify ways in which the ongoing situation might be resolved.**

- 12.1 During the hearing of evidence and analysis of the issues affecting Springfield School, it became apparent to the panel that the following information would be required to assist it in identifying solutions:
- Future predictions on the number of primary and secondary pupil places that will be required over the next seven years.
  - Information on plans for the future of the City of Portsmouth Boys' School and whether these plans may affect the future demand for places at Springfield School.

## **13. Future Predictions for Primary Pupil Places**

- 13.1 The Strategic Commissioning Manager presented a report to the panel. Predictions for future primary school places will have an impact on demand for secondary school places in future years. Predictions over the next two years have indicated that two of the three feeder schools (Court Lane Junior and Solent Junior) are also oversubscribed.
- 13.2 Surplus capacity is forecast to reduce from 11.5% in 2010/11 to just 4.6% by 2015/16 rising to 6% by 2021/22. At a school level the surplus capacity is unevenly distributed with a significant proportion of primary schools at or near full capacity.
- 13.3 Analysis of projected pupil numbers by year group reveal pressures on particular Year Groups, the most acute of which is in Years 3-6 (2015/16 – 2018/19).
- 13.4 Current Year R (reception) is facing significant pressure with 30 schools full as of 31 August 2011, and with limited available spaces concentrated to the north and south of the city. Current capacity in the primary sector may not be sufficient to meet projected pupil numbers.

## 14. Future Predictions for Secondary Pupil Places.

14.1 Surplus capacity will fall unevenly across the secondary schools with popular schools remaining full and under-subscribed schools with relatively low pupil numbers. Surplus capacity is particularly high at Charter Academy and City of Portsmouth Boys', King Richard and Mayfield Schools.

14.2 Springfield School and Admiral Lord Nelson School are forecast to remain full for the foreseeable future, with only a limited number of surplus places available at Miltoncross School, Priory School and St Edmund's Catholic School.

14.3 As mentioned at 8.6, Portsmouth City Council uses three indicators to forecast numbers of children and young people:

- School Census i.e. known pupils in existing Portsmouth schools
- Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts (HCC SAPF) based on censuses, planning applications, demographic changes to household sizes, etc.
- HCC Chelmer forecasts – these are longer term forecasts with data at a Local Authority level.

14.4 To meet the needs of the predicted growth in population, the demand for future housing is estimated at an additional 19,000 new homes by 2027. However, with the current economic climate and uncertainty regarding the type of housing involved and the people to be homed within these areas, it is very difficult to gauge the scale of increased demand. For example, if dwellings are relocating existing Portsmouth residents, the impact at a city level may be minimal although the availability of local school places may be an issue. If the dwellings are for an in-migration of residents to Portsmouth, the pressures on school places could be considerable.

14.5 Consideration of cross-border pupil movements is also important. Data derived from the DfE's Statistical First Release "Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics, January 2011" shows that Portsmouth is a net 'exporter' of pupils. In the primary maintained sector, the net difference between imports and exports is -181. In the secondary maintained sector the net difference is -502. There is evidence of increasing pressure on some secondary schools in Hampshire which are currently accessed by Portsmouth's children, notably Cowplain Community School, Purbrook Park School and Crookhorn College of Technology. Information provided by Hampshire County Council suggests that due to internal population pressures within Hampshire, including the impact of local housing developments, Portsmouth's children will no longer have access to these schools within the next five years.

14.6 Traditionally a zero net migration model has been used to forecast pupil numbers in Portsmouth (i.e. pupils that leave the Local Authority have been balanced by new arrivals). This may change in future.

14.7 The secondary pupil projections at a LA and school level reveal the following:

- For 2010/11, the secondary schools have a surplus capacity of 13.5% (using January 2011 number on roll). By 2017/18 the LA surplus capacity (including

Charter Academy) will be 13.4%. Based on current estimates, the surplus capacity will reduce to 6% by 2020/21. Across the Local Authority area there are therefore sufficient secondary school places for the next decade.

- In the short to medium term, i.e. 2013/14/15/16, surplus capacity in the city will increase to some 1,760 places (equivalent to a spare secondary school). This surplus is likely to fall unevenly across schools with popular schools remaining full and unpopular schools with low and potentially unviable pupil numbers. In the longer term, however, i.e. 2019/20/21/22, overall surplus capacity will fall to more acceptable levels.
- Surplus capacity is particularly high at the City of Portsmouth Boys' School (51.8%), Charter Academy (44.2%), King Richard School (27.8%) and Mayfield School (17.5%) and are forecast to remain high, increasing to 53.3% at City of Portsmouth Boys' School, 34.6% at King Richard School and 28.3% at Mayfield School by 2014/15. Surplus capacity at Charter Academy is forecast to decrease slightly to 42% by 2014/15.
- Plans are being put forward to address the condition and the surplus capacity at King Richard School and Portsmouth City of Boys' School. King Richard School is the subject of a bid under the Priority School Building Programme for a complete rebuild of the School. Previously the School was to be a sample school under Building Schools for the Future (BSF). The proposal is to reduce net capacity from 1089 to 900.
- For the City of Portsmouth Boys' School there is a proposal to replace the school with a co-educational 11-19 Technical Academy with an overall net capacity of 840 compared to the current net capacity of 985.
- Springfield School and Admiral Lord Nelson School are forecast to remain full for the foreseeable future, with only limited number of surplus places available at Miltoncross School, Priory School and St Edmund's Catholic School.
- Previous plans to expand the capacity of Springfield School by raising the PAN from 220 to 240 have had to be shelved due to the closure of BSF.
- LA forecasts and individual school forecasts can hide individual year group pressures. The table on the next page provides projected pupil numbers for each year group and the difference each year between numbers on roll (NOR) and the overall admission limit.

### Projected Pupil Numbers by Year Group

NCY Group	Data from Jan 2011 census	Projected Pupil Nos (using SAPF based Year R)
-----------	---------------------------	---

	2010/11			2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	Census NOR	Admission Limit (AL)	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff	NOR and AL diff
R	2123	2235	112	84	61	91	114	111	125	155
1	2105	2235	130	112	84	61	91	114	111	125
2	1998	2235	237	140	122	94	71	101	124	121
Total Infant	6226	6705	479	336	267	246	276	326	360	401
3	1860	2168	308	141	105	87	46	23	52	75
4	1848	2243	395	315	209	113	95	55	32	61
5	1760	2243	483	403	323	217	121	103	64	41
6	1934	2275	341	488	408	328	222	126	108	70
Total Junior	7402	8929	1527	1347	1045	745	484	307	256	247
Total Primary	13628	15634	2006	1683	1312	991	760	633	616	648
7	1685	2032	347	257	421	348	343	246	158	142
8	1756	2032	276	350	260	424	351	346	249	161
9	1799	2072	273	274	348	258	422	349	344	247
10	1795	2072	277	264	266	340	250	414	341	336
11	1882	2092	210	286	274	275	349	259	423	350
Total Sec	8917	10300	1383	1431	1569	1645	1715	1614	1515	1236
Total P+S	22545	25934	3389	3114	2881	2636	2475	2247	2131	1884

## 15. The City of Portsmouth Boys' School.

### The Views of the Head Teacher of the City of Portsmouth Boys' School.

- 15.1 Mr Smith began by informing the panel that a capital bid for City Boys' to become a UTA had been prepared and that if the bid is successful the school would very likely become a co-educational school. However, it would not become a catchment area school. If the bid did not turn out to be successful, he believed that the school had a long term future as a sustainable single sex school.
- 15.2 He referred to the recent achievements of the school. In the past, the school had not demonstrated any good reason to parents for choosing the school, apart from wanting single sex education. Therefore, more recently, the need to persuade parents to make an active choice to send their boys to the school was recognised. The school now had the third best examination results in the city and the results were better than the majority of co-educational schools in the city. The last Ofsted report had judged the school to be good.
- 15.3 The current year 7 cohort was 120 and was the highest number of new entrants. It was anticipated that over the next 4-5 years, year 7 cohorts would increase and reach figures closer to the PAN.
- 15.4 The possibility of the school becoming co-educational was suggested some years ago but this did not happen because the idea was rejected by the LA. The school

governors currently held the view that the school should remain a single sex boys' school.

- 15.5 Many parents all over the city are now choosing City Boy's school because the exam results had improved significantly. He pointed out that if City Boys' were to become co-educational the option of single sex education for boys would be removed for the whole city. Mr Smith expressed the view that the best solution would be to improve the quality of education in the other schools in the north of the city and that would relieve pressure on Springfield.
- 15.6 The panel was advised on the type of education to be provided at UTAs. It was explained that whilst the school would be focussing on maths, science and technology, it would still have to provide the full range of national curriculum subjects up to the age of 16.
- 15.7 Panel members commented that the City of Portsmouth Boys' School becoming a co-educational UTA would go some way towards alleviating the problems with excess demand for places at Springfield. However, if the bid failed, then the City Council would have to consider alternatives. It was believed the bid had a 20% chance of success, as this was in a competitive bidding environment.
- 15.8 However, if the UTA bid was not successful, the Chair suggested that the panel might consider referring the matter to the Cabinet Member for Children and Education suggesting that, in the light of the improving results at the City of Portsmouth Boys' School, changing its status to co-educational could alleviate the pressure for places at Springfield.
- 16. Options open to Portsmouth City Council to address the periodic over subscription at Springfield School are as follows:**
1. Review school catchment areas.
  2. Review the need for school catchment areas.
  3. Reduce the catchment area of Springfield School. This may not resolve but merely shift the level of dissatisfaction especially for those who feel they have previously paid a "house premium" to live in the Springfield catchment area.
  4. Do nothing and accept the periodic dissatisfaction of some parents, with the comfort that Portsmouth City Council fully meets its legal responsibilities and has a high rate of successful first and second preferences for secondary school applications.
  5. Change the structure of the school day by introducing a shift system as described in section 9.8.
  6. Build another secondary school in the north of the city. This option is unlikely in the current financial climate.
  7. Create a Solent STEM school for 300 pupils; this could possibly serve a niche market which could reduce the demand for places at Springfield School. This option is unlikely in the current financial climate.
  8. Invest in additional building at Springfield School to increase the PAL from 220 to 240, as planned in the Building Schools for the Future programme which was curtailed following the change of government. This option is unlikely in the current financial climate.



9. Create a UTA on the City of Portsmouth Boys' School site. This would be linked to Portsmouth University and provide technical education for 11-19 year olds.
10. Consider the possibility of the City of Portsmouth Boys' School becoming a co-educational secondary school with a defined catchment area or a co-ed UTA.

## **17. Conclusions.**

Based on the evidence and views it has received during the review process, the panel has come to the following conclusions:

1. The problems of capacity at Springfield School are likely to continue for the foreseeable future and be exacerbated as new residential development within the catchment area takes place.
2. The capacity projections for the City of Portsmouth Boys' School indicate a likely surplus of places for the foreseeable future.
3. If the City of Portsmouth Boys' School were co-educational, it would relieve the pressure on Springfield School by being able to accept more children from the nearby Highbury Estate, who otherwise seek to attend Springfield as the next nearest school. The proposal for the City of Portsmouth Boys' School to become a co-educational University Technical Academy for 11-19 year olds is therefore welcomed and supported.
4. However, given that the Head Teacher's assessment of the likelihood of becoming a UTA was rated at only 20% there should be a fall-back position: namely, that the governors of the City of Portsmouth Boys' School be asked to consider allowing the school to become co-educational, as they are clearly willing to for the school to become a UTA. Should they accept that, and should they so wish it, a co-ed school could have a defined catchment area, which should include the Highbury Estate and allow for the proposed future residential development at Tipner. In so doing, it would address the significant surplus of places currently at the school. That being the case, the City Council should be requested to assist the school to fund such changes necessary to facilitate this change from the delegated capital budget for schools or from Section 106 monies.
5. The catchment area for Springfield school includes a large naval estate. The very nature of life for service personnel means that families moving to this estate will often find that their children are unable to gain a place at Springfield. The Fair Access Protocol is a City Council document which sets out arrangements for securing a school place for all children and young people who, for whatever reason, are considered "hard to place". Within section 4 of the Fair Access Protocol there is a definition of "Hard to Place" pupils. Amongst the definitions are children who have been permanently excluded and who are ready for mainstream provision, Looked After Children and children of refugees and asylum seekers not in accommodation centres. What it does not include is children of service personnel who have moved to, or within, Portsmouth as a result of Services deployments. This is inappropriate for a city that is home to the Royal Navy and to many service personnel.

**18. Recommendations.**

**1. The panel recommend to the City Council that :**

**(b) The City Council ask the Springfield School governors to consider a school building programme to increase the numbers on roll from 220 per year group to 240, supported by capital funding from monies received under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

**(b) The bid by the City of Portsmouth Boys' School to become a co-educational University Technical Academy for 11-19 year olds be supported.**

**Note the reasons for this proposal are as follows:**

- It would address the issue regarding surplus places at the City of Portsmouth Boys' School.**
- The proposed change would be in the interests of efficiency and efficient use of resources.**
- A greater parity of school places for boys and girls in the Highbury area of the city could be achieved.**
- It would constitute forward planning for school places in the light of proposed future residential development at Tipner.**

**(c) Should City of Portsmouth Boys' School not be successful in their bid to become a UTA the City Council should recommend that the governors of City of Portsmouth Boys' School be asked to consider allowing the school to become co-educational. Should they accept that, and should they so wish it, a co-educational school could have a defined catchment area, which should include the Highbury estate and allow for the proposed future residential development at Tipner. In that case, the City Council be requested to examine how it may assist the school in funding the changes necessary for the school to become co-educational.**

**(d) Should the Governors of the City of Portsmouth Boys' accept (c) above, if the City Council believes there is still a requirement for an all-boys' school then the cabinet member with responsibility for schools be requested to consider ways in which that might be achieved.**

**(e) The City Council requests head teachers to include within the Fair Access Protocol a requirement that added to the definition of "Hard to Place" children are: "children of service personnel who are about to move to or have moved to, or within, Portsmouth as a result of Services deployments".**

**(f) Portsmouth makes provision for applications from Services Personnel to be processed if the families have proof of posting, even if they do not have an address in Portsmouth inline with the new Admissions Code to be published in 2012**

**(g) Representations be made to Government to the effect that, if necessary, the Published Admission Number of a school may be adjusted to accommodate children of forces personnel.**

**Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

No equality impact assessment is required in the compilation of this report as there is no negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

**APPENDIX ONE**

**Meetings Held by the Panel**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>WITNESSES</b>	<b>DOCUMENTS RECEIVED</b>
10 June 2011.	<p>Mike Fowler, Former Head of Transforming Education Admissions Officer.</p> <p>Sue Barratt, Admissions Officer.</p>	<p>Report on admission arrangements generally and particularly with regard to Springfield School for the September 2011 cohort.</p>
24 June 2011.	<p>Lynn Evans, Headteacher Springfield School.</p> <p>Nigel Webb, Assistant Head Teacher (Admissions) Springfield School.</p> <p>Derek Good, Chair of Governors, Springfield School.</p> <p>Jacqueline Boulter, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Services.</p> <p>Mike Allgrove, Assistant Head of Planning Services.</p> <p>Mike Fowler, Former Head of Transforming Education.</p> <p>Sue Barratt, Admissions Officer.</p>	<p>Report on forward planning for new housing development and decisions on planning applications, both related, where relevant to Springfield catchment area –Principal Planning Officer, Planning Services.</p> <p>Report on background to admissions to Springfield School for September 2011- Head of Transforming Education Services.</p>

<b>DATE</b>	<b>WITNESSES</b>	<b>DOCUMENTS RECEIVED</b>
8 July 2011.	<p>Mike Fowler, Former Head of Transforming Education Services.</p> <p>Neil Stevenson, Admissions (Exclusions &amp; Reintegration)</p>	<p>Fair Access Protocol for Secondary Schools.</p> <p>Explanation notes for the Inclusion Support Panel data.</p> <p>Proposed 11-19 Technical Academy, Solent STEM Centre and Academies.</p> <p>Pupil distribution via the Fair Access Protocol.</p> <p>Adjusted School Forecasts.</p> <p>Report on the Fair Access Protocol by Admissions Officer (Exclusions &amp; Reintegration).</p>
15 September	<p>Mike Stoneman, Strategic Commissioning Manager</p> <p>.</p> <p>Mike Smith, Head Teacher, City of Portsmouth Boys' School.</p>	<p>High Level Review of pupil places in Portsmouth (primary and secondary)</p>
7 November		<p>Report signed off.</p>

**APPENDIX TWO**

**Admissions Policy Criteria for Springfield School.**





**APPENDIX THREE**

**Map of Springfield Catchment Area.**



**Fair Access Protocol.**