

Report to: Education, Children & Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

Report from: Mike Fowler, Head of Transforming Education Services

**22/3/11 City Council Notice of Motion re
Review of Admissions to Springfield School
for September 2011**

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Scrutiny Panel on the background re: Admissions to Springfield School for September 2011.

Background

2. 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 3 miles to school.
3.
 - The secondary pupil projections for the City are as follows:

| Academic Year | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2013/14 | 2015/16 | 2017/18 | 2019/20 | 2021/22 | 2023/24 | 2025/26 |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Secondary NOR/ NOR Forecast | 9106 | 8820 | 8527 | 8519 | 8903 | 9421 | 9589 | 9443 | 9204 |
| Secondary Net Capacity | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 |
| Secondary Surplus | 1054 | 1348 | 1633 | 1641 | 1257 | 739 | 571 | 717 | 956 |
| Secondary Surplus % | 10.4% | 13.2% | 16.1% | 16.1% | 12.3% | 7.3% | 5.6% | 7.1% | 9.5% |

- (i) It is important to note that there is a health warning re the forecast figures for the latter years i.e. 2019/20 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) PCC pupil planning judged “good” by Ofsted ($\pm 1\%$)
- (iv) BSF pupil planning up to 2018/19:
 - Independently verified by national expert
 - Checked and approved by government

The City therefore in aggregate has sufficient secondary school places for the next decade.

Planning for School Places at a local level

4. 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

To take each in turn.

5. Number of Young People in the catchment area

PCC use two indicators to forecast numbers of young people in each catchment area:

- School Census (short term 1-2 yr) – i.e. known pupils in existing Portsmouth schools
- SAPF (longer term 3 yrs) – HCC small area population forecasts based census, planning applications, demographic changes to household sizes etc.

6. Level of planned new building

- Pupil yield of these developments dependent on:
 - Timing
 - Nature of house/apartments
 - Private/social
- Rule of thumb
 - Private house = 1/3 child per house
 - Social house = 1 child per house
 - Yields table

| Description | Number of bedrooms | Pupils per unit |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|
| Housing association flat (inc LA developments) | Any | 0.09 |
| Housing association house (inc LA development) | 1-2 | 0.80 |
| Housing association house (inc LA development) | 3 | 1.60 |
| Housing association house (inc LA development) | 4+ | 2.10 |
| Private flat | Any | 0.03 |
| Private house | Any | 0.33 |
| Not Known | Any | 0.18 |

7. Parental Preference

Parental preference will be based upon

- Local perception of the school
- Economy i.e. numbers prepared/able to pay for private school
- Religious preference – particularly Roman Catholics to Oaklands or St Edmund’s
- Single sex – City of Portsmouth Boys’ or City of Portsmouth Girls’

Springfield

8. Springfield currently has an admission limit of 220 in all year groups.

9. For September 2009

- There were 255 YR6 pupils in Springfield catchment
- 241 YR6 pupils applied for Springfield School from the catchment area
- i.e. 94.5% participation rate

10. YR6 Pupil projections (January 2010)

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

11. Impact on Planned housing

- 5 developments (including Southern Electric, Station Road, Highbury)
- Range of additional pupils per year group is 10-17

12. Likely pupil projections based on paragraphs 10 and 11 above

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

13. Views of Springfield School

- There is a limit to expanding “good” schools beyond which performance will suffer
- Springfield School Governing body are resolute that 240 is their limit based on additional BSF new build

14. DfE perspective

- DfE recognise that there is a limit to satisfying parental preference
- PCC projections demonstrate adequate secondary school provision
- PCC rates of successful first preference secondary school applications are amongst the highest nationally

15. PCC options

The key options open to PCC to address the periodic under-capacity of Springfield are as follows:

- PCC to invest in additional building at the school to increase the PAL from 220 to 240
- To reduce the catchment area of Springfield School which would 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

- To do nothing and accept the periodic dissatisfaction of some parents, with the comfort that PCC fully meets its legal responsibilities and has a high rate of successful first and second preferences for secondary school applications