

Local Authority Report

to

The Schools Adjudicator

from

Waltham Forest Local Authority

to be provided by

30 June 2020

Report Cleared by: David Kilgallon

Title Director of Learning and Systems Leadership

Email: David.Kilgallon@walthamforest.gov.uk

Date submitted: 30th June 2020

By:

Name: Mark Joshi

Title: Head of Service Admissions Commissioning

Telephone number: 020 8496 3536

Email: mark.joshi@walthamforest.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-of-the-schools-adjudicator

Please email your completed report to: <u>osa.team@schoolsadjudicator.gov.uk</u> by <u>30 June 2020 and earlier if possible</u>

Contents

Section	on 1 - Normal point of admission	4
A.	Co-ordination	4
В.	Looked after and previously looked after children	
C.	Special educational needs and disabilities	
Section	on 2 - In-year admissions	6
A.	Co-ordination of in-year admissions	6
B.	Looked after children and previously looked after children	6
C.	Children with special educational needs and/or disabilities	7
D.	Fair access protocol	8
E.	General comments on in-year dmissions	8
Section	on 3 - Other matters	9
Section	on 4 - Feedback	9

Introduction and guidance on completing the report – Revised April 2020

- 1. Section 88P of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (the Act) requires every local authority to make an annual report to the adjudicator. The Chief Adjudicator then includes a summary of these reports in her annual report to the Secretary for State for Education. The School Admissions Code (the Code) sets out the requirements for reports by local authorities in paragraph 6. Paragraph 3.23 specifies what must be included as a minimum in the report to the adjudicator and makes provision for the local authority to include any other matters. This is a revised template issued in the light of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 2. This template requests local authorities only for:
 - a) information about how admission arrangements in the area of the local authority serve the interests of looked after children and previously looked after children, children with disabilities and children with special educational needs, including any details of where problems have arisen;
 - an assessment of the effectiveness of Fair Access Protocols and coordination in their area, including how many children were admitted to each school under them.
- 3. We would be grateful if local authorities would follow the approach used in statutory provisions and in the Department for Education Statistical First Release¹ and the Education Middle School (England) Regulations 2002².
- 4. Local authorities are, of course, free to comment on any other matters not specifically addressed in this template if they wish to do so under section 3. The views expressed by local authorities in previous years also remain a matter of public record.
- 5. The report **must** be returned to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator by **30 June 2020**.

¹ Department for Education Statistical First Release

² The Education Middle School (England) Regulations 2002

Information requested

Section 1 - Normal point of admission

A. Co-ordination

i.	How well did co- ordination of the main admissions round work?	Not well	A large number of small problems or a major problem	Well with few small problems	Very well
	Reception			X	
	Year 7			Х	
	Other relevant years of entry				Х
3.	Looked after and	previo	usly looked after childre	an .	
		•	•		
i.			ions system in your local nildren at normal points o	-	e the
	□Not at all □Not	well 🗆	Well ⊠⊠Very well □No	ot applicable ³	
ii.			ns systems in other local a d after by your local autho	•	
	□Not at all □Not	well	Well □⊠Very well □No	ot applicable ³	
iii		er local	sions system serve the in authorities but educated		
	□Not at all □Not	well 🗆	Well ⊠⊠Very well □No	ot applicable ³	

³ 'Not applicable' will only be appropriate if there are no children falling within this definition.

iv. How well does the admissions system in your local authority area serve the interests of previously looked after children at normal points of admission ?
□Not at all □Not well □Well □⊠Very well □Not applicable³
v. Priority in admission arrangements for 2021 for adopted children previously in care abroad. Please comment on the use of a priority in admission arrangements for a child adopted who was previously in care abroad if you wish.
 If you wish to please give any examples of good or poor practice or difficulties which exemplify your answers about the admission to schools of looked after and previously looked after children at the normal points of admission:
Examples of good practice:
 LAC and PLAC given a place at first choice school in time for national offer day
 Consistent request for and use of evidence of LAC and PLAC status within the admissions application process
Appropriate information sharing with the receiving school in a timely manner
Examples of poor practice (other Admissions Authorities outside LBWF):
 LAC and PLAC not given a place at first choice school and prioritised by other oversubscription criteria
 Inconsistent request for and use of evidence of LAC and PLAC status within the admissions application process
 PLAC not given the highest priority in oversubscription criteria
 Lack of information around LAC and PLAC status shared with receiving school
Appeals process incorrectly applied to children in care by some authorities

C. Special educational needs and disabilities

	Please provide any comments you wish to make on the admission of children with special educational needs and/or disabilities at the normal points of admission:
--	---

Section 2 - In-year⁴ admissions

A. Co-ordination of in-year admissions

Plea wish	ase provide any comments on the co-ordination of in year admissions if you n.	
В.	Looked after children and previously looked after children	
D .	Looked after children and previously looked after children	
i.	How well does the in-year admissions system serve children who are looked after by your local authority and who are being educated in your area?	
	□Not at all □Not well □Well □⊠Very well □Not applicable ⁵	
ii.	How well do the in-year admission systems in other local authority areas serve the interests of your looked after children?	
	□Not at all □⊠Not well □Well □Very well □Not applicable ⁶	
iii.	How well does your in-year admissions system serve the interests of children who are looked after by other local authorities but educated in your area?	
	□Not at all □Not well □Well □⊠Very well □Not applicable ⁶	

⁴ By in-year we mean admission at the start of any school year which is not a normal point of entry for the school concerned (for example at the beginning of Year 2 for a five to eleven primary school) and admission during the course of any school year after the end of the statutory waiting list period (ie 31 December) in normal years of admission.

⁵ 'Not applicable' will only be appropriate if there are no children falling within this definition.

⁶ 'Not applicable' will only be appropriate if there are no children falling within this definition.

iv. How well does your in-year admissions system serve the interests of previously looked after children?
□Not at all □Not well □Well □⊠Very well □Not applicable ⁶
v. If you wish please give examples of any good or poor practice or difficulties which support or exemplify your answers about in-year admissions for looked after and previously looked after children:
Examples of good practice:
 Swift processing of in-year applications First choice school being allocated Admissions meeting arranged in a timely manner Admissions Authorities being clear with schools that LAC and PLAC must be admitted and supporting them to do so. Timely information sharing once school place is offered
Examples of poor practice (other Admissions Authorities outside LBWF):
 Information about child's previous attainment, progress and behaviour being requested and used to consider the offer of a place for LAC Schools refusing to admit LAC on the grounds that they have a high number of vulnerable children Lack of challenge from the Admissions Authority when a school refuses to admit Schools attempting to interview children before offering a place Drift and delay in processing in year admissions for LAC Lack of knowledge around the priority for PLAC Schools requesting funding above and beyond the child's Pupil Premium allocation as a condition of admittance. Some admission authorities accepting and processing applications from foster carers without requesting evidence of legal status and/or communicating with social care or Virtual School Children in care and previously Looked After Children placed on waiting lists by some authorities Placing authorities advised by some admission authorities to direct schools to admit children in care as a matter of course
C. Children with special educational needs and/or disabilities
i. How well served are children with special educational needs and/or disabilities who have an education health and care plan that names a school when they need to be admitted in-year?
□Not at all □Not well □Well □Very well □ Not applicable ⁶

i		are children with special educa o not have an education health ted in-year?	
	□Not at all □Not	well □Well ⊠Very well □Doi	n't know
iii.	•	oles of good or poor practice or wers about in-year admissior and/or disabilities:	• •
IV.	of other children:	rovide any comments about in -	-year admissions in respec
D.	 Fair access proto i. Has your fair accemainstream scho ⊠ ⊠ Yes for primar ⊠ ⊠ Yes for secon 	ess protocol been agreed ⁷ with ols in your area? 'y	the majority of state-funded
	ii. If you have not be	een able to tick both boxes abo	ve, please explain why:
	•	en were admitted to schools in etween 1 April 2019 and 31 Ma	•
		Number of child	Iren admitted
	Type of school	Primary aged children	Secondary aged children
	Community and voluntary controlled	3	33
\ \ 6	Foundation, voluntary aided and academies	3	42
-	Total	6	75

 $^{^{7}}$ An existing protocol remains binding on all schools up until the point at which a new one is adopted.

iv. How well do you consider hard to place children are served by the fair access protocol in your area?	
□Not at all □Not well □Well ⊠□Very well □Not applicable ⁸	
v. Please make any relevant comment on the protocol not covered above if you wish.	
E. Any other comments on the admission of children in-year not previously raised if you wish.	
Section 3 - Other matters Are there any other metters that the least outherity would like to raise that have not	
Are there any other matters that the local authority would like to raise that have not been covered by the questions above?	
LBWF would like summer born issue to be addressed in new School Admissions Code	
Section 4 - Feedback	
We would be grateful if you could provide any feedback on completing this report to inform our practice for 2021.	
Thank you for completing this template.	
Please return to Lisa Short at OSA.Team@schoolsadjudicator.gov.uk by 30 June 2020	

⁸ 'Not applicable' would mean that there were no hard to place children for which the protocol was required.