



Leicester  
City Council

**OVERVIEW SCRUTINY AND MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**13<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

**CABINET**

**31<sup>st</sup> March 2008**

---

**ADMISSIONS ARRANGEMENTS FOR ENTRY IN 2009/10**

---

**Report of the Corporate Director for Children and Young Peoples Services**

**1.1 Purpose of the Report**

As Admissions Authority for the majority of maintained schools in the City Leicester City Council is required to consult upon and publish its admission arrangements for entry in September 2009/10 by 15<sup>th</sup> April 2008.

This report briefs Cabinet on the outcome of a recent Consultation exercise on Admission Arrangements for 2009/10 and seeks immediate approval for City Council admission arrangements for 2009/10.

The report also updates Cabinet on performance s improvement at Secondary Transfer for September 2008 and draws attention to other possible admission developments for 2009/10.

**1.2 Recommendations**

Recommendations and summary outcomes for Cabinet's consideration are detailed at Section 6 and **Appendix A** of this Report . Recommendations themselves are summarised below.

Cabinet is asked to:

- 1.2.1 Note the improved performance at secondary transfer for September 2008 as detailed at Section 2.2 below and the rationale behind the current consultation.

- 1.2.2 Note respondents' views on proposed variations to oversubscription/ allocation criteria and consider related issues.

Cabinet is asked to agree the following recommendations:

- 1.3.1 Proposal 1: The merging of current Criterion 1 and 2 (Children in care and Children on the Child Protection register/ From 1 April 2008, children subject to a child protection plan)  
Recommendation 1: Maintain the status quo with two separate criteria .  
Rationale – legal requirement.

- 1.3.2 Proposal 2: The removal of current criterion 5, 'pupils who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs' (SEN).  
Recommendation 2: Remove current criterion 5 from the oversubscription criteria used to allocate school places. Rationale – legal requirement.

In recognition of the imperative to ensure pupils' needs are met as quickly as possible the admissions and SEN teams will liaise closely over individual cases.

- 1.3.3 Proposal 3: Re-instate the secondary sibling link (current criterion 4) across all secondary year groups.  
Recommendation 3: Maintain the status quo. Rationale – maintain performance and promote parental choice.

The admissions team will continue to monitor the impact of this criterion to inform future admission arrangements.

- 1.3.4 Proposal 4: The introduction and ranking of a new criterion – 'Children of Mothers fleeing Domestic Violence'.  
Recommendation 4: Introduce a new criterion for the children of *parents/ carers* fleeing domestic violence and place this immediately before distance in the priority order. Rationale - protect the vulnerable.

- 1.3.5 Recommendation 5: Agree new oversubscription priority allocation criteria to reflect decisions taken in connection with above recommendations.

- 1.3.6 Admission numbers for 2009/10: Cabinet is recommended to agree, the proposed Admission Numbers detailed at **Appendix A** to allow for formal publication of these arrangements from 15<sup>th</sup> April 2008.

- 1.3.7 Note that further mid year admission number variations may be required to accommodate any Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Phase 1 build programme slippage and emerging Strategy for Change outcomes for the City as detailed in sections 6.2 and 6.3 of the report.

- 1.3.8 Note that should it prove necessary to vary numbers in response to issues detailed at 1.3.7 above and 5.5 below then the Department will seek consent to these necessary changes via a submission to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator at the earliest possible date. Members are asked to note and support this strategy.

## 2.0 REPORT

### Description of the recent consultation process

- 2.1 Each year the City Council consults upon the criteria by which places in its schools are allocated and the number of places in each year group in each maintained school (the Admission Number).
- 2.2 City Council performance at Secondary Transfer for entry in September 2008 has just been reported to the Department for Children, Schools and Families. In Leicester 96.8% applicants will receive either their first, second or third preference. (In September 2007 the comparable figure was reported as 94.2%) In September 2008 84.8% of City applicants will receive their first preference, 9.6% their second and 2.4% their third preference.
- 2.3 For entry in 2009/10 the City Council has therefore focused upon a limited number of changes to allocation/ oversubscription criteria and the admission number in each school.
- 2.4 The City Council has done this as secondary transfer performance has improved in recent years and there is also a need to reflect upon the potential impact of a number of local and national initiatives such as Building Schools for the Future and the newly announced Strategy for Change.
- 2.5 The City Council is therefore seeking to maintain performance at secondary transfer, ensure stability and increase parental choice.
- 2.6. Two possible allocation criterion changes within the current consultation have been suggested by Tribal Education as part of a strategic review of admissions and school place planning undertaken during November and December 2006.
- 2.7 The current City consultation document for admission arrangements for entry in 2008 was issued to 300 nominated stakeholders on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2008 and responses invited by 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2008. The consultation was also available via the Council's web site. A list of consultees is detailed at **Appendix C**. Responses are summarised at Section 3 below.
- 2.8 Prior to the release of the consultation documents a number of these issues were the subject of discussion with both the statutory Admissions Forum and the Chair of this Forum. Following the end of the consultation period responses have also been considered by the statutory Admissions Forum on 26th February 2008. The collective views of Admissions Forum are reported below and inform recommendations within this report. This report has also been received by Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 13 March 2008 and views incorporated.
- 2.9 As detailed at 2.1 above consultation for 2009/10 has sought views on two aspects of the admissions process in community maintained schools within the City.

## 2.10 Potential revisions to Priority oversubscription allocation criteria to secure improve parental choice.

Consultation sought views on four potential changes.

### **Proposal 1**

The merging of current Criterion 1 and 2 (see **Appendix D**)

Criterion 1 Children in care of a Local Authority (previously known as Looked After Children)

Criterion 2 Pupils who are on the Child Protection Register and need to attend an alternative school to avoid the abuser. (*From 1 April 2008, children who are on the Child Protection Register and need to attend an alternative school to avoid the abuser*)

**Background:** Both of these criteria seek to support vulnerable young people and, in accordance with local and national prioritisation, it was reasoned that the Admissions Service should treat these equally.

**Anticipated impact:** Very little.

### **Proposal 2:**

To consider the removal of current criterion 5, 'pupils who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs' (SEN).

#### **Background:**

In December 2006, Leicester City Council engaged the services of independent consultants from the Tribal Group to explore and report on Leicester City Council's School Admission arrangements. The Tribal Group's recommendation in relation to criterion 5 was that it should be removed as the local authority SEN service has extended statutory powers to nominate a school and to admit such pupils, even if a school is full.

**Anticipated impact:** Although small, such a change would most likely increase the number of parental preferences being met.

### **Proposal 3:**

To consider re-instating the secondary sibling link (current criterion 4) across all year groups.

**Background:** In December 2006 the Tribal Group recommended that it ought to include all secondary age\_year groups and not be restricted to certain year groups.

#### **Anticipated impact:**

This proposal would effectively restore the position that prevailed for secondary entry prior to 2004. Data evidencing the impact of the introduction of our current sibling criterion is detailed in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1** shows that the introduction of the Year 9 requirement in 2005 resulted in an increased number of preferences being met on distance in successive years. In 2007, 47% more preferences were met on distance than compared to 2004.

If a sibling connection across all year groups is reintroduced then it is highly likely that this will both discriminate against children who do not have siblings in Year 10 and 11, and reduce the number of applications being met under Criterion 8 (Distance).

Table 1

Year	Criterion 4	Total of Criterion 8 (prefs met on distance)
Entry 2004	Sibling across all years	255
Entry 2005	Sibling restricted to Year 9 and below	305
Entry 2006		489
Entry 2007		485

If this criterion was reintroduced across all year groups, it may also generate appeals from children who were unsuccessful during 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 admissions transfer process.

**Proposal 4:**

To invite views on the introduction and ranking of a new criterion – ‘Children of Mothers fleeing Domestic Violence’

**Background:** For a number of years, the Admissions Service has received applications from mothers who have suffered domestic violence and have had to be re-located for their safety. In such cases, mothers often have little option but to resort to the appeal process and are forced to re-live the abuse suffered when explaining their situation to Panel Members. (It should be noted that this criterion is superseded if children are already covered by current Criterion 2 – children on child protection register)

If accepted the children of Mothers fleeing Domestic Violence’ criterion is expected to be ranked before distance. In addition, applications received citing this new criterion would only be considered if authorised by a Senior Social Worker.

**Anticipated impact:** The impact will be minimal on the overall numbers but of great assistance to children affected by domestic violence.

- 2.11 Revised admission numbers to reflect known developments. During the autumn of 2007 the Department commissioned a review of secondary school projections for the next 10 years as part of its scrutiny of its Building for the Schools programme. This review found projections to be sound however a number of minor changes are indicated in **Appendix A** to accommodate notified BSF Phase 1 outcomes and other planned activities e.g. Rebuilding of Taylor Road Primary School.

The Department has commissioned a similar review of primary place projections and this will inform thinking in connection with a new Strategy for Change.

This Strategy for Change will look across our whole school estate and secure a fully

integrated capital strategy that will deliver facilities for primary provision and 14-19 years olds across schools and the further education system.

- 2.12 Relationship to previous consultation exercises: Members will recall that last year's admission consultation exercise indicated that the Authority was minded to make significant changes to admission arrangements from 2009 onwards. Views were sought at that point on new families of schools and considerable interest and debate was generated throughout the City.

The Authority remains of the view that there is a need to secure enhanced neighbourhood working and the delivery of integrated services across the City. Schools will of course be central to this. *No firm revised admission proposals have however been consulted upon or proposed at this stage given current developments and the need to maintain stability.* It is believed that this position is welcomed by City Headteachers at this point given the challenges presented by the need to Transform Leicester's Learning and secure immediate school improvement.

- 2.13 Expression of interest from other school promoters: Members will recall media coverage of receipt of an expression of interest from the I-Foundation in establishing a new voluntary aided Hindu school within the City. Although initial public consultation has been conducted by I Foundation the City Council has not received a formal detailed communication stating intent to proceed. There is therefore no reference to this potential development in this current consultation exercise and report.

### **3. Responses to Consultation exercise**

- 3.1 In total the Consultation attracted 22 respondents. This is considerably less than last year's consultation with respect to arrangements for entry in September 2008.

Consultation respondents	Number of responses received
Secondary schools	9
Primary schools	4
Infant Schools	1
Junior Schools	2
Admissions Forum	4
Other Agencies/Services	2

#### 4. Questions asked and answers received

Q1. Do you support the merging of criterion 1 and 2?	<b>YES</b>	19
	NO	0
	No comment	3
Q2. Do you support the removing of criterion 5, 'pupils who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN)?	<b>YES</b>	14
	NO	5
	No comment	3
Q3. Do you agree to re-instate the secondary sibling link (criterion 4) across all year groups?	<b>YES</b>	11
	NO	7
	No comment	4
Q4. Do you agree to the introduction and ranking of a new criterion for children of 'Mothers fleeing domestic violence'?	<b>YES</b>	17
	NO	1
	No comment	4
Q5. Do you agree with the figure for your school?	<b>YES</b>	13
	NO	3
	No comment	6
Q6. Do you agree with the figure for other schools in your area?	<b>YES</b>	11
	No	4
	No comment	7

A summary document of responses received can be inspected in the Members Library.

#### 5. Analysis of consultation outcomes

5.1 With regard to **Question 1** (merging criteria 1 & 2) it is clear that this proposal is supported by respondents including the independent Admissions Forum. Recent legal advice has however advised that these criteria should be kept separate to maintain the primacy accorded in law to pupils in care of a local authority.

*It is therefore recommended that current criteria 1 & 2 be retained in their current form.*

5.2. With regard to **Question 2** (*removing of current criterion 5, 'pupils who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN)*) the position is less clear.

The proposal is supported by the majority of respondents and this change itself was suggested by external consultants Tribal Education in 2006. The number of young people affected is relatively small. It is reasoned that no child with special needs would be disadvantaged by this change as the Local Authority has a reserve power to name and place children in required schools. Schools themselves however may experience difficulties with this change as one possible outcome is that they would fill normally and then be required to accept a child with an SEN statement above their given admission number.

It is the view of the Special Needs Service within the Local Authority that this may lead to potential conflict and delays in admission of this group of young people to schools.

Given the limited number and responses and differences of view upon this matter further legal advice has been sought on this issue.

The admission of pupils with a statement of special educational need is addressed at Paragraph 2.6 of the statutory Admissions Code that governs admissions to all maintained schools. This reads:

*“All governing bodies are required by Section 324 of the Education Act 1996 to admit to the school a child with a Statement of Educational Needs that names the school. This is not an oversubscription criterion. Schools must admit such children whether they have places or not”.*

Admissions Forum have discussed this matter and it is clear that the Forum would be in favour of this proposal but only if this is found to be a legal requirement. Legal advice has been sought on this matter.

It is the view of Legal Services that this should not feature as an oversubscription criterion and therefore Cabinet are recommended to remove this from our oversubscription criteria as indicated in the consultation document.

Cabinet will wish to note that the implication of this is that at the point of transfer all children will be included in the transfer round regardless of whether they have a statement or not. This will mean that we as an admitting authority will no longer be able to give children with statements an advantage – instead they will be considered under all the other criteria alongside all other children. This will however, in all likelihood, result in an increase in parental preference performance.

- 5.3 On the reinstatement of the secondary sibling link across all years (**Question 3**), the majority of respondents supported this measure. The independent Admissions Forum were however in favour of maintaining the status quo with a Year 9 cut off point.

Once again Cabinet’s attention is drawn to the small number of responses and recent experience within the City.

Prior to 2004 oversubscription criteria/ allocation took account of sibling connection in all secondary year groups. **Table 1** above however makes clear that the introduction of the current criteria (with a cut off at Year 9) led to an increased number of admissions on the basis of distance – a measure of parental choice.

Conversely, It may be argued however that retention of this criterion supports families from particular heritage groups who may have children across a wide age range. Research by Tribal Education in 2006 with young people however found that they themselves placed a higher priority upon peer rather than sibling relationships at transfer.



In view of the outcomes detailed in **Table 1** and differing views on this matter the Department recommend that careful consideration is given to any decision to re-introduce the sibling link across all year groups.

The current cut-off at Year 9 has clearly meant a significant increase in meeting parental preferences from children in the locality that previously would have otherwise been disadvantaged.

Key issues for Cabinet to consider include:

- The desirability of keeping family groups together, even though independent research showed that secondary level children are more likely to go to school in friendship groups and not with older siblings (Years 10 and 11).
- Not all schools are the same in terms of performance and curriculum offer. Parents and pupils may wish to express a preference for a school or specialism that is not available in their immediate locality. A change to allocation criteria that reduces probability of allocation on distance will impact negatively upon parental choice.
- If the sibling link is brought in across all year groups a child with a sibling in Year 10 who may live in the county may stand a better opportunity of successfully gaining a place at a city school than a City resident only child living in the immediate locality.
- Children in Year 11 only realistically stay in school until about May, after which many are on examination leave and therefore family groups would not in reality be going to school together.
- Refugee, migrant or traveller families who have only recently moved into the City may be disproportionately disadvantaged.
- As detailed at 2.2 above, this year 96.8% of all children have successfully gained a place at one of their preference based schools. If the sibling link is re-introduced this figure will drop and City Council performance in future years will be negatively affected.

*In view of the above Cabinet is recommended to maintain the status quo and retain the cut off at Year 9.*

5.4 On **Question 4** (introduction and ranking of a new criterion for children of mothers fleeing domestic violence) respondents were clear in their support. It is recommended that this proposal be accepted. In recognition that fathers too may be the subject of domestic violence Cabinet may wish to vary this criterion to read “children of parents fleeing domestic violence”.

5.5 With regard to Questions 5 & 6 in connection with admission numbers Cabinet will wish to note that the following schools reported dissatisfaction with their proposed admission number or numbers associated with schools in their locality.

School	Do you agree with the figure for your school?	Do you agree with the figure for other schools in your area?	Observation
Babington	School would be better served with a more realistic AN of 180	Increase at Soar Valley compounds problem	AN at this school to be reviewed during 2008/09
Riverside	Trends suggest AN unattainable in immediate future		AN at this school to be reviewed during 2008/09
Sir Jonathan North	School report AN previously set at 260		School has never had AN of 260

In view of the observations above the Admission Numbers at the above school will remain as detailed in **Appendix A**.

5.6 Summary recommendations are incorporated at Section 1 above and associated revised admission numbers detailed at **Appendix A** below.

## 6. Admission Number recommendations & next steps

6.1 Recommendation for Admission arrangements for 2008: Cabinet is recommended to agree the proposed Admission Numbers and proposed Priority Subscription criteria detailed at Section 1 above to allow for formal publication of these arrangements from 15<sup>th</sup> April 2008.

6.2 Members are reminded that schools have a right to appeal to the Schools Adjudicator about the admission number set. Having been provided with an opportunity to review these however it is not expected that any City school will wish to do so.

6.3 Recommendation on any further changes required to accommodate potential slippage in Building for Schools Programme (BSF) Phase 1: Proposals within this paper reflect the Phase 1 project plan at the time of writing. Although it is not envisaged that any slippage will occur the Department are mindful of the need to act prudently in this matter. Members are advised that should it prove necessary to vary numbers in response to building development the Department will seek consent to any necessary changes via a submission to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator at the earliest possible date. Members are asked to note and support this strategy.

## 8. Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising directly from the proposals in this report, although admissions arrangements in general play a part in promoting the effective use of resources across schools. Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance & Efficiency, C&YP, ext 7750.

## 9. Legal implications

The legal issues are dealt with in the main body of the report and there are no other issues to draw to Cabinet's attention. Guy Goodman, Head of Community Services Law - ext 7054.

## 10. Other Implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References Within Supporting information
Equal Opportunities	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sections 5.2 &amp; 5.3</b>
Policy	<b>No</b>	
Sustainable and Environmental	<b>No</b>	
Crime and Disorder	<b>No</b>	
Human Rights Act	<b>No</b>	
Elderly/People on Low Income	<b>No</b>	

## 11. Report author:

**Trevor Pringle**

**Interim Service Director  
Strategic Planning, Commissioning & Performance**

**0116-252-7702**

[Print001@leicester.gov.uk](mailto:Print001@leicester.gov.uk)

**Appendix A: Proposed Admission Numbers for City Schools for 2009/10**

**Appendix B: Proposed priority subscription criteria for 2009/10**

**Appendix C: List of consultees**

**Appendix D: Current priority subscription criteria.**

<b>Key Decision</b>	Yes
<b>Reason</b>	Is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward.
<b>Appeared in Forward Plan</b>	Yes
<b>Executive or Council Decision</b>	Executive (Cabinet)

## Appendix A: Proposed Admission Numbers for City Schools for 2009/10

The following table details revised admission numbers for City schools and information received from other admission authorities within the City.

School Name	AN Sept 2008	AN Sept 2009, if different
Abbey Primary Community School	75	
Alderman Richard Hallam Primary School	90	
Avenue Primary School	75	
Babington Community Technology College	210	
Barley Croft Primary School	45	
Beaumont Leys School	210	
Beaumont Lodge Primary School	30	
Belgrave St Peters C of E Primary School	30	
Braunstone Community Primary School	45	
Braunstone Frith Infant School	75	
Braunstone Frith Junior School	72	
Bridge Junior School	90	
Buswells Lodge Primary School	60	
Caldecote Primary School	60	
Catherine Infant School	110	
Catherine Junior School & Community Centre	110	
Charnwood Primary School	60	
Christ the King Catholic Primary School	50	
Coleman Primary School	90	
Crown Hills Community College	240	
Dovelands Primary School	70	
English Martyrs Catholic School	180	
Evington Valley Primary School	45	
Eyres Monsell Primary School	45	
Folville Junior School	90	
Forest Lodge Primary School	60	

School Name	AN Sept 2008	AN Sept 2009, if different
Fosse Primary School	45	
Fullhurst Community College	180	
Glebelands Primary School	40	
Granby Primary School	60	
Green Lane Infant School	90	
Hamilton Community College	240	
Hazel Primary School	45	30
Heatherbrook Primary School	30	
Herrick Primary School	50	
Highfields Primary School	40	
Holy Cross Catholic Primary School	30	
Hope Hamilton C of E Primary School	45	
Humberstone Infant School	90	
Humberstone Junior School	90	
Imperial Avenue Infant School	60	
Inglehurst Infant School	75	
Inglehurst Junior School	75	
Judgemeadow Community College	240 (Yr 7) All other year groups to naturally fall to 240	240 (Yrs 7 & 8) All other year groups to naturally fall to 240
Kestrels' Field Primary School	50	
King Richard III Infant & Nursery School	60	
Knighton Fields Primary School	35	30
Linden Primary School	60	
Madani High (VA) School	120 (60 boys, 60 girls)	
Marriott Primary School	50	
Mayflower Primary School	55	
Medway Community Primary School	60	
Mellor Primary School	60	
Merrydale Infant School	90	
Merrydale Junior School	90	

School Name	AN Sept 2008	AN Sept 2009, if different
Moat Community College	210	
Montrose Primary School	60	
Mowmacre Hill Primary School	50	
New College Leicester	180	
Northfields House Primary School	50	
Overdale Infant School	90	
Overdale Junior School	90	
Parks Primary School	45	
Queensmead Community Primary School	60	
Riverside Business & Enterprise College	180	
Rolleston Primary School	51	45
Rowlatts Hill Primary School	45	
Rushey Mead Primary School	60	
Rushey Mead School	270	
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	50	
Samworth Enterprise Academy Primary Secondary	60 120	
Sandfield Close Primary School	60	
Scraptoft Valley Primary School	45	
Shaftesbury Junior School	60	
Shenton Primary School	60	
Sir Jonathan North Community College	240	
Slater Primary School	23	
Soar Valley College	255 (Yrs 7 & 10) 240 (Yrs 8, 9 & 11)	255 across all year groups
Sparkenhoe Community Primary School	60	
Spinney Hill Primary School & Community Centre	90	
St. Barnabas C of E Primary School	40	
St. John the Baptist C of E Primary School	68	
St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	40	

School Name	AN Sept 2008	AN Sept 2009, if different
St. Mary's Field Infant School	60	
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	30	
St. Paul's Catholic School	180	
St. Thomas More Catholic Primary School	37	
Stokes Wood Primary School	40	
Taylor Road Primary School	60	90
The City of Leicester College	220	
The Lancaster School	240	
Thurnby Lodge Primary School	30	
Uplands Infant School	120	
Uplands Junior School	120	
Whitehall Primary School	60	
Willowbrook Primary School	60	
Wolsey House Primary School	60	
Woodstock Primary School	60	
Wyvern Primary School	60	

**Proposed priority subscription criteria in accordance with recommendations at Section 1 of the main report are detailed in Appendix B below.**

## Appendix B

### Proposed priority subscription criteria for 2009/10

The proposed priority order criteria for allocation of places for entry into Year 7 for September 2008/9 and for Mid-term entry during 2008-9 academic year except for VA schools and the Samworth Enterprise Academy are as detailed below.

These assume that Cabinet agree all recommendations at Section 1 of this report.

1st Pupils in care of a local authority (previously known as Looked After Children)

---

2<sup>nd</sup> Pupils who are on the Child Protection Register and need to attend an alternative school to avoid the abuser. (From 1 April 2008, *children subject to a child protection plan and need to attend an alternative school to avoid the abuser*)

---

3rd Pupils who live in the Priority Area (former catchment area) for the School.

---

4th Pupils with a sibling (sister or brother) who will be attending the same school in one of the following year groups, Year 7, 8 or 9 from the proposed time of entry.

---

5th Pupils living in the area of a closed school whose parents name one of the linked schools to that area. If there are more of these preferences than places available, we will allocate them to the pupils who live closest in a straight line.

---

6th Pupils whose parents are basing their application on religious convictions.

---

7<sup>th</sup> Children of parents/ carers fleeing Domestic Violence' (Subject to verification by a senior social worker or current City Council procedures for housing reallocation in cases of recognised domestic violence)

---

8th Pupils who live nearest to the school (measured in a straight line).

---

For each preference you make for a school which is oversubscribed, your application will be prioritised with all the others by this priority order. The highest in your ranking which is successful, will be the one offered.

---



## APPENDIX C

### LIST OF CONSULTEES

All Headteachers/Principals of Leicester City Schools
All Chairs of Governors of Leicester City Schools
City of Leicester Governors Association
All members of Leicester City Admissions Forum
All members of Children & Young People's Service Senior Management Team
All members of Teachers' Consultative Committee
All members of Leicester Strategic Partnership
Parent & Carer's Council
All Trade Unions
Learning & Skills Council
Legal Services Division
Youth Inclusion Programme
The Minority Ethnic Language & Achievement Services
Centre for Deaf People
Headteachers/Governors' of Schools in relevant areas
Leicestershire County Council
Nottingham Diocesan Education Service
Diocesan Education Board – Church of England
Madani High School & Community Centre Governing Body
Choice & Inclusion Adviser

## APPENDIX D: Current priority subscription criteria

### Appendix 1

The priority order criteria for allocation of places for entry into Year 7 for September 2008 and for Mid-term entry during 2007-8 academic year except for VA schools:

1st	Pupils in care of a local authority (previously known as Looked After Children).
2nd	Pupils who are on the Child Protection Register and need to attend an alternative school to avoid the abuser.
3rd	Pupils who live in the Priority Area (former catchment area) for the school.
4th	Pupils with a sibling (sister or brother) who will be attending the same school in one of the following year groups, Year 7, 8 or 9 from the proposed time of entry.
5th	Pupils who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs.
6th	Pupils living in the area of a closed school whose parents name one of the linked schools to that area. If there are more of these preferences than places available, we will allocate them to the pupils who live closest in a straight line.
7th	Pupils whose parents are basing their application on religious convictions.
8th	Pupils who live nearest to the school (measured in a straight line).

For each preference you make for a school which is oversubscribed, your application will be prioritised with all the others by this priority order. The highest in your ranking which is successful, will be the one offered.