

RICHMOND UPON THAMES ADMISSIONS FORUM

**16 September 2009, 6.00pm-7.10pm, Teddington Room,
Curriculum and Training Centre, Clifden Road, Twickenham
Chair of meeting: Cllr Stephen Knight**

Present: Hatija Bhatia, Christine Brett, Andrew Cole, Prehlad Dhall, Ian Dickinson, Charles Hoseason, Carol Jerwood, Cllr Bob King Lesley Kirby, Cllr Stephen Knight, Cllr David Marlow, Cllr Brian Miller and Anne-Marie True.

Officer: Matthew Paul (Secretary to the Forum).

Guest: Steve Bolingbroke (Managing Director, Kunskapsskolan UK).

Apologies received from: Richard Burke and Janet Hilton.

	Minutes	Action
1.	<p>Membership.</p> <p>The Forum noted that two members of the Forum – Melissa Cliff and Sara Freeman – had resigned with immediate effect. Replacements would be sought via Governor Support.</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes of previous meeting.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2009 were agreed as a correct record. There were no matters arising.</p>	
3.	<p>Update on proposed Hampton and Twickenham academies.</p> <p>The Secretary outlined the two separate consultation processes, both of which started on 11 September and would end on 26 October: the Local Authority's consultation on the proposed closure of the existing schools on 31 August 2010 and their replacement with academies the following day; and the consultation run by Appleyards (the DCSF-appointed project management company) on the academy proposals.</p> <p>Steve Bolingbroke then gave a presentation on the Hampton and Twickenham academy proposals, who Kunskapsskolan are, what their educational model consists of and how it would coalesce with the best practice in the two schools. Among points that Mr Bolingbroke made were that the proposed academies would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the same admission arrangements, including priority for children attending linked primary schools and full participation in the Fair Access Protocol, as the existing schools and that they would only amend those arrangements in liaison with the Local Authority if the latter were to propose justifiable changes; 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stay firmly within the local family of schools and play their full part in current arrangements for SEN, safeguarding, etc., in accordance with the fact that the LA is co-sponsoring the academies; and ▪ Not take up some of the freedoms that other academies have done, e.g. the broad English national curriculum would be taught, as at present. <p>The brochures of the proposed academies had been put together in response to questions and comments made in the previous round of (informal) consultation with local people that had been carried out between March and June.</p> <p>Members of the Forum then asked the following questions:</p> <p>Q: Would the academies have new teachers? A: No; we would expect all existing staff to, transfer to the academies under TUPE. Sue Demont, Principal of HCC, has been appointed Principal-Designate of the proposed academy at Hampton.</p> <p>Q: It's unfortunate that the brochures don't mention RE or collective worship. A: RE is mentioned in the educational brief that underpins the brochures.</p> <p>Q: What is the rationale for not having any post-16 provision in the proposed academies? A: Previous consultation with parents showed that at Whitton parents are very content with the local provision at Richmond upon Thames College; and at HCC that parents had more mixed views, but that when, with the LA, we looked at the numbers of students who weren't transferring to Richmond upon Thames College or Esher College the total was minimal and would not justify a viable sixth form at the proposed academy. The DCSF have agreed that the case we made was sensible. If the LA subsequently changed its position re post-16 provision in other schools in the borough, we would reconsider our position. Having no post-16 provision has enabled both the proposed admission numbers to be increased to 210, so as to assist with the increased numbers of children coming through the primary schools in the borough. Reaching agreement around these matters demonstrated our commitment to working in partnership with the LA.</p> <p>Q: The proposed sponsor of the proposed academy at Shene told me that he is keen to see post-16 provision at Shene... A: If the Local Authority's position regarding post-16 in schools in the Borough changed, we would work with the LA to reconsider the position.</p> <p>Q: What about exclusions? A: It's a myth that academies exclude pupils all the time. The proposed academies would be inclusive, but might have to exclude pupils if, for example, they posed a threat to the safety of other pupils.</p> <p>The Forum thanked Mr Bolingbroke for his presentation and agreed that a response to the consultations should be sent on its behalf to express its delight that the proposed academies would be retaining the current admission arrangements of the existing schools.</p>	
4	<p>Proposed scheme for in-year admissions.</p> <p>The Forum noted and discussed the proposed scheme and suggested several amendments and additions. The secretary would issue a revised version in due course.</p>	
6.	<p>Date, time and venue of next meeting.</p>	

	Wednesday 10 February 2010, at 5.45pm for 6pm start, in the Teddington Room, First Floor, Curriculum & Training Centre, Clifden Road, Twickenham.	
--	---	--