

DETERMINATION

Case reference: VAR/000575

Admission Authority: The Governing Body of The Al-Hijrah School

Date of decision: 21 March 2012

Determination

In accordance with section 88E of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I approve with modification the variation to the admission arrangements determined by the Governing Body of The Al-Hijrah School.

I determine that for admissions in September 2012 the admission arrangements shall be as set out in the annex to this determination.

The referral

1. Birmingham City Council (the council), writing on behalf of the Governing Body of The Al-Hijrah School (the school) has referred a variation to the Adjudicator about the admission arrangements for the school, a Voluntary Aided Islamic school, for September 2012.
2. The variation that has been requested is that the admission arrangements be changed in order to allow the school to admit children to the Reception Year in 2012, and to cease to make admissions at that same time to Year 7.

Jurisdiction

3. The referral was made to me in accordance with section 88E of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (the Act) which states that:

“where an admission authority (a) have in accordance with section 88C determined the admission arrangements which are to apply for a particular school year, but (b) at any time before the end of that year consider that the arrangements should be varied in view of a major change in circumstances occurring since they were so determined, the authority must [except in a case where the authority’s proposed variations fall within any description of variations prescribed for the purposes of this section] (a) refer their proposed variations to the adjudicator, and (b) notify the appropriate bodies of the proposed variations”.

I am satisfied that the proposed variation is within my jurisdiction.

Procedure

4. In considering this matter I have had regard to all relevant legislation, guidance and the School Admissions Code (the Code).

The documents I have considered in reaching my decision include:

the council's e-mail of referral of 10 February 2012 and supporting documents;

the determined arrangements for 2011/2012 and the proposed variation to those arrangements;

a copy of the council's booklets for parents seeking admission to primary and secondary schools in the area in September 2012 ;

a copy of the letter notifying the appropriate bodies about the proposed variation; and

copies of relevant documents relating to the change in circumstances at the school which were provided by the council with the variation request, including the proposed revised admission arrangements and the existing and proposed Supplementary Information forms.

5. I have also taken account of the information I received during a meeting I convened at the school on 24 February 2012, attended by representatives of the school and of the council, and of the information provided to me following that meeting, which included a copy of the papers provided to the council's Cabinet when it determined the school's proposal to change the lower age limit of the school.

Other matters

6. A revised School Admissions Code came into force on 1 February 2012. However, this request is for a variation to admission arrangements that were determined during the period of currency of its antecedent, which is the Code to which I must therefore have regard in making this determination. References to "the Code" which I shall make here are therefore to the Code in force immediately prior to 1 February 2012.

Background

7. On 6 October 2011, the Governors of The Al-Hijrah School published a statutory notice proposing a change in age-range of the school from 11-16 to 4-16 with effect from 1 January 2012.

8. The description given in the proposal of the alteration for which approval was being sought was that the lower age-range of the school be lowered from 11 years to 4 years. In 2002, the previously independent school for children

aged 4-16 had acquired voluntary aided status as a secondary school, leaving the primary years, which share a building with pupils of secondary age, forming an independent, fee-paying school.

9. The proposal did not state whether or not admissions to Year 7 were to cease as a result of the change, and no proposed admission arrangements for Year R were provided. The proposal was approved by the council, as decision-maker, on 28 November 2011.

10. The council wrote to the Schools Adjudicator on 10 February 2012 asking on behalf of the Governors that a variation in the school's admission arrangements be considered. As the council pointed out in their referral, a change in the admission arrangements is necessary if there are to be any admissions to Year R in September 2012, since those currently in place refer to Year 7.

11. The council also informed the Adjudicator, at the same time that the variation request was made, that the school had filled the places created in the primary years by the implementation of the proposal in January 2012 with in-year admissions. It became clear at the meeting which I held that all the children attending the former fee-paying independent primary school and wishing to do so had transferred to the roll of the voluntary aided school as part of this process, and that other admissions had taken place, in some year groups (including the current Year 6) up to a figure of 60, the existing admission number for admissions to Year 7 for the school.

12. The information which was provided to me as part of the variation request was incomplete. Each of the following matters was discussed at the meeting held with the parties on 24 February 2012:

(i) no proposed admission number was given, although a figure of 60 was shown in the attached proposed admission arrangements for Year R;

(ii) no net capacity information for the school premises was supplied;

(iii) no information on previous pupil numbers, or the expected demand for places was given;

(iv) no details of neighbouring schools, and therefore of any response which they might have made (which is requested of those requesting a variation) was supplied.

13. The covering e-mail sent with the form requesting a variation in the school's admission arrangements also provided a copy of proposed admission arrangements for Year R in September 2012. At the meeting on 24 February 2012, I raised with those present aspects of these proposed arrangements which did not in my view comply with the requirements of the Code.

14. I also explained at this meeting the difficulties which the timing of the variation request introduced. First, the date on which offers of places at secondary schools for September 2012 must be made (1 March 2012) would be reached before any determination giving effect to the removal of admission arrangements for Year 7 could be issued. I asked the council and the school,

to consider their position regarding the making of such admissions. Secondly, since the date for expressions of preference for reception places for September 2012 had already passed, I asked them to let me know what arrangements would be made in the city, were the requested variation to be approved, to enable expressions of preference from parents seeking places at the school.

15. In view of the pressing timescale, I asked those present at the meeting on 24 February to provide me as soon as possible with the range of information which I had made them aware was outstanding, or which would rectify identified defects concerning the proposed variation.

16. I turn now to a consideration of both the background to this request and to its details, in the light of the response of the parties to that request.

Consideration of Factors

17. I have considered very carefully three matters which I believe are pertinent to my response to the request for a variation in the school's admission arrangements because of the major change in the school's circumstances.

(i) the proposal approved by the council

18. First, I have examined the proposal which was approved by the council. It has been a matter of concern to me whether or not I should proceed with my consideration of the request if my view was that the proposal was not properly made or properly approved. Although I have no jurisdiction concerning either of these matters, I believe I must bear in mind whether or not any decision I make concerning the matter referred to me, and over which I do have jurisdiction, is so compromised by the process that has led to it that it would itself be unsound.

19. Prescribed alterations which may be proposed by the governing body of a voluntary school are described in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007(the Regulations). What the Governors wished in this case to achieve was the extension of the age-range of the existing Voluntary Aided school, the effect of which would increase the number of pupils from 300 to 720, an expansion which would in turn require a significant enlargement of the premises of the school.

20. The Regulations state that if the premises of a school are enlarged so that its capacity is increased by more than 30 pupils, or by 25% or 200 pupils (whichever of these is the lesser), then the change constitutes a prescribed alteration because of the enlargement of the premises. In this case, each of these tests is met, and the Governors should therefore have published proposals for the enlargement of the premises in addition to those which they did publish for an alteration of the lower age limit of the school. I would have expected there either to have been two published (related) proposals, or one statutory notice that contained information about, and that met all the

requirements in respect of, both proposals. The Regulations set out the information which must be included or provided in relation to proposals, and although this is not different for prescribed alterations of the two types which this change constitutes, it is nevertheless of concern to me that in circumstances in which the change being proposed so evidently requires an enlargement of the premises available to the school that it has at no stage been described as such. The information which should have been available as part of the proposals is discussed further below (paragraph 23).

21. The consultation carried out by the Governors concerning the proposal to extend the age-range of the school took place between 3 September and 1 October 2009, more than two years before they published a statutory notice to that effect. I have considered the relevant guidance to which proposers and decision-makers must have regard concerning the process of consultation. This provides no guidelines as to whether consultation prior to the publication of proposals must take place immediately prior to publication, or whether some interval might be reasonable. The requirement that there be such consultation however implies in my view an expectation that the responses elicited might inform the decision as to whether or not the proposal is made, and therefore that they do not have their relevance unduly diminished by the passage of time. Two years is likely in my view in most circumstances to at least call into question whether responses could be considered relevant, and although the publication of proposals is obviously an opportunity for further comments to be made by interested parties, it would nevertheless have been safer had the Governors carried out a further round of consultation before publishing proposals.

22. I have also examined a copy of the papers available to the council in making its decision, from which it is clear that the evidence as to the timing of this consultation and of the consideration by the proposer of the responses which it elicited was available to the council. Had the council taken the view that the proposer had failed in its duty to have due regard to these responses in making its proposal, or not to have acted appropriately to secure them, it would have been open to it to have rejected the proposals on this basis.

23. Members of the council were provided with a copy of the statutory guidance to which they must have regard in coming to their decision, together with a copy of the full statement of the proposals. They should therefore have been aware that in addition to the potential issues concerning the description of the proposal and consultation, the published proposals did not meet the statutory requirements that they should contain

- (i) information about the school's capacity;
- (ii) a statement about the intended provision for children below the age of five, and
- (iii) a statement concerning the need for the additional places that would be created.

Although the proposal contains a statement concerning the capacity of the school, this is an inappropriate (and incorrect) statement that the capacity of

the school will increase from 300 pupils to 600 pupils if the change is approved. The Regulations require that this statement should refer to the net capacity of the school determined in accordance with the Department's guidance, not to the number of pupils it is intended to accommodate.

22. I have seen no evidence that the issue of the adequacy of the published information was brought to the attention of the members of the council.

23. When I met the parties and explained my concerns regarding information that was not provided as part of the published proposals, I asked if could now be provided to me. Calculations of the net capacity of the school were provided by the council subsequently, and are discussed below (paragraph 36). The covering paper which was provided to members of the council also made clear statements concerning the need for additional pupil places. However, I have seen no statement of the provision which it is intended should be made for children below the age of five,

24. I also asked the school whether consultees, and in particular the parent body, had been kept informed of events when the proposal was not published in the autumn of 2009 (as had been the intention), and whether they were aware in the autumn of 2011 that the proposal was still active. Had that been the case, it would in my mind have gone some way to compensating for any difficulty introduced by the long time interval between the consultation which were carried out by the Governors and their publication of proposals. The school has provided me with a number of letters to parents and other members of the faith community written between July and October 2011 which had this latter effect, and with evidence showing that a copy of the Public Notice was circulated to all other schools in Birmingham via the council in October 2011.

25. I have seen a photocopy of the Public Notice concerning the proposals as it appeared in the local press, and I have noted that the council was aware that there had been no objections made to the proposals as a result of this publication when it decided to approve them.

26. The guidance to which decision-makers must have regard, and which was available to the Members of the council when they considered the proposal, sets out the matters to which they are to have regard in considering their decision. The guidance places significant emphasis on the need for decision makers to be satisfied regarding the effect of the proposals on raising standards of local provision. I have seen no evidence that this matter was considered by the council, and in the absence of any statement in the proposals themselves concerning the pre-compulsory education that the school proposed to provide, or of appropriate admission arrangements for the Reception year, I regard this as a significant omission on the part of the council.

27. Decision-makers are also guided to satisfy themselves that any premises required to implement the proposals will be available. I would have expected Members of the council to have been aware of a commitment in writing made by the proprietors of the independent primary school to close and to make the premises occupied by it available to the expanded voluntary school, but they

had to rely instead on a simple statement that this was to happen. The proposals implied that this process would take place, but did not do so explicitly.

28. The proposals contain no information about the need for the extra (primary years) places that would be created, and although the information given to Members of the council was that there was significant pressure on school places in the area as a result of increasing birth rates in recent years, this was not quantified. The proposals contained factual information about the numbers of applicants for the available places in the voluntary (secondary) school prior to the implementation of the proposals, but this is a different matter since the proposals did not involve expanding the availability of such places.

28 Taking all these matters together, I am surprised that the council did not apparently consider whether the proposals met the statutory requirements, or that if they did do so, that they did not decide that this test had not been met. Even if they had thought that the case, they could still have taken the view that they were able to decide the proposals, but seem not to have considered the matter, and I believe they should have.

29. Although I do not have jurisdiction to overturn the council's decision I nonetheless consider the background regarding the proposals to be factors in whether it would be appropriate to approve the variation.

(ii) the request for a variation

30. Secondly, I have considered matters which arise from the making of the variation request. In addition to the information not provided as part of the request, which I shall deal with below, I have been particularly concerned about its timing.

31. In view of the nature of the prescribed alteration to the school given effect by the proposals, which requires there to be admissions to Year R (even if Year 7 admissions were to continue), it would have been helpful if the council had recognised this and either made its approval conditional upon appropriate such arrangements being agreed, as described in the guidance available to it, or it could have required appropriate arrangements to be presented to it. It did neither of these things, and the paper it received limited itself to a discussion of the inadmissibility of the then existing school's practice of admitting equal numbers of boys and girls to Year 7. This is discussed further below.

32. It is not clear to me either why the request for a variation was not made as soon as the proposals had received approval. At the meeting which I held with the parties, I expressed my concern that in the interval between the implementation of the proposals and the notification to the Adjudicator that variation in the admission arrangements was being requested, admissions to the primary age-groups of the school had taken place in spite of the fact that there were no determined admission arrangements other than for admissions to Year 7 in place, and without as far as I have been able to tell there being any general awareness of the availability of those places.

33. No process has taken place in which parents in the general population

who might have wished to have had an application considered for their child for a place at the school have been made aware of this possibility. Such applications should have been canvassed from all those who might seek a place and any that were made should have been considered against the school's oversubscription criteria, if that became necessary.

34. The delay in making the referral also means, first, that the date by which parents must express their preferences for Year R admissions in September 2012 (16 January 2012), has already passed. Parents in Birmingham will not have known of the availability of reception places at the school when expressing their preferences. The booklet for parents on applying for reception places in September 2012 issued by the council does not mention the possibility of there being places at the school. Although, as described above (paragraph 14), I have asked whether the council has arrangements in hand for the appropriate canvassing of applications for September 2012, I have received no information to that effect.

35. I was assured by the school at the meeting which I held on 24 February 2012 that parents and local schools had been kept informed during the autumn of 2011 of the developments at the school, and that there would be a possibility of maintained primary places being created. The evidence for this with which I have been provided has been described above (paragraph 24).

36. Secondly, and as mentioned above (paragraph 14), the timing of the request has also meant that any removal of the existing Year 7 admission arrangements could not be achieved before the national offer date for secondary admissions of 1 March 2012. The council and the school were aware that its secondary admissions booklet for September 2012 describes the school as a secondary school, and that parents had accordingly named it as a preference. The council wrote to me on 28 February 2012 to inform me that in view of this fact, the school and the council were of the view that the current Year 6 age-group in the school could not be considered as constituting the entirety of Year 7 in September 2012, and that additional Year 7 admissions would be needed. On 1 March they informed me that the existing admission arrangements had been used to make 60 offers of Year 7 places for September 2012, meaning that up to 120 places would be needed for this one year and that the council was working with the school to ensure that appropriate accommodation was available for these increased numbers of children. The use of the existing arrangements for the making of these admissions is to be regretted, for reasons which I will set out below (paragraph 41) when discussing the admission arrangements themselves.

37. Although the council initially informed me that the net capacity assessment for the school had yet to be finalised (but that it had received information from the school which it believed was evidence that the school would be able to accommodate 60 children in each age group in a school for 4-16 year-olds), it has now provided net capacity calculations for the premises being occupied by the school. These show an indicated admission number of 60 if the primary school methodology is applied, and of 55 if it is the secondary. In other words, the school and the council will now undoubtedly need to ensure steps are taken so that the "bulge" that will pass through the school as a result of the extra admissions that will take place to Year 7 this year can be successfully

accommodated.

38. The council has also provided a list of the primary schools that are situated within three miles and secondary schools within five miles. This shows 103 primary schools that make admissions to Year R, and 51 secondary schools, within these specified distances. None of the primary schools has objected to the increase in Year R provision which the requested variation would entail. The council has also helpfully now informed me, in an e-mail dated 28 February, that it is in the process of an extensive programme of providing additional primary school places, and will have increased this provision by 8,000 places from the original baseline figure (undated) by September 2012.

(iii) the admission arrangements requested

39. As mentioned above (paragraph 13), concerns which I had concerning the admission arrangements which the school has requested should be used for admissions to Year R in September 2012 were also discussed at my meeting with the parties.

40. Those present were able to clarify that although this had not been stated explicitly, I was being invited to agree a variation in which the admission arrangements for the school no longer referred to admissions made in Year 7, and that it was the intention that there should in future be only one point of entry to the school – Year R. It was also confirmed that the request was that the admission number which should apply as part of the revised arrangements was 60.

41. The proposed arrangements stated that the school would admit children practicing the Islamic faith “in preference to” other pupils (which is not quite the same thing as saying that such children would be given priority) and that “all applicants” (as opposed, as should have been the case, to those wishing to be given priority on the grounds of their faith) would be required to undergo “a verbal assessment” of the ‘practicing the Islamic faith’ criterion. This repeated the requirement in the current arrangements for admissions to Year 7, which had also been provided to me. The Code (paragraph 1.52) makes it clear that interviews of any kind must not form part of the admission process. A previous determination (ADA/001211, issued in 2008) had also been explicit in informing the school that this practice of carrying out interviews in relation to the making of admissions was not permitted. It is a matter of concern that the school appears to have ignored the determination and the Code in continuing to interview applicants. Furthermore, the school continued to admit equal numbers of boys and girls despite the fact that the determination in 2008 allowed this arrangement for admissions in 2009 only, and that they were aware that this practice had more recently been considered to be a breach of the Equality Act 2010, and had been so advised by the council.

42. A second major concern that I raised was that the proposed arrangements did not provide a clear statement concerning deferred entry to Year R, as required by the Code, paragraph 2.69. It seemed to me that, when taken together with the absence of any description in the proposal of the provision to be made for children under the age of five, this absence meant that there was

a significant omission from the background information which should have been available to decision-makers on the proposal as to what the intended educational arrangements were to be for the very youngest pupils.

43. I also explained that the proposed Supplementary Information Form, which had been forwarded to me as part of the proposed admission arrangements, asked for information which could not be used directly to have a bearing on any of the oversubscription criteria which formed part of those arrangements. For example, the nationality of applicants was asked for, as was the name and address of more than one parent. The Code, paragraph 1.83, makes it clear that such information should not be sought.

44. I advised the parties that I would not be able to agree to a variation which resulted in admission arrangements which did not comply with the Code, and therefore invited them to provide me with revised proposals which addressed the concerns listed above.

45. Revised proposed Year R admission arrangements were sent to me by the council, on the school's behalf, on 28 February 2012. Since my view on receipt of these was that there remained a number of aspects which were not in accordance with the Code, I wrote to the Governors on 1 March 2012 saying that I was now considering the use of the powers to amend the requested variation given to the Adjudicator in the Act, section 88E(6)(b), and seeking their views on modifications to both the proposed admission arrangements and Supplementary Information Form which I was proposing to make.

46. In doing so, I made a point of referring to the proposal in the Governors' revised arrangements that the request made of those parents seeking to be given priority on the grounds of their Islamic faith should be that they provide a declaration to the effect that their child follows the faith. I asked that the Governors confirm to me that in constructing this faith-based oversubscription criterion, and as required by the Code (paragraphs 2.50 and 2.52), they had consulted the appropriate religious body (the Association of Muslim Schools UK), and that the school had had regard to any advice which that body had offered them. In view, again, of the pressing need to resolve the variation request, I asked the Governors to let me have their responses by 6 March. I had received no response to this request by 15 March and wrote again to the Governors to say that if I had not heard from them by 20 March, I would need to proceed with my determination. The Governors responded on 19 March, saying that they found my proposals "acceptable and accurate", but making no reference to the matters set out in this paragraph.

47. On 1 March I also provided both the council and the school with a list of the information which I was at that time still seeking from them, some of which has been provided to me subsequently, as described in the foregoing paragraphs.

Conclusions

48. In order that I may agree a variation in the school's admission arrangements for September 2012, I believe that I must be satisfied on three counts.

49. First, I need to be satisfied that the prescribed alteration to the school was not agreed so improperly as to make any change made in consequence of it unsound. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 18-29 above, I have come to the view that the council has acted somewhat incautiously in determining the proposals on the basis of the information that was available to it, given the inadequacy of this. However, I have been given important information subsequently, such as the capacity assessment of the available premises, and have been provided with a clearer picture of the background of a need for additional places in the area. I am mindful also of the fact that the council has made its decision, which I am powerless to overturn, and that the school is now operating as a 4-16 school. Unless the school is not to admit children in Year R in 2012, which outcome would not be desirable in view of the shortage of school places in the area, there is therefore an urgent need for admission arrangements for Year R for September 2012. I have therefore concluded that I should make a determination that gives admission arrangements for September 2012.

50. Secondly, I need to satisfy myself that the information that I have available is sufficient for me to judge the merits of the request. I have discussed the issues involved above, paragraphs 30-38. Although this information was significantly deficient initially, I have been able to clarify matters such as the precise variation being requested and have seen evidence that both those parents and those neighbouring schools most likely to be affected by the change were aware that the intention to provide additional places in the primary years was under active consideration, even if they were not notified directly about the proposed variation in admission arrangements. In view of the very small proportional effect of the addition of 60 reception places on the volume of local provision, I do not think that there is likely to be a significant negative impact of this change, even though I would have preferred to have had secure knowledge to the effect that that view is shared by the local schools themselves.

51. Of greater concern to me is that the variation request could and should have been made in a more timely manner, and that in the time interval which resulted from this delay, the newly created primary school places have been filled in a manner which has not been open and transparent. The closure of the former fee-paying primary school would inevitably have created displaced pupils, who may well have had a very strong call on the new places in any case had more appropriate procedures been adopted. I cannot however let my serious concern that this has happened prevent me from considering the requested variation since to do so would mean the school having no admission arrangements for admissions to Year R in September 2012.

52. Thirdly, I must be satisfied that the admission arrangements that are in place for admissions to the school's reception year in September 2012 are compliant with the requirements of the Code. As explained above, paragraphs

45 and 46, I have consulted the Governors on a set of arrangements which will meet this test in my view, which take account of their original request, of the content of the meeting which I held with them, and of the subsequent revision requested by them. The response of the Governors is described above (paragraph 46). In consequence, since appropriate Year R admission arrangements are needed, I am of the view that those arrangements, as set out in the annex to this determination together with the associated Supplementary Information Form, must be used. I have therefore decided that I should use the power given to me under section 88E(6)(b) of the Act to modify the requested variation so that the admission arrangements for the school for September 2012 are as set out in the annex to this determination. These are the admission arrangements that will apply to the making of all admissions to the school for 2012, including any further admissions to Year 7, after the date of this determination.

53. I trust that the school and the council will use this decision to instigate a process by which the admissions which result are seen to take place in a fair and open way, and that those wishing to do so are given an opportunity to seek a place at the school in September, notwithstanding the passing of the deadline for the expression of preferences in the case of admissions to Year R. I also have a clear expectation that for future years, Year 7 will not be a year group to which admissions will normally be made.

Determination

54. In accordance with section 88E of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, I approve with modification the variation to the admission arrangements determined by the Governing Body of Al -Hijrah School.

55. I determine that for admissions in September 2012 the admission arrangements shall be as set out in the annex to this determination.

Dated: 21 March 2012

Signed:

Schools Adjudicator: Dr Bryan Slater

ANNEX

Determined Birmingham School Admission Arrangements September 2012

School name	Al-Hijrah School		
School address	Burbidge Road, Bordesley Green, Birmingham, B9 4US		
Headteacher	Mr Mohammed Saqib	Tel no:	0121 773 7979
Admission Number:	60		

	<p>Al-Hijrah School is a voluntary aided Islamic school for boys and girls in the 4-16 age range. The Governing Body is the admissions authority for the school; priority will be given to children practising the Islamic faith.</p> <p>The school provides education for boys and girls in parallel gender streams. Children are admitted to the school's Reception Year, but in 2012 only admissions will also take place to Year 7. The number of places available in Reception is 60.</p>
Application Procedure for Places in Reception	<p>Parents must complete the Local Authority application form and return this to the Local Authority. An additional Al-Hijrah supplementary information form MUST be completed and returned to Al-Hijrah School by the closing date stated on the form if the applicant wishes to be considered against the religious oversubscription criterion. The Al-Hijrah supplementary information can be obtained from the Local Authority or from the school.</p> <p>Parents will be informed of the outcome of their application on the 23rd April 2012 (or the next working day or as determined by the Local Authority).</p>
Oversubscription Criteria	Where the number of applications exceeds the number of places available, the Governing Body will apply the following criteria:
Criteria	a) Looked After children practising the Islamic faith
	b) Children practising the Islamic faith with a brother or sister at the school who will still be in attendance at the time the sibling enters the school.
	c) Other children practising the Islamic faith
	d) Other looked after children.
	e) Other children with a brother or sister at the school who will still be in attendance at the time the sibling enters the school.
	f) Other children
Random Allocation Procedure:	<p>In the event of oversubscription in any of the above the categories, offers will be made by random allocation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Using a Random Number Generator each applicant will be electronically allocated a number within each category.

	<p>2. Applicants will be randomly selected using an electronic system in order to decide which applicant should take priority in each category.</p> <p>3. Any subsequent places offered from the waiting list will be offered using a fresh round of the random allocation process. This will include applications that have been accepted after the closing date.</p> <p>The process will be supervised by a person that is independent of Al-Hijrah School. That person will check that each of the above stages is properly carried out.</p>
Islamic Faith	Evidence will be required in the form of a declaration signed by the child's parent/carer that the child practices the Islamic faith
Late applications	Late applications will be considered in accordance with the oversubscription criteria and if there are no places available the child will be placed on the waiting list after all the other applicants.
In year applications	From September 2010, all in year applications should be made through the Local Authority in which your child resides.
Waiting list	The waiting list will be generated using the oversubscription criteria. Any places that become available will be allocated according to the waiting list.
Appeals	If a child is refused admission, parents have a right to appeal to an independent appeals panel. An appeal form can be obtained from the school office.
Notes	Children will be admitted in the September following their fourth birthday. Parents/carers may defer their child's admission to school until later in the school year or until the term in which the child reaches compulsory school age (the term following their fifth birthday). Parents can also request that their child attend on a part-time basis until they reach statutory school age.
Sibling definition:	<p>Children (siblings) with an older brother or sister already at the school who will still be in attendance at the time the sibling enters the school.</p> <p>Siblings (brothers or sisters) are considered to be those children who live at the same address and either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) have one or both natural parents in common; ii) are step-brothers or sisters; iii) are adopted or fostered by a common parent.

Al-Hijrah Through School

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FORM September 2012

All sections must be complete. Please write N/A if not applicable.

PUPIL DETAILS

Surname:		Chosen Name:	
Forename:		Middle Names:	
Date of Birth:			<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Home Address:			
Postcode:		Home Telephone:	
		Religion:	
Is your child a 'Looked After Child'?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

DETAILS OF SIBLINGS AT AL-HIJRAH THROUGH SCHOOL

Full Name of Brother/ Sister (already in school – Primary and Secondary Sections):		Date of Birth:	Class/Form:
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			

PARENT GUARDIAN DETAILS

Parent Surname:				Parent Forename/s:			
Contact Details:	Home or mobile telephone:						
			Email:				

ISLAMIC INFORMATION

If you wish your child to be given priority as one who practices the Islamic faith, please provide a declaration that he/she practices the faith, signed by a parent/guardian.

PARENT/GUARDIAN DECLARATION

1. I have provided correct information and understand that the provision of false information may affect the offer of a place for my child.
2. I have received the Admissions Policy and understand that places will be allocated accordingly.

Parent/Guardian Signature:		Date:	
----------------------------	--	-------	--

RETURNING THE FORM

Before returning your child's application, please check you have completed the following:

Fully completed Form <input type="checkbox"/>	Signed Form <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------

Return Forms
to:

The Admissions Officer
Al-Hijrah Through School
Cherrywood Centre | Burbidge Road | Bordesley Green | Birmingham | B9
4US

T: 0121 773
7979

F: 0121 773 7111

E: [enquiry@al-
hijrah.bham.sch.uk](mailto:enquiry@al-hijrah.bham.sch.uk)

W: www.alhijrahschool.co.uk
