

PUPIL PLACE PLANNING: REGISTER OF FACTORS INFLUENCING FORECASTS

ID No	Raised by	Date Raised	Description	Potential scale of impact	Potential speed of impact	Unadjusted Impact	Confidence in data or assumption	How data is handled	Owned by	COMMENTS
Factors built into projections methodology – ‘above the line’										
1	ECH	Jun-11	Increase/decrease in birth rate - impact on admission numbers	High	High	High	High	High impact, but high confidence in data	SC	
2	ECH	Jun-11	Large housing developments: Phasing, demolitions, completions and mix	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Information results from discussions with developers. Good systems in place to track. Strive to improve accuracy by being more detailed.	BH	
3	GS	Jan-12	Small site housing developments: Phasing, demolitions, completions and mix	Low	High	Medium	High	Information largely results from sites with planning permission. Good systems in place to track. Strive to improve accuracy by being more detailed.	BH	
4	ECH	Jun-11	Pupil yield from housing	High	High	High	Medium	Confidence in data. Refreshed yields in 2013 based local research. Be aware of evidence of changes.	BH	
5	GS	Jan-12	Housing developments: Schools likely to be attended	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Possibility of monitoring recent developments to get up to date trends.	LA	
6	GS	Jan-12	Housing developments: Pupils moving in-Borough or new to Borough	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Use planning research and assumptions where possible. Possibility of monitoring recent developments to get up to date trends.	BH	
7	GS	Jan-12	Primary/secondary transfers	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High quality data available	LA	
11	ECH	Jun-11	Changes in cross border movements eg designated area and LA boundary issues	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Monitor trends	CT	Notably affects secondary numbers in Bracknell North. In particular RBWM re Charters and Wokingham re St Crispins
Factors built into projections methodology – ‘below the line’										
8	ECH	Jun-11	Raising of participation age (RPA)	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Monitor trends	MS / SL	
9	ECH	Jun-11	Parental preferences eg to new schools or impact of OFSTED inspections on secondary schools	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Monitor individual school inspection outcomes and possible impact on parental choice	RW	

10	GS	Jun-11	Parential preference for denominational or selective secondary education	Low	Low	Low	Low	Monitor trends	LA	
21	GS	Apr-13	Parential preference for denominational or selective primary education	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Monitor individual school changes and possible impact on parental choice	LA	May be significant as new schools are opened. Linked to 13
12	ECH	Jun-11	Immigration/emigration e.g. Nepali and Eastern European groups	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Monitor NI data, Schools Census, other sources of hard evidence and trends evidenced in local service take up	SC	
13	ECH	Jun-11	Development of Academies/free schools eg Holyport (secondary) - effect on popularity and possible changes in DA and/or admissions numbers	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Monitor individual school changes and possible impact on parental choice	RW / CT	
14	ECH	Jun-11	Provision for, and numbers of, pupils with special educational needs	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High quality data available	SMcK	
15	GS	Jun-11	Provision for, and numbers of, pupils out of school eg at PRU	Low	Low	Low	High	High quality data available	RW	
16	ECH	Jun-11	Movements in or out of other provision – home educated or private schools	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Monitor anecdotal and published evidence and trends	RW	Home education numbers stable. If have closure of a private school then implication on local demand for places
17	GS	Jun-11	Within year mobility eg movements of traveller communities, armed forces mobility, casual admissions	Low	High	Medium	Medium	Unpick variables and treat as accurately as possible. High quality data available for some factors. Monitor trends	RW	
18	GS	Jul-12	Economic vitality of Bracknell Forest	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Local economic assessments (when published). Local indicators on BORIS	GS	
19	SJ	Jul-12	Families with children with SEN tend to live in new houses, with adaptations made, and want to attend school close to new home.	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Anecdotal evidence. Small numbers but significant impact on facilities required in local schools	GS	Need to be aware when planning new schools
20	GS	Jan-13	Early indication of trends in births and numbers 0 to 4 in Early Years settings	Low	Medium	Low	High	Some actuals based on services provided. Some anecdotal	KF	
22	GS	Apr-13	Changes to benefits causing family mobility	Low	Low	Low	Low	Anecdotal evidence.	KF	

Standard Guidance Notes for Prioritisation

These tables set out the guidance as to what is defined in terms of likelihood and impact

Likelihood Description	Definition
High (3)	Risk is likely to occur (70% - 100%)
Medium (2)	Risk may occur (but is not inevitable) (30% - 70%)
Low (1)	Risk is unlikely to occur (i.e will only occur in exceptional circumstances) (0% - 30%)
Impact Description	Definition
High (3)	Risks resulting in – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive permanent or long term injuries / sickness • Loss of life • Long or medium term interruption to school activities • Adverse national publicity • Difficult to handle local press interest • Negative consequences for most pupils, staff or parents • Litigation almost certain and difficult to defend • Material financial loss • Breaches of law punishable by imprisonment or issues considered critical by OFSTED Inspectors
Medium (2)	Risks resulting in – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical treatment required • Short term interruption to school activities • Negative consequences for many pupils, staff or parents • Litigation to be expected • Significant financial loss • Breaches of law punishable by fines or issues considered important by OFSTED Inspectors • Breaches of national or professional regulations/standards
Low (1)	Risks resulting in – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No injuries beyond “first aid” level • Minor or no significant disruption to school activities • Negative effects on a few pupils, staff or parents only • Unlikely to cause complaint/litigation • Negligible financial loss • Breaches of local procedures/standards