

# Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2016 for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes

## Outcome of consultation

### Consultation 1 – Changes to admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools

#### Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 69 individual responses had been submitted online and one further response was received by email.
2. The 69 responses were from:
 

Headteacher	3
Parent	67
3. A summary of the responses to questions within the consultation that were received from all sources is set out below in Table A

**Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation for September 2016**

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Bagshot Infant School - introduction of reciprocal sibling link with Connaught Junior School	Enclosure 1 Appendix 2	5	1
2	Hammond Community Junior School - introduction of priority for children attending Valley End and Windlesham Village Infant schools	Enclosure 1	7	1
3	Meath Green Junior School - introduction of a feeder link for children at Meath Green Infant School	Enclosure 1	6	0
4	Wallace Fields Junior School - introduction of a tiered feeder link from Wallace Fields Infant School	Enclosure 1	42	9
5	Worplesdon Primary School – introduction of admission criteria for Year 3	Enclosure 1	3	0
6	Cranleigh Primary School – removal of Published Admission Number for Year 3	Enclosure 1 Appendix 1	0	0
7	Own admission authority schools to be considered in the assessment of nearest school	Enclosure 1 Appendix 3	14	7
8	Start date to primary admissions round	Enclosure 1 Appendix 4	7	15
9	Surrey's Relevant Area	Enclosure 2	5	3

## Analysis of responses to questions within the 2016 admission consultation

4. **Introduction of reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School with Connaught Junior School** - Overall, five respondents agreed with this proposal whilst one was opposed to it.
5. Of the five respondents who agreed with the proposal three were parents and two were headteachers. Of the parents, only one indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
6. Respondents in agreement with the proposal indicated that:
  - Siblings should be placed at the same school or schools next to each other
  - These schools formed a natural pair and served the same community
7. The respondent who was opposed to the proposal was a parent who indicated that they would be directly affected by the proposal. The reason given for not supporting the proposal was because it would exclude pupils from neighbouring towns who might live the same distance from Connaught.
8. **Introduction of priority to Hammond Community Junior School for children attending Valley End and Windlesham Village Infant schools** – Overall, seven respondents agreed with this proposal whilst one was opposed to it.
9. Of the seven respondents who agreed with the proposal five were parents and two were headteachers. One of the headteachers represented a school affected by the proposal. Of the parents, all five indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
10. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
  - Valley End currently has no feeder link
  - Parents are currently put off applying for Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools because they have no feeder links
  - Live in the village of Valley End and may choose this school
  - Provides more equality and options
  - Parents will be less likely to remove their children from Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools
11. The respondent who was opposed to the proposal was a parent who indicated that they would be directly affected by the proposal. The reason given for not supporting the proposal was because they do not want to be forced to send their children to a 'sub par' school that is further away from Connaught and that had they wanted their children to go to Hammond they would have applied to Windlesham Village Infant school.
12. **Introduction of a feeder link from Meath Green Infant School to Meath Green Junior School** – Overall, six respondents agreed with this proposal and none were opposed to it.
13. Of the six respondents who agreed with the proposal, five were parents and one was a headteacher (unrelated school). All five parents declared that they would be affected by the proposal.
14. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
  - Would like child to progress to same schools as his peers
  - Both schools local to home
  - Makes sense that schools work together and for the excellent work of the infant school to continue at the junior school
  - Prevent a lot of extra administration for both schools
  - Enable children to go to same school as friends
  - Schools are close together and other Horley schools are all through schools

- Takes away the worry of child not getting the place they want
  - Without feeder links there will be uncertainty
15. **Introduction of a tiered feeder link from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School** - Overall, 42 respondents agreed with this proposal whilst nine were opposed to it.
16. Of the 42 respondents who agreed with the proposal 41 were parents and one was a headteacher (unrelated school). Of the parents, 33 indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
17. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- Makes sense for schools to have tiered feeder link and will minimise stress and heartache for children
  - The current system is unfair
  - Majority of children do currently go on to the junior school
  - Unsettling for a child not to get in when their friends do
  - Due to close proximity of the two schools it makes sense for them to be a feeder school
  - It will remove the anxiety but remain fair as it still needs to be the nearest school
  - Removes discriminatory element of children without siblings being lower down the order of priorities
  - Gives children continuity and is settling for families to know that their child is likely to follow on through the school
  - Gives greater certainty to families whose siblings are three school years apart
  - Creates logistical difficulties if children allocated schools further away
  - Does not prevent children from Ewell Grove taking up places if they live nearby
  - Important for children to have continuity as children move from the infants to the juniors
  - Whole community benefits as friendships and close ties between children and parents will remain in place
  - All children at Wallace Fields Infant School should automatically be given a place at the junior school
  - It would make life a lot easier if the school's were run as one school
  - Few other schools admit children at aged 7
  - Wallace Fields Infant and Junior schools share out of school arrangements like breakfast, after school and holiday clubs and so infants already know many of the juniors
  - Would help to smooth the transition between infants and juniors
  - Too many out of area children with siblings in the junior who will unfortunately take priority. A new system would be fairer
18. Of the nine respondents who were opposed to the proposal all were parents and eight indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
19. Reasons given for opposing this proposal were as follows:
- Sibling should be higher priority than distance
  - Not good for environment, traffic, safety or life for children and parents
  - Complexity leads to more errors
  - Help children go to their nearest school if they choose to
  - Will affect children attending Ewell Grove Infant School and may endanger its survival
  - It does not include all children at the infant school
  - Tiered sibling link is not good for current parents who already have a child attending
  - Changes would benefit families living on the infant school side and penalise those living on the junior school side
  - Reduces the options for families who have children attending an infant school that does not have a feeder

20. **Introduction of admission criteria for Year 3 at Worplesdon Primary School** - Overall, three respondents agreed with this proposal and none were opposed to it.
21. Of the three respondents who agreed with the proposal two were parents and one was a headteacher (unrelated school). Of the parents, both indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
22. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- Potentially opens up a junior school option for my children
  - Will be welcomed by families who send their children to Wood Street as geographically it makes more sense to send children to a school that is close by rather than another part of Guildford
23. **Removal of Published Admission Number for Year 3 at Cranleigh Primary School** – No respondents commented on this proposal.
24. **Own admission authority schools to be considered in the assessment of nearest school** - Overall, 14 respondent agreed with this proposal whilst seven were opposed to it.
25. Of the 14 respondents who agreed with the proposal 13 were parents and one was a headteacher. Of the parents, seven indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
26. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- Fairer for children to go to their nearest school
  - Seems a fair approach
  - Distance only rule disadvantages children who do not have a choice of schools in their area
27. Of the seven respondents who were opposed to the proposal all were parents and only one indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
28. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- St Martin's Junior should not be included on the basis that there are only sufficient places for children at the infant school, it is able to change its policy without reference to the local authority and it is a faith school
  - Faith schools retain the right to offer places to children according to faith and it is not fair to deprive such schools from being able to recruit from Catholic families
  - Don't understand why Charter's is not included
29. **Start date to primary admissions round** - Overall, seven respondents agreed with this proposal whilst 15 were opposed to it.
30. Of the seven respondents who agreed with the proposal six were parents and one was a headteacher. Of the parents, four indicated that they would be affected by the decision.
31. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- Only if that continues through the following years
  - Children at 4 years old are too young for school
  - A more staggered approach is helpful and will enable teachers to concentrate on the changes to older pupils
  - Open days don't happen until the Autumn term anyway so easier to make an informed decisions
  - It will give parents more time to submit admissions
32. Of the 15 respondents who were opposed to the proposal 13 were parents and two were headteachers. Of the parents, only one indicated that they would be affected by the decision.

33. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Don't wish to penalise children with a summer birthday
  - Would rather get it sorted sooner rather than later
  - It gives parents more time to make the right decision for their child
  - Spaces at primary schools are so complicated and restricted already
  - Can't see how it will make any difference if closing date remains unchanged
  - Consequences of concentrating parent visits into November and January would put a much larger burden on the headteacher's time
  - How would families understand that they may begin to view the school from September if they haven't already made contact with them
  - Families who view a school early and complete a school's SIF may omit to complete the Surrey application for at a later date if the dates don't coincide
34. **Surrey's Relevant Area** - Overall, five respondents agreed with this proposal whilst three were opposed to it.
35. Of the five respondents who agreed with the proposal all were parents. No reasons were given.
36. Of the three respondents who were opposed to the proposal two were parents and one was a headteacher.
37. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Not sufficiently explained thus it cannot be assessed properly
  - There shouldn't be too many changes that gives uncertainty to parents and children

This page is intentionally left blank