

Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes for September 2018

Outcome of consultation

Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 31 respondents had submitted an online response to the consultation, some of whom had answered more than one question.
2. The 31 responses were from:

Headteacher	2
Parent	22
Parish/Town Council member	2
School governor	4
Surrey County Council member	1
Total	31

1. A summary of the responses to the individual school related questions within the consultation is set out below in Table A. As some respondents answered more than one question, the total number of responses in Table A is higher than the total number of respondents.

Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation for September 2018

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Stoughton Infant School – sibling link with Northmead Junior	Enclosure 1 Appendix 2	19	1
2	St Andrew's CofE Infant School – reduction of PAN from 40 to 30	Enclosure 1 Appendix 1	3	4
3	Walsh CofE Junior – reduction of PAN from 75 to 64	Enclosure 1 Appendix 1	8	4

3. In addition, respondents were asked if they had any comments on Surrey's Relevant Area or the proposed admission arrangements for the remaining community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey. Two respondents commented on Surrey's Relevant Area and four respondents commented on the proposed admission arrangements for the remaining community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Analysis of responses to questions within the 2018 admission consultation

4. **Stoughton Infant School: introduction of a sibling link with Northmead Junior School -**
Overall, 19 respondents agreed with this proposal and one was opposed to it.
5. Of the 19 respondents who agreed with the proposal 18 were parents and one was a school governor of an unrelated school. Ten parents indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
6. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
 - Will have a child at Northmead when applying for a younger sibling to go to Stoughton
 - Failed to get a younger sibling in to Stoughton in the past which led to being offered a school further away
 - Lack of sibling link causes a lot of stress, upset and worry
 - Makes sense given the locality of the two schools

- Will prevent families having to make childcare arrangements in order to travel to different schools
 - Stoughton is the only infant school in the north of Guildford that does not have a sibling link with a school
 - It will prevent families from moving their children to other schools
 - Helps with the transition for children starting school if siblings have previously attended
 - Builds a good sense of community and security for children
 - Builds on a long term relationship between families and schools
 - Other schools have such a reciprocal sibling link in place
 - There is a feeder link between the schools
 - It makes sense to keep siblings together
7. The respondent who was opposed to the proposal was a parent. They declared that they would not be affected by the proposal and gave no reasons for their opposition.
8. **St Andrew's CofE Infant School: reduction of Reception PAN from 40 to 30** – Overall, three respondents agreed with this proposal and four were opposed to it.
9. Of the three respondents who agreed with the proposal one was a headteacher of an unrelated school, one was a member of Farnham Town Council and one was a school governor. None indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
10. The response from a member of Farnham Town Council indicated that the Town Council welcomed the reduction in PAN to 30 as this was a more manageable number which should help to secure the future of the school.
11. Other reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- PANs that aren't multiples of 30 are difficult for schools, both financially and logistically
 - 40 isn't a manageable number for a school financially
12. Of the four respondents who were opposed to the proposal all were parents. One parent indicated that they would be affected by the proposal however none lived in the local area of the school.
13. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- Are there enough school places in Guildford?
 - There are not enough primary school places in the local area as it is
14. **Walsh CofE Junior School: reduction of Year 3 PAN from 75 to 64** - Overall, eight respondents agreed with this proposal and four were opposed to it.
15. Of the eight respondents who agreed with the proposal three were school governors from Walsh CofE Junior, one was Chair of Governors at Walsh CofE Junior, one was the headteacher at Walsh CofE Junior, one was a parent, one was a Surrey County Councillor (also representing Guildford Borough Council and Ash Parish Council) and one was a member from Ash Parish Council.
16. However from the reasons given (set out in italics in paragraph 19) it would appear that the parent respondent, the Surrey County Councillor respondent and the respondent from Ash Parish Council may have been opposed to the proposal.
17. The headteacher of Walsh CofE Junior indicated that a PAN of 75 has caused financial difficulties and that the school cannot continue with this PAN without going in to deficit. Whilst the school has managed with mixed age classes in Years 3 and 4, the only other financial saving would be to mix years 5 and 6 which would not be in the best educational interests of the children. A PAN of 64 would enable the school to operate with 2 classes per year group in future and would remove the uncertainty over numbers which has impacted on recruitment.
18. Other reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- The school has been significantly under PAN in recent years which is impacting on finances

- The school's main feeder is Walsh Infant School which has an intake of 60
- An intake of 64 would still provide some places for children applying from other infant schools
- The school doesn't have the demand to meet a PAN of 75
- In the short/medium term there is no evidence that more places are needed
- *Are there enough reasonable school places in Guildford?*
- *This is a short sighted approach given the number of planning permissions granted in the immediate catchment area of the school*
- *The increase in the birth rate*
- *Tongham only have infant schools*

19. Of the four respondents who were opposed to the proposal all were parents. Two of these indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
20. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
 - More and more houses being built in the local area with no additional schools in area
 - There are not enough primary school places in the local area as it is
21. **Surrey's Relevant Area** – Overall two respondents chose to make comments on Surrey's Relevant Area
22. One parent indicated that more school places were required for the noble park area.
23. Another parent indicated that there are not enough schools in the area.
24. **Admission arrangements for which no change was proposed** - Overall, four respondents chose to make comments on the admission arrangements for which no change was proposed.
25. One headteacher queried why it was necessary for parents to rank their preferences if Surrey operated an equal preference scheme and claimed this led to some schools offering to children who had named the school as their second preference when others who had named it first had not been offered a place.
26. One parent indicated that they disagreed with schools being allowed to apply religious criteria when they are not funded entirely by the church.
27. One parent indicated that the sibling rule should be in place for all schools.
28. One parent disagreed with Christ's College being included in the assessment of nearest school when it accepts up to 50% of its intake from practicing Christian families. The parent felt this was unfair, especially when the majority of its remaining intake went to children attending one of the named feeder schools. Inclusion in the assessment of nearest school also meant that some families would receive lower priority for other schools.

This page is intentionally left blank