

## Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes for September 2020

### Outcome of consultation

#### Response to consultation

- By the closing date, 34 respondents had submitted an online response to the consultation, some of whom had answered more than one question.
- The 34 responses were from:
 

Parent	31
Headteacher	1
Family member	1
Other (Appeals panellist and ex-governor)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>
- 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 2020**

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree
1	Furzefield Primary School - reduction of Reception PAN from 60 to 58	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	1	3
2	Wallace Fields Junior School – change to the measuring points used to assess nearest school and home to school distance	Enclosure 1	28	1
3	Children previously in state care outside England – inclusion within criterion 2 for children with an exceptional social/medical need	Enclosure 1	6	9

- 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. Four 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 2020 admission consultation

- Furzefield Primary School: reduction of Reception PAN from 60 to 58** - Overall, one respondent agreed with this proposal and three were opposed to it.
- The respondent who agreed with the proposal was a parent. No reasons were given for their support.
- The three respondents who were opposed to the proposal were parents, although none lived in the area of the school. One of these indicated that they would be affected by the proposal, however their comment would indicate that their response related to another question.

8. Reason given by one parent for opposing the proposal was that finding schools close to home can be difficult and that any proposal to lower numbers can see families making difficult sacrifices which can impact on home life. They commented that a reduction of two places would not make a difference.
9. **Wallace Fields Junior School – change to the measuring points used to assess nearest school and home to school distance** – Overall, 28 respondents agreed with this proposal and one was opposed to it.
10. Of the 28 respondents who agreed with the proposal, 27 were parents and one was another family member. Of these, 14 indicated that they would be affected by the proposal.
11. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- It will enable more children to transition to junior school with their friends
  - It will make it easier for children who attend the infant school to move to the junior school, if the infant school is their nearest school
  - It will remove uncertainty in the admissions process at the point of transition
  - It gives fairer opportunity to get in to the junior school for children who have attended the infant school
  - It will aid the social and psychological wellbeing of children at the point of transition
  - It will support parents with children of different ages if their children can attend school in the same place
  - It is fairer to base the 'catchment' for Wallace Fields as a whole rather than treat the two schools separately as in essence they serve a single local community
  - It will mean children who got in to the infant school as their nearest school will be considered on an equal footing with other applicants, as long as they haven't moved away from the area
  - It will make a big difference to children living at the edge of the catchment and provide certainty and continuity
  - Moving schools in year 2 could cause a child severe disruption and upset if they are unable to continue in junior school with their peers
12. The respondent who was opposed to the proposal was a parent who was unsure if they would be affected by it. Their reason for opposing the proposal was because they thought that admissions for Wallace Fields Junior School should be calculated from the junior school gate.
13. **Children previously in state care outside England – inclusion within criterion 2 for children with an exceptional social/medical need** - Overall, six respondents agreed with this proposal and nine were opposed to it.
14. Of the six respondents who agreed with the proposal one was a headteacher and five were parents. Two respondents declared that they would be affected by the proposal. Reasons given for support acknowledged that there were times when such children should be prioritised and would benefit from that priority place.
15. Of the nine respondents who were opposed to the proposal, eight were parents and one declared themselves to be an appeals panellist and ex-governor. Three of these indicated that they would be affected by the proposal as the chances of gaining a place may reduce if this change went ahead.
16. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- The playing field should be level across England
  - It may set a precedent for children to move to the area to benefit from this
  - Local children would be displaced
  - It may create an unbalanced number of previously looked after children within a school
  - Other countries have different criteria
  - Should wait for a change to the School Admissions Code
  - It would place an additional duty on admissions administrators

- State care could be in Wales, Scotland or overseas territories which are currently experiencing extreme difficulties
- Ridiculous to give a higher priority for children previously in state care outside England rather than children originating in the locality
- Reporting systems outside of the UK are notoriously poorer than our reporting systems and cannot be relied upon as being correct
- Children who have resided in England should be given first priority, including those without exceptional social or medical need

17. **Surrey's Relevant Area** – Overall three respondents chose to make comments on Surrey's Relevant Area

18. Comments were as follows:

- Surrey needs to create more school places in line with the increasing population as the huge demand on places is resulting in families being sent to schools that are unreasonably far to access
- Surrey is becoming more populated but bus transport does not go to local schools and, due to individual circumstances, parents may not be able to drive their child to schools further away.

19. **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.

20. Two parents made comments regarding the provision of school places and the need for new schools to be built.

21. One parent indicated that the proposal for Wallace Fields Junior School should be adapted to give priority to children who have been through the infant school and have a sibling at either the infant or junior school, regardless of whether or not either school is the nearest.

22. One parent suggested that the admission arrangements for Southfield Park Primary School should be changed to give priority to children who live closest to the school, without regard to the catchment area that currently exists.

This page is intentionally left blank