

# Consultation on Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and coordinated schemes for September 2021

## Outcome of consultation

### Response to consultation

1. By the closing date, 163 respondents had submitted an online response to the consultation, some of whom had answered more than one question. Two further responses were received by email, making a total of 165 responses.

2. The 165 responses were from:

Academy Trust	1
Borough/district councillor	2
Chair of governors	5
Diocesan Representative	2
Family member (other than parent)	1
Headteacher	11
National Secular Society	1
Other Local Authority	1
Parent	105
Parish Council member	1
School governor	8
School staff member	21
Other	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>165</b>

3. A summary of the responses to the individual school related questions within the consultation is set out below in Table A.

**Table A - Summary of responses to admission consultation for September 2021**

Question Number	Proposal	Document	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion
1	Priority for children of staff	Enclosure 1	108	40	17
2	Worplesdon Primary School: reduction of Reception PAN from 60 to 57	Enclosure 1, Appendix 1	6	11	148
3	Schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school	Enclosure 1, Appendix 3	48	65	52

### Analysis of responses to questions within the 2021 admission consultation

4. **Priority for children of staff** - Overall, 108 respondents agreed with this proposal and 40 were opposed to it.

5. Of the respondents who agreed with the proposal the breakdown was as follows:

Chair of Governors	4
Diocesan representative	1
Headteacher	10

Parent	64
School Governor	6
School staff member	18
Other	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>

6. Of the 38 respondents from a school, 33 declared the school that they were from and, of those, 28 were from a community or voluntary controlled school.

7. Of the respondents who were in support, 58 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 1 to Enclosure 4. A summary of some of the main points is as follows:

- It would improve recruitment and retention of staff in schools.
- It would encourage part time and full time workers to return to work.
- It would help ease issues with childcare.
- Schools would be able to recruit the right teacher for the job rather than being hampered because of geographical difficulties and school run problems.
- It would help improve the wellbeing of staff.
- Teachers and their children could be part of the same school community.
- It would create a level playing field with other local academies which have this policy already.
- It will act as an incentive for teachers to stay in certain schools and to raise standards.
- It would remove the stress of multiple car journeys.
- It would remove the financial strain of before and after school clubs.

8. Of the respondents who were opposed with the proposal the breakdown was as follows:

Academy Trust	1
Borough/District Councillor	1
Chair of Governors	1
Diocesan representative	1
Family member (other than a parent)	1
Headteacher	1
Parent	29
School Governor	2
School staff member	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>

9. Of the 8 respondents from schools, none represented a community or voluntary controlled school.

10. Of the respondents who were opposed 28 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 1 to Enclosure 4. A summary of some of the main points is as follows:

- School staff should not receive priority over local children.
- It is a teacher's choice where they work.
- Hard to justify a non-Catholic child receiving priority over a Catholic child.
- Children should be admitted according to a fair policy.
- There is no cap to the allocation of places for children of staff.
- Having children of staff in school could create conflict of interests.
- Teachers already experience fewer childcare issues than other working parents.
- Children should attend the school closest to their home.
- Difficulties with recruitment does not justify disadvantaging other children.
- The proposal doesn't specify whether the staff member would be full or part time.
- People pay a premium for houses close to good schools to ensure they get in and so why should someone from outside the area benefit.
- Having children from outside the area breaks down the community and local friendships.
- We should be enduring children can walk/cycle to school.

11. **Worplesdon Primary School: reduction of Reception PAN from 60 to 57** - Overall, six respondents agreed with this proposal and 11 were opposed to it.

12. Of the six respondents who agreed with the proposal, five were parents and one was a Diocesan representative.

13. Reasons given for agreeing with the proposal were as follows:
- that is a practical solution to being able to offer enhanced experience to children with SEN
  - smaller class sizes are a good thing as fewer children allows each child to have more individual time with the teacher/teaching assistant
14. Of the 11 respondents who were opposed to the proposal, 10 were parents and one was a school staff member at an unnamed school.
15. Reasons given for opposing the proposal were as follows:
- It would increase the pressure on neighbouring schools.
  - Primary schools in the Guildford area recently undertook significant expansions - why now decrease the intake?
  - Previously informed that the proposed creation of a special needs centre at Worplesdon would not impact the other students - this is clearly a [negative] impact
  - The intake for the existing part of the school should not be reduced as a result of another development on the site
  - Already over subscription at all local schools so they should be increasing not decreasing
16. **Schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school** - Overall, 48 respondents agreed with this proposal and 65 were opposed to it.

17. Of the 48 respondents who agreed with the proposal the breakdown is as follows:

Borough/District Councillor	1
Diocesan representative	1
Headteacher	2
Parent	38
Parish Council member	1
School Governor	2
School staff member	1
Other	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>

18. Of the respondents who were in support 31 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 2 to Enclosure 4. A summary of some of the main points is as follows:
- If people lived closer there wouldn't be so much of a traffic/parking problem.
  - Unfair for local families to have to travel further because other children have attended Mass more.
  - School space shortages mean local children are pushed to schools further away.
  - Outrageous that faith schools are publicly funded yet remain selective to faith applicants.
  - Faith schools should have children of the same faith.
  - We should be making it easier for children to walk/cycle to school and reduce pollution.
  - Important for children to go to their local school to build stronger communities.
  - Religious schools should not be able to maintain different criteria to other state schools.
  - It's not right to include Catholic schools which do not accept non-Catholics in the nearest school assessment.
  - Inclusion for all.
  - All schools should accept children living nearby regardless of religious beliefs.
  - This criterion disadvantages faith schools and should be removed.
  - It's not fair to restrict admissions based on County divisions.
  - Parents should be able to select their nearest school.

19. Of the 65 respondents who opposed to the proposal the breakdown is as follows:

Chair of Governors	2
Diocesan representative	1
Family member (other than a parent)	1
Headteacher	4
National Secular Society	1

Other local authority	1
Parent	48
School Governor	2
School staff member	4
Other	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>

20. Of the respondents who were opposed 49 gave reasons. Full details are included as Appendix 2 to Enclosure 4, redacted as necessary. A summary of some of the main points is as follows:
- Schools should change their admissions policy to give priority to local children.
  - Exclusions should not exist as all schools should admit local children.
  - Children should go to their nearest school.
  - Schools should not prioritise children based on religion or belief.
  - Changes would negatively impact and discriminate against non-Catholic children who live in an area where one of the listed schools would be the nearest school.
  - The change should coincide with The Wavell changing its catchment in order to benefit Surrey residents.
  - Catholic schools may be unsuitable for families who do not support Catholic beliefs.
  - Removal of schools from the list would be unfair if applicants would not get in to those schools as they may then miss out on a place at their next nearest school.
  - Admission criteria for faith schools would need to change in order for the proposal to be fair.
  - Not fair to expect children who are not religious to have to apply for a religious school.
  - There may not be places available at the named faith schools in any given year.
  - The State should not be forcing people to attend faith schools, which it is by including them in the nearest school policy.
  - Changing the policy for 2021 is too soon for families who have already moved and bought houses in an area based on the existing policy who may now be forced to send their child to a faith school instead of the school they wanted.
  - If parents are willing to travel to a faith school they should be allowed.
  - It will distort the perception of local residents who will think that they will get in to their local faith school when they may not.
  - Surely all schools should be included.
  - Why reduce the accessibility of schools when there is a shortage.
21. **Admission arrangements for which no change was proposed** - Overall, 29 respondents chose to make comments on the admission arrangements for which no change was proposed. However, from those comments, only two matters arose that were not already covered by the consultation and related to community and voluntary controlled schools.
22. One respondent indicated that Surrey's admissions procedures should be amended to ensure that children who were subject to a Special Guardianship Order should be treated as an excepted pupil for in year admissions, in line with looked after and previously looked after children.
23. Two respondents indicated that sibling priority should no longer be given if a family has moved away.