

<b>Comments from respondents in support of the proposal</b>	
1.	It would be much better and easier for teachers at the school and makes sense to me.
2.	I am in no doubt that this proposal would increase the pool of candidates available to us. We already offer part time working which is attractive to candidates with young children but I have personal experience that difficulties with childcare has put off candidates in the past.
3.	So that schools can recruit the right teacher for the job rather than being hampered because of geographical difficulties and school run problems.
4.	It is important that schools are sufficiently staffed.
5.	Teachers work long hours and if their children can stay nearby it makes family life much easier for the teachers and it also mean that teachers can offer more to the community they belong to.
6.	I think in this current climate with difficulties recruiting teachers, we have to look at other ways of attracting and retaining teachers for our schools. Additionally, with our focus on wellbeing of staff, having your child in the same school where you work makes being a working parent more possible.
7.	Prioritisation should be based upon common sense.
8.	It's hard enough affording to live in this area on current salary with house prices as an educator. To be able to have staff with their own children in the school would be so beneficial in financial and in terms of logistics and time
9.	Teachers and their children can be part of the same school community.
10.	Only if the member of staff has been at the school for at least two years BEFORE the child starts, and only if there is evidence of a difficult recruitment search to fill a post.
11.	Particularly in an area like Oxshott where it is often too expensive for our staff to live within walking distance a place at school would make a teaching role with us more attractive.
12.	Yes because it will help the school retain teaching staff at a time where we have teacher shortages.
13.	Having worked as a teacher whilst being a parent in the past I appreciate how much easier it would be to do your job well if your child is at the same school as you (simpler logistics). I believe this policy would help you recruit and retain talented staff in your schools.
14.	I am lucky enough to live close to the school I teach in. My daughter attends my school but the school was not our closest. We were lucky that she got in when we put my school as first choice. I am hoping she will be accepted into our feeder school but again this is not certain.
15.	There is a shortage of well qualified teachers in many shortage subjects. This will give good teachers incentive to stay in good schools and to raise standards. There are not many benefits to being a teacher, this is a good one.
16.	It would aid retention of staff, particularly when staff members have returned part-time and need to juggle work-life balance. It would also create a level playing field with other local academies which have this policy already.
17.	This has potential to assist with recruitment and retention. It presumably suggests that staff will be confident that they are working in good schools in which they wish their child to be educated. It is clearly sensible for minimising transport.
18.	Give schools a chance to retain experienced staff and encourage parents back into work without high childcare costs.
19.	Recruiting teachers is increasingly difficult. The quality of the school is so dependent on the teachers they can employ.
20.	It would greatly help regarding childcare as you would not need to take extra travel time to your child's destination/your place of work. This could also impact on cost of childcare, which can ultimately force you to leave a place of work if you cannot fund your childcare. You already have an invested interest in the school itself. You would be able to support and benefit the school from both a parent and staff point of view.
21.	As a diocese we were supportive of this priority from the start and indeed several of our own admission authority schools implemented it early on in the process, with many others following suit. I think it would be fair to say that whatever its position in our schools' over-subscription

criteria, it has proved very useful in the recruitment and retention of staff, which is obviously to the benefit of all children in the school.
22. For teachers yes, but not for TA and only when they stay at that employment.
23. To aid staff recruitment and retention.
24. Fair and convenient for teachers.
25. Makes sense to enable them to do their job.
26. We need to retain teachers in the profession and this seems a good benefit to offer, that will help with this aim.
27. I believe that if teachers are unable to gain priority status for their child at the school they are employed, this could result in the loss of a potentially good teacher as they may be unable to arrange childcare for getting their child to another school.
28. Encourages parents back to work by making it easier.
29. Excellent way for local schools to address the recruitment crisis in teaching staff and shows a high level of commitment and trust in the school when staff select it for their child.
30. How would this apply? For example staff definition as a contractor or person who runs an after school club? Also for a religious school there is no clarity in that a teacher may be non-Catholic wishing to put their child in a Catholic school. This means a non-Catholic child takes precedence over a baptised Catholic child because they are staff? Does this mean a baptized Catholic child is denied a Catholic education because their parents are staff?
31. I believe this should be a benefit that our teachers receive.
32. It simply makes sense for all concerned.
33. Easier work life for staff and financially beneficial.
34. It makes returning to work as a teacher more manageable in terms of child care.
35. Recruitment is very difficult currently and this would enable schools to ensure employees have the opportunity to have their children attend the school they work at.
36. I think if someone is teaching at a school there should be priority for their children to attend that school as it will make life easier for them in addition to that it should be seen as a perk to attract teachers. You want to make it as easy as possible for them as they are providing a valuable service to the community.
37. I currently live outside of catchment area for the school where I work, but would like my son to attend there for many reasons. The school is an outstanding school and I know he would receive an excellent education if he attended there, but also because it would allow for a reduction in wrap-around care. I believe if you live and work in the same borough then teachers' children should be on the priority list for the schools where they work. I believe that if the parent/teacher lives outside the borough of the school they work in this should be considered as this may affect the children when they then go on to secondary school more locally to where they live as they will have made primary friends outside of their local area.
38. To assist with teacher recruitment in a time where we struggle to recruit and retain the best staff. To attract and retain quality teachers in a climate of difficult staff recruitment.
39. Convenience. Positive for both parent and child. Removes stress for school staff in having to manage drop off and pick-ups at another school.
40. As an experienced teacher and single parent, I welcome the opportunity for my children to apply to the school in which I work. It removes the stress of multiple car journeys and the financial strain of before and after-school clubs. Schools are experiencing a recruitment crisis, so any means to hold onto valued staff should be encouraged. It will enable me to continue working.
41. There is a growing problem with teacher recruitment and retention (not staff as a whole) due to well understood national problems. In addition, our school is on the borders of a better paid region (London and its environs) so attracting candidates from inside this region is a real problem. Attracting candidates from our own area when London is so close is becoming an increasing concern. Offering priority to the children of teachers is a real and tangible benefit which may well swing a candidate's mind. The subject of priority has been an issue for more than existing teacher as their child approaches school age. Having such a priority can only be an advantage - other methods suggested include a monetary incentive of some sort (eg Golden

<p>Hellos) but this is not a real option given our financial position and carries the risk of being a divisive factor.</p>
<p>42. It's a good idea for ease of school run for the families involved.</p>
<p>43. As a parent of a child starting school next September, this is a major factor in picking schools, I may have to cut hours back in order to make pick-ups or drop offs, or pay extra for breakfast/ after school clubs. Which I currently do not have to do as he attends the nursery at the school I work at, which is the same as school hours.</p>
<p>44. I understand the difficulties of having a child and managing employment (drop off/pick up etc) and recognise the benefits to staff and their child if the child is able to attend the school where their parent is employed.</p>
<p>45. I think it is a good option when considering recruitment and retention of staff however only when staff live at distance from the school where it will impact on childcare. I don't always think it is in the best interest of the child to work in the same school as their parent.</p>
<p>46. This would make childcare arrangements much easier for staff and provides an excellent non-financial incentive for teachers to return to work when financial reward is low.</p>
<p>47. There is so little incentive for people to teach at present and this would make childcare easier.</p>
<p>48. To ease the pressure teachers face with child care arrangements and therefore allowing them to focus on school tasks.</p>
<p>49. I am a teacher at the school and I have a child who will be starting Reception in 2020. Having my son attend the same school that I work in will not only enable me to be more committed to my job. It will allow me to work full time hours but will also encourage me to stay at the school for many years to come.</p>
<p>50. It is a practical and sensible way to address some of the problems with staff recruitment and retention and to improve the staff wellbeing offer.</p>
<p>51. As a teacher and parent I am aware how difficult it can be to juggle school runs and trying to make it to work on time. Some teachers give up teaching when their child is in early education because paying for wrap around childcare on a teacher's salary doesn't make a lot of sense. We are short of teachers in this country, let's try and keep them! This will certainly help.</p>
<p>52. Though it will effect intake numbers available for new students I don't think that it will be a detrimental effect. It also allows the retention and recruitment of good teachers.</p>
<p>53. To keep families together.</p>
<p>54. Makes it much easier for teachers who are parents to work.</p>
<p>55. It seems reasonable to allow the parent the chance to have their children at the school if that allows their child care arrangements to work best! (It could also save extra transport and help the environment.)</p>
<p>56. It is definitely a struggle for the many teachers that I know who have children at one school, but work at another. There is extra child care, the worry of getting to collect them on time, pressures of wanting to see your child's performance, but being bound to be at work at another school during those special times. It would therefore, make life so much easier for those working at a school to have their child at the same location.</p>
<p>57. Logistically that is the most logical option.</p>
<p>58. I believe it is fair as long as the staff of the schools have contributed to our society and local school, then priority should be given to their children, this enables them to be less worried about their children, so they can concentrate to their work, ultimately children in the school benefit this.</p>

### Comments from respondents opposed to the proposal

1. It is a teacher's choice where they work - as it is for all working parents. Until Surrey CC can accommodate each child who LIVES in their school catchment with a place in their preferred school then school staff should NOT get special treatment over local council tax paying residents.
2. Parents have a right to send their children to a faith school which is part of their church and community and life. Not all of us have the luxury of the church community being on the doorstep! Stop this post code lottery!
3. In a Catholic school, I would find it hard to justify giving priority to a non-Catholic child of staff ahead of a Catholic child on the waiting list. If the priority for children of staff came lower than Catholic children, I would support the proposal.
4. I think staff should be employed on their skill base and children admitted according to a fair policy. This suggested process could mean that staff fulfil a role to get their children into a school rather than doing the job as an actual choice.
5.
  - This appears to be a driven by offering an employment perk rather than addressing a genuine need for the teachers. Teachers already have shorter working days than in most other professions and have matching holidays to school holidays, thus suffering fewer childcare issues than other working parents.
  - This is being offered without additional space provision and will push parents further down the priority listing for limited places at local schools. It is not specified that the teacher has to be resident within the local authority and this fundamentally introduces unfairness in the allocation system.
  - There is no cap in this allocation, without a cap this could easily result in several places in any year's intake going to teachers.
  - Having the children of teachers within the same school as the teacher potentially introduces conflicts of interest and a difficulty in treating their children without bias over other children both positively and negatively, no matter how much you may desire not to.
  - We appreciate the need to offer employment incentives, however, please consider other more typical approaches of flexible working, job share etc. and not one that impacts on other parents' ability to find their child a place in a local school.
  - Less than 50% of schools responded positively to this and the fact the most other schools failed to respond is not indicating a strong issue for the majority, it might also indicate they had a fear to respond negatively.
6.
  - My view is that the council suggest in this proposal that the local community would be disadvantaged particularly where the places are oversubscribed. I object primarily that just because staff have been employed for 2 years that their children would then take up a valuable place as this scenario would mean that in my local school that more than 10 places were set aside for staff and I just don't think that's an acceptable position.
  - I would suggest that the max number of places in each school under both sets of criteria is a combined figure and not treated separately. This could be relaxed if the school was undersubscribed. Staff children should not be advantaged by the fact their parent happens to work in a good school - it's tantamount to jumping a queue on the basis of their profession.
7. If the staff member and child do not live locally this could mean that a child living nearer to the school does not receive a place. There are far too many instances where children are not able to go to their nearest school which results in more car journeys, more traffic difficulties around school drop off/pick up and a negative effect on the environment. The proposal does not state either which number in the hierarchy of qualifiers they intend to position 'children of staff' is it high priority after 'looked after children' or lower priority before 'anyone else'???? This should be made clear in your proposal so that people have an understanding of your intentions.
8. People may take up positions specifically to ensure a school place for their child.
9. This could disadvantage other school children.
10. I do not agree with this. Children should attend the school nearest to their home, not one based upon parents employment. This creates an unfair advantage of choice for teacher-parents who could opt for their nearest school or place of employment.

11. I don't think it is fair for others, some being siblings, to be kept far down the waiting list because an employer at the school has a child who want to attend that school to get a space before others on the waiting list especially those with siblings already attending the school when the wait seems like forever and never as it is without less of a chance being added.
12. You do not say what priority will be given to staff. Will it be 1st place above looked after children? 3rd place above all siblings. I do think staff should have some kind of priority but not above siblings, medical reasons or looked after children. Your proposal is far too vague, and needs to be rewritten.
13. I believe that this is very reasonable to give priority for primary schools. For secondary schools if the nearest school is within 1 1/2 miles (by road / pavement) and the route is lit and has pavements I do not feel that it is necessary. Where a member of staff has been recruited to fill a vacant post in a primary school where there is a skills shortage, priority should only be given if the post is likely to be permanent - i.e. not just to cover maternity leave or similar.
14. Everyone is equal and we all pay lots of tax.
15. I can see that this would be an attractive prospect, but from a selfish perspective it's difficult enough to get your child into a school without adding even more criteria / competition.
16. We are over-subscribed and to extend preference for school staff would reduce the inclusive nature of our admissions policy.
17. Whilst I can appreciate the difficulties schools may have with recruitment it is not, in my view, justification for disadvantaging other children and families. The problems of recruitment- the profession not being as attractive an option as it should be - should not be masked by changing admissions policies to give favour to teachers. The perception of inequality this would create is in my view wrong.
18. Will there be any attempt to hire locally before hiring outside of the school's polygonal catchment area? I am in support of the idea theoretically, but it doesn't specify whether the staff work part-time or full-time. You may find that people are applying for small, part-time roles just to get their kids into a good school. And then spots for that school may not go to local children, and would instead be given to staff's children. This change should be more specific.
19. I do not think it is right for the children of staff to get a prioritised space at the school because 1) people buy houses near the school to ensure they get in, people pay a premium for those houses why should someone from outside the area benefit from that? 2) it is about local community and making local friends and creating support networks. If we suddenly have children coming from outside the area this breaks down the community / local friendships. 3) a teacher's child / children attending may take the space of someone for whom this is their closest school, that does not seem right. 4) from an environmental and safeguarding perspective we should be ensuring we give the spaces to the people that can walk / scoot / cycle safely to and from school. 5) It could be argued that in many schools it might not have a significant impact due to the amount of staff with children at the right age for that school but for larger schools this may not be the case and we are currently experiencing issues with this as a policy in our local secondary school where there are significant numbers of local people not able to get into their local school and yet staff children can. 6) many of us choose to live where we do because we find a school we feel is right for our children to go, one that suits them and their needs. To then not be able to access this due to a staff members child taking priority is unfair in my opinion.
20. I don't agree with this policy as it could potentially take a place away from a child if they live outside of the usual distance given. Which is very unfair on that child.
21. Despite now being allowed in the Code, this criterion remains controversial. For those of us who have a long memory, the Code in the past considered this criterion as unfair. When the DfE suggested a change to the Code, the NUT said "The NUT believes there is a serious flaw with regard to a proposed change which would give children of staff priority when applying for a pupil place. If large groups of staff take up this opportunity, then this will result in a skewed and unbalanced intake. 'Jumping the queue' in this way will be perceived as unjust by the wider



<p>school community. Staff will be perceived as taking places from local children with difficult family circumstances, potentially parent-teacher relationships. The NUT believes that this change in the Admissions Code must not be made.” We still believe this criterion is potentially unfair. The Diocese agrees too with the comments that the NUT made some years ago. The criterion will mean that local children will be displaced. The Diocese has consistently advised our schools not to use it. However, with the Local Authority proposing to add this criterion for community and voluntary controlled schools, it makes it that much harder not to allow it for other schools (as the critical mass of schools using it will have moved).</p>
<p>22. If the staff are not religious and therefore the children are not baptised or following the particular religion of the school then I see no reason why the children of staff should get priority when other children who may live nearby and tick all the religious boxes may miss a place. There is nothing to stop staff moving to a school to get their child accepted and the moving to a different school- the child would then not be moved. Having children of staff members also makes it difficult for the teachers who are having to teach children of other staff members. It also means that other children may miss out on having a 'great' teacher as they cannot teach their own child. I think having children of staff in school makes it all very difficult and it means the other children of non-staff members miss out on various aspects and could ultimately lose out on a place because of a staff's child who may not tick all the other relevant admissions criteria.</p>
<p>23. I feel this would mean more experienced and qualified teachers would be attracted to only living and working in areas where outstanding schools are already so that they can send their children to school. This disadvantages local children and families twofold: there will be fewer spaces for local children who may not have exceptional needs but may come from lower socio-economic backgrounds; there will be less qualified and experienced teachers working at schools who require improvement and would benefit from more experienced and qualified teachers as the latter will have moved to working for outstanding schools which means children in less well performing schools are afforded the opportunity to be taught by more experienced and qualified teachers. Furthermore, I am concerned that almost half of the schools consulted with did not respond. I feel it's important to receive responses from the majority before a final decision can be made.</p>
<p>24. It may cause teachers to get a job at a certain school just to get access for his/her child.</p>
<p>25. I do not think it is fair if staff receive such a huge benefit when school places are in such short supply. There is already such competition over school places. The staff may be part time or not doing a particularly significant role.</p>
<p>26. Whilst appreciating recruitment difficulties I think this would create a sense of equality by giving priority to teachers.</p>
<p>27. There are so many working parents struggling with childcare. Where is our help? Teachers already have the advantage they have adequate leave to look after children during the extensive school holidays the rest of us don't have enough leave for. Other public or government roles get similar pay and don't get those perks. Schools need to be for local children, it would be grossly unfair if a local resident were forced away while a teacher living nowhere near got a place purely because of their profession.</p>
<p>28. Our opinion at the moment is minded to potential unfairness for the communities around a school if there is priority given to children of staff, as this potentially disenfranchises children living in a school admission priority area.</p>