


**Responses to the statutory consultation on  
Hampshire's proposed school admission arrangements  
for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for 2018/19**

The consultation period opened on Monday 21 November 2016 for six weeks, closing on Monday 02 January 2017.

The proposed admission arrangements for 2018 were posted on the School Admissions pages of the County's public website ([www.hants.gov.uk/admissions](http://www.hants.gov.uk/admissions)) and later added to the corporate list of active consultations (<http://consultations.hants.gov.uk/>).

The proposed admission arrangements were also sent directly (via email) to eleven neighbouring authorities: Bournemouth; Bracknell Forest; Dorset; Isle of Wight; Portsmouth; Southampton; Surrey; West Berkshire; West Sussex; Wiltshire; and Wokingham.

**The following response was received:**

<b>1)</b>	<p>The Diocese of Guildford would support the first two options ie. higher priority for Children of Staff and higher priority in junior schools for federated infant/junior pairings.</p> <p>Re the other options, we don't feel that we are in a position to comment.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> 
<b>2)</b>	<p><b>Subject:</b> Proposed change of catchment for Halterworth school</p> <p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>I'm writing to express my concern for the change of catchment proposed for Halterworth school.</p> <p>I feel that there has been little money spent on Halterworth in comparison to the other schools in Romsey and that actually it is an oversubscribed school and could therefore, with a little bit of financial contribution accommodate the children from the new houses at Hoe Lane.</p> <p>It is unfair that Halterworth school, which is oversubscribed cannot be allowed to take these additional children.</p> <p>Surely where parents wish to send their children is a massive factor in deciding which school should accommodate any additional housing needs.</p>
<b>3)</b>	<p><b>Subject:</b> Reduction in the Halterworth School Catchment Area</p>

	<p>We are disappointed to hear that the Halterworth School in Romsey's catchment area is going to be reduced. As parents of current (and former) Halterworth school pupils we know how popular and in demand the school is. The teaching and overall experience of school life has been fantastic for our children and we know of lots of parents who have been on the waiting list for many years.</p> <p>Surely a successful school like Halterworth should have continuous funding to support the already outstanding school? This will now be cut if the catchment Area is reduced and could be detrimental to the school.</p>
4)	<p>RE: Submission to public consultation on admissions arrangements for 2018/9</p> <p>We strongly support the proposed changes giving higher admission priority to the “child of staff” category. This is an important step to helping the teaching profession move towards a better work-life balance and would remove or at least reduce the need for parents who are also teachers to make difficult decisions. Teaching is stressful enough without additional external worries that are easily removed by minor amendments to the admissions processes.</p> <p>We also strongly support the proposed changes giving higher admission priority to the “children attending infant school in federated infant and junior pairings”. The raising of the priority in the latter category is particularly important to us. Our child was allocated to such a school, despite our being out of catchment, and our first choice being a primary school where she would have had an automatic place until the end of Year 6. We explained the reasons this was so important to us in our application form. The disruption that a change of school would cause if she were not to be admitted to the federated junior school is a very significant concern to us. We feel that consequent change of routine, loss of familiar surroundings and, in particular, the disrupted and lost friendships that would result from her many friends from in catchment being admitted to the junior whilst she was not has the potential to have a significant detrimental impact on our daughter’s well-being and hence on her educational and emotional outcomes. In fact, the impact on our whole family would be highly significant, due to our personal circumstances outlined in our initial application. Raising the priority for children in the linked infant school all but removes this risk for us and for other children and parents who share our situation. It is a worry which has shadowed our experience of her being at the Infant School, and we applaud your intention to rectify the problem. Federated schools in practice have very close daily links and it is not possible to explain to an infant school age child why she may not be allowed to attend the junior school. The only assumption she can make is that they may not want her; your amendment would remove the need for such detrimental assumptions being made by any child.</p>
5)	<p><b>Subject:</b> Consultation</p> <p>I have already given some views about the proposed changes to the catchment area and proposed building of SEN schools in The Vyne's area. However, for the benefit of the consultation I will pass the views surrounding Chapel Hill to you too.</p> <p>On the face of it, I am delighted that the places for the Chapel Hill development are to be allocated to the Oakridge Federation and The Vyne, for safeguarding reasons. There is a direct route to both of these schools which is both safe and short in distance and it seems a</p>

	<p>logical decision to make. I cannot comment on what it would mean for The Vyne's capacity as it very much depends on what information HCC holds on housing developments in other areas. However, if it requires the expansion of the school, (we are oversubscribed in Year 7 and will be next year) I would happily discuss this.</p> <p>My only concern would be safety and traffic. As I say it isn't far and there are good footpath routes which is great, but I have raised concerns about the lack of a bus bay outside the school and a lack of sensible traffic management in Queen Mary Avenue and Vyne Road. Our children who travel in from Chineham fill one double decker bus and this is set to increase next year. The bus currently stops on the road, on a double yellow, dangerously close to a corner. Were there to be more traffic coming towards The Vyne, as well as the extra children going to Oakridge and the proposed new 75 strong SEN school in Shooters Way, I would want consideration to be had of the safety implications of this.</p> <p>Otherwise I agree with the catchment change absolutely.</p> <p>In terms of making the 'Child of staff' criteria higher up than catchment/link junior/sibling, yes I absolutely agree. Recruitment has now reached crisis point and this is a great incentive to attract someone who is moving to the area, as a busy working dad, it certainly would tick a box for me.</p> <p>--  <i>Mark Kingswood</i>  <i>Headteacher - The Vyne Community School</i></p>
6)	<p>Thank you for making me aware of your consultation.</p> <p>I wish to comment in respect of <a href="#">Admission policy for Community and Voluntary Controlled junior schools federated with their linked infant 2018-2019</a></p> <p>I am unaware of the number of children who traditionally move from federated infant schools to junior schools in Hampshire and I assume that some work has been undertaken around this. However, I would expect that a large proportion of children do move from one to the other. I have no issue with this being included in the oversubscription criteria but would suggest that a definition of the term "federated linked infant school" is included at a later point in the policy and that it clearly names each of the linked schools in order to meet 1.16 of the Admissions Code.</p> <p>I am however concerned about the inclusion of both catchment and out of catchment criteria in the policy and whether or not this imposes a level of conditionality that could be seen to be unreasonable and/or unfair and therefore in breach of 1.4 and 1.8 of the Admissions Code. It may therefore be helpful to consider removing the catchment areas for federated junior schools (whilst retaining catchments at infant school level).</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss further should you wish.</p> <p>Education Officer, Admissions &amp; Exclusions  Children, Young People &amp; Learning  Borough of Poole   Dolphin Centre   Poole BH15 1SA</p>
7)	<p>We have already responded to the previous online survey, but would like to confirm</p>

	<p>that our federation would support a higher priority in the junior school policy for federated infant and junior pairings for children attending the infant school; and that if this is not adopted we would like to make it a school specific criterion.</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Ian Waine Executive Headteacher The Federation of Trosnant Schools Stockheath Lane Havant Hampshire PO9 3BD</p>
8)	<p>The full governing Body at St James' CEC Primary, Emsworth discussed the proposed admissions arrangements 2018 to 2019, please take this email as response to the consultation, as invited on the HCC webpage.</p> <p><b>PAN:</b> Following advice about staff structure from HCC finance and cuts to funding, St James' leadership and a Diocese representative met with HCC officers in August to discuss the PAN. Currently having a PAN of 34, the infant class size max of 30 requires the School to operate four classes in the three years of Reception and Infants combined. Effectively an extra class, staff and classroom funded by income from 12 additional pupils. St James' requested therefore that the HCC reduce the PAN to 30, with a view to Juniors still operating at 34. This adjusted PAN has not been incorporated in the proposed 2018 2019 arrangement.</p> <p>The Governors at St James' have a good understanding of the pressure on school places - the ongoing expansion of local school place provision and the pace of housing developments in the local area.</p> <p>They also take seriously the responsibility to serve the Community by providing a required standard of education for it's Children within the constraints of diminishing funding.</p> <p>The HCC stated reason to retain the PAN at the anomalous figure of 34 - only 1 other HCC Primary has this 34 number for 2018 - is the pressures on school places, that is understood and appreciated by the governors. This made no reference or consideration (nor claimed to) to the impact of not adopting these efficiency measures, on the standard of education provision.</p> <p>Put simply, the school is compelled to operate an inefficient staffing structure, as rightly highlighted in HCC financial advice, the like of which is not imposed on almost all other Primary Schools.</p> <p>We ask that the admissions forum to take a broader view and review the request to reduce the PAN to 30.</p>

**In-catchment Oversubscription priority order:**

The governing body make the following requests around the proposed admissions policy:

1. 'Children of staff' criteria be below that of 'Siblings'.

On the basis that the disruption to a family with split primary schools is likely to be greater than that of a Staff member with a child/children at a different school.

2. The definition of 'Staff' , for the 'Children of staff' criteria, be refined.

It was considered that that a motivation for elevation of 'Children of staff' priority was to aid recruitment and retention of Teachers, therefore this should be 'Teaching Staff'. Admin staff, LSA's etc are not the target of this measure, and therefore should not displace a sibling or proximity entry.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards

Chair of Governors