

Responses to the statutory consultation on Hampshire's proposed admission arrangements for 2021/22

The consultation period opened on Friday 29 November 2019 for six weeks, closing on Friday 17 January 2020.

The following response was received:

1)	<p>Subject: Admission to Sarisbury Junior School</p> <p>Dear Glenn,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply and for the information you have provided. I have taken a look at the HantsWeb 'Have your say' webpages and I would like to ask whether my comments/requests would be considered in this consultation with regards to the chain of email correspondence between yourself and I or whether I would need to write again separately and if so, would this be to the original email address I used initially as is stated on the 'Have your say' web page?</p> <p>I have noticed looking at the 'Have your say' webpages it doesn't make any mention in the 2021 PAN list for Sarisbury junior school to accommodate 120 children. It only lists 90 children as per all other previous years. This differs to what is stated in your email below to me. Please could you clarify why it would not be included in this document on the Hantsweb in order for it to be reviewed/approved and rolled out for 2021 year 3 admissions?</p> <p>Also, in the 'School Specific Criteria for 2021 – 2022' it states the specific change proposed for Sarisbury Junior School for 2021 – 2022 year 3 admissions is as per the below:</p> <p><i>Sarisbury CE Junior School Children living in the catchment who at the time of application attend Sarisbury Infant School– criterion 5 (in addition to displaced children).</i></p> <p>This to me is stating that children who are at the linked Sarisbury infant school already and are in the catchment area will be placed as a higher priority for a place at the linked junior school than even other children who are not already at Sarisbury infant school but are in the catchment area. I would like to propose that this be changed to ALL children who are currently at the linked infant school are placed within this criterion 5 rather than just those who are in catchment to therefore allow ALL children who are already in the linked Sarisbury infant school, whether they are in or out of the catchment area, to be granted a higher priority than any other children who are in/out catchment but not already at the linked infant school. The reason for this is it would not only aid a better experience and continuum of education for the children but also allow greater efficiency between the linked infant and junior school for familiarity of children moving up to the junior school to aid a more smoother transition and on-boarding experience for all at the junior school. To switch children already in the infant school to a completely new school in the area and bring in another child from another school to the junior school is a lot of change that could be avoided with honouring those children currently in the infant school to have first place offering in the linked junior school.</p>
----	--

	<p>The specific area around Sarisbury infant and the linked junior school is a popular family area with many new houses being built continuously in the catchment area without obvious provisions for how this will affect the school. As we have discussed previously, in September 2018 there was a larger than normal (and unaccounted) number of children in the local area of which there was a need to have an extra class within one of the local schools in the area. It was decided by the Admissions team to do this at Sarisbury Infants school. This allowed those children in this heavy new house build housing location to be placed within their catchment school and a decision was made to fill the remainder of the spaces with out of catchment children to make the additional class viable and cost effective. It would therefore be respectful to honour those out of catchment children and families during the transition to the junior school by now prioritising their place in the liked junior school..</p> <p>I appreciate your time to review my comments and proposal for recommendations to be made to the Executive Member for Children’s Services and Young People, Cllr Patricia Stallard, in advance of her decision day on 26 February 2020. Please advise back whether this can be done off the back of this email correspondence or whether I would need to write again separately?</p> <p>Thank you in advance.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p>
2)	<p>Subject: Response to consultation on school admissions 2021/22</p> <p>I have only just noticed a consultation on school admission arrangements for 2021/22 that affects Sarisbury Junior School. I’m surprised that directly affected parents were not notified.</p> <p>The consultation does not reflect non-catchment children being able to transition across from Sarisbury Infant School (SIS) to Sarisbury Junior School (SJS). Martin Goff HCC indicated at a public meeting in May 2018 at SIS that transition arrangements To SJS would be made to accommodate the ‘bulge’ of 2018. I would like to understand if these reassurances still stand.</p>
3)	<p>Subject: Consultation response to School Admission Arrangements - Sarisbury Junior School</p> <p>Dear Martin (and School Admissions to submit as a response to the consultation)</p> <p>I would like to raise the following concerns regarding School Admission Arrangements to Sarisbury Junior School Consultation.</p> <p>There are growing concerns parents have been misled during the September 2018 intake to SIS, purely to make the numbers up and justify the additional form of entry for new developments in the area. This is cited for 2 reasons. Firstly, the presentation on 14th May 2018 by Martin Goff (HCC) stated children will transition with the additional form of entry to SJS and this clearly misled some non catchment parents into believing they will</p>

	<p>transition across to SJS. I clarified this in my email below, only to be provided with further assurances regarding linked school status and we kept our son at SIS (if it weren't for the assurances we were planning to change schools) <i>'As we are discussing admissions that are a few years away we can look at the policy for SJS. Some other schools in Hampshire give priority to those attending the linked infant school (over catchment children). That is a conversation we can have with the governing body at SJS'</i>. This was also recently raised by Cllr Woodward http://www.sean-woodward.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Sarisbury-InTouch-Spring-2019.pdf</p> <p>However, none of the School Admissions Consultation covers this (nor do any governing body minutes show attempts at raising this matter) and we feel we have been misled with these assurances and that non catchment children have in effect been used as space fillers to justify the additional form of entry at SIS and SJS for new developments in the area, with no regard for continuity and the overall wellbeing of c16 non catchment children during the Sept 21 transition.</p> <p>Secondly, a new primary school is forecast to open in Sept 2021 to serve the new North Whiteley housing development, with new homes to be occupied during 2020. The catchment for SJS currently covers part of this new development. Are there no plans for the SJS catchment area to change for the Sept 2021 intake as its not detailed in the schools admissions consultation? As detailed above, this is a further example that raises our concerns on the handling of the 'bulge' year.</p> <p>Please can this matter be considered with high priority, especially the linked school status (or change to criterion 5 to include non-catchment) as we have been somewhat misled by assurances made in 2018 when it seemed the SIS bulge was acknowledged which could (and would) be managed to meet parental preference and provide surety to children transitioning across to SJS.</p>
4)	<p>Subject: Consultation for reduction in PAN</p> <p>To whom this may concern.</p> <p>I am writing this email to express my concerns with the plans to reduce several schools PAN number ?</p> <p>How can reducing class numbers be justified when there's not any new schools being built ? Population within towns is growing, more houses are being built, and you want to reduce class sizes ?</p> <p>Last Summer my Son didn't get a place in Alverstoke Junior School due to them reducing the PAN and he has a sibling at the school.</p> <p>Where do you propose all these children go who lose out on spaces ? As all the other schools may be full. we as a family have come to discover, it takes two people to collect my children from school, calling in favours from friends and family ! This is hardly feasible for the next two years. I have also found it hard to secure a job. My son who now has to attend a school away from his sibling and peers has not settled at all and every day is a battle resulting in him not being in class.</p>

	<p>All decided by 4 people at an appeal who, without being disrespectful have not lived in the current climate we do today and quite clearly have no knowledge of what it's like and how hard it is.</p> <p>They have decided our sons future and it's been ruined. And we've only been through one term.</p> <p>That is why I am sending my disagreement to the proposed consultation to reduce School PAN as we would not want any other family to go through what we have and still are suffering as a consequence of.</p>
--	---