

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

### Written responses to the consultation

Bitterne Park Infant & Junior:

Date Received	Relationship to schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary my merging the two schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary by closing the infant and expanding the junior	Comments
07.02.13		Not convinced by open to persuasion.		I received the letter regarding the consultation today and I would like to ask some questions before responding. I have a child in both the infant and junior schools and will likely be involved with the school(s) for at least another 9 years.
08.02.13		No	No	To whom it may concern, I am not in total agreement with the merger of the Infant and Junior Schools and can see some advantages, although I think the underlying reason is not that of the benefit of the children as sated but more that of a "money saving exercise". What I do object to is the Infant School being "discontinued". The Infant School has always been the strongest of the two schools, both in their nurturing of our children and the education they received from a very early age, whereas the Junior School is far less approachable and lacks the "Community" links which the Infant School finds so important. I would be much happier if it was the Junior School to be "discontinued".
11.02.13	Parent / Child Infant and Junior	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

12.02.13	Parent / Carer of School Child	Yes	Yes	
12.02.13	Parent / Pre School Child / Junior / Infants	Yes	No	I have a child at each school and a child who will start in a couple of years. From my observation the Infants school has always been a really nurturing environment and whilst the Junior School is clearly improving, it is far less so. I have no complaints about the Juniors and feel it is efficient and well run but I would worry about losing the philosophy of the infants School. If the proposal was to close the Juniors and extend the Infants I would not hesitate to back it. At the moment I do not agree and I believe that the decision has already been made. The fact that the Juniors has a Head already overseeing 2 other Schools worries me greatly. The Infants has always been a lovely School. What day to day impact will this have and will we be expected to buy all new uniform / certainly hope not in this economic climate.
12.02.13	Parent / carer of child Infants and Juniors	No	No	
12.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	No	I am a parent of a school child. Whilst I think the amalgamation of the two Bitterne Park schools into one overall Primary is an exceptionally good idea, I do not agree with the entire plan as laid out in the information received this week. The Infant School has an excellent record and very positive, proactive attitude with regards to special educational needs. I feel that the Junior School could learn a lot from the Infant School and am concerned
14.02.13		Yes	Concerns	
14.02.13	Parent / Child Infant and Juniors	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				that this would not happen if the Infant School were closed. The Infant School also has a willing and active Governing Body which the Junior School lacks.
14.02.13	Parent / Infant School Child	No	No	To make the school a primary is wrong on two serious points, I believe the Infant school should not be closed because it is a much more rounded school than the Juniors. I have a child in both schools and think the Infants is a much better school. The infant school cares as much about the emotional well being of my child as his educational needs whereas the Juniors is so focussed on academic achievement that the emotional needs of the young people are neglected. The head at the junior school is rarely there as she is spread across three Schools. Bitterne Park deserves a Head that is dedicated to that school and is not thinly spread. Mrs Montague only has a three year contract and what will happen when the contract has ended? Yet more upheaval and upset for the young people. Good for the City and budgets NOT good for children. School should be able to survive on its own budget. Short termism by the Council will not make for a sustainable future. Ticking statutory boxes won't make well educated children. It seems clear that the real reason for the proposed merger is concerned with saving money and not prioritising the well being of children at either the infant or junior school. The "super" header teacher
18.02.13	Parents / Child Infants and Juniors	Yes	No	
19.02.13	Parents / Child Infants and Juniors	Yes	No	
21.02.13	Parent/child of a school child and pre- school child	No	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				now in charge of the junior school occupies the same post at several other schools, which begs the questions how would she cope with the extra responsibility and who would lose out as a result, the children?
25.02.13	Parent/child of infant school child	No	No	
				I feel it is outrageous to discontinue Bitterne Park Infants and to move forward with the Junior School taking the lead. Bitterne Park Junior School is nowhere near the same standard and it is therefore unacceptable that their leadership should have the responsibility for running a combine school. The Junior School standards have been falling over the last few years, so much so that I have been considering sending my child to an alternative junior school provision. However, if the schools were to merge and the infants were to lead the new primary school, I would reconsider this move. Bitterne Park Infant School has a wonderful ethos and leadership team (including Governors) which reflects positively in the overall school atmosphere, the happiness of its students and in their Ofsted reports. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the Junior School. I urge you to consider changing the lead on this merger and I feel this will be the general feeling of the local community.
25.02.13	Parent/child of infant school child	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

25.02.13	Parent/child of infant school child	Yes	Yes	
25.02.13	Parent/child of Infant and Junior School	Yes	Yes	<p>I would be interested in what the proposal for new Junior/Infant/Primary uniform would be and would there be a transitional time for implementation. Having a child going into Year 6 in September 2013 I would be very reluctant to buy a new uniform for a school year.</p> <p>I am reluctant for two good schools to be disrupted by a merger, particularly as one of my children is due to start in September 2013 and precious time in his education could be affected by the transition period. If a merger does go ahead I would be very concerned about the current head of the Junior School becoming the overall head of the new primary. This is mainly due to the fact she is already managing other schools. Such a large primary school needs one dedicated head who is solely committed to the new school - on site through the week a- committed to the local community and available and supportive to staff and pupils. Ideally either a new head would be appointed or the existing head would only manage one school. The children of the infant school are younger, need stability and a larger school would lose the strong nurturing qualities so valued at the current infant school.</p>
25.02.13	Parent/carer of infant school child. Parent/carer of a pre-school child. Local Resident	No	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

25.02.13	Parent of Infant School and pre-school child	Yes	No	<p>Due to the good reputation of the infant school I would rather the junior school be discontinued and the infant school to extend its age range. I would be interested to hear more about an "external provider" and discuss this idea further. I am not happy for the head of the junior school to become the head of the new primary school as I feel she is already too stretched and would not have adequate time or energy to run another school. A one hour drop in session is not suitable, especially at 2.30pm - an evening session for questions and discussion where ALL parents could attend would be essential. I feel it would be very important for the current strong governing body at the infant school to remain in role prior to the merge and new parent elected representatives from the current juniors join them. I am not concerned about the two schools becoming a primary but I do think a new head should be employed to lead the school forward. The proposal makes claims that a merger would benefit pupils' education but needs to substantiate this. I believe the fact the infant school does not have a head is seen as an opportunity to cut costs. I believe a governing body focused on a narrower age range is better as the needs of children will be very different. It is a far more difficult task - headteacher across the primary school. If you merged the school why wouldn't you advertise the role of headteacher across the primary. I am not aware of any significant transition disruption that the merger would mitigate? What were (are) the issues and how would that be</p>
26.02.13	Parent/carer of an infant school child and a local resident	No	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				improved by a merger? Agree communality of school policies and not needing to apply for school places are an advantage but in my opinion not significant enough to warrant the merger.
				The Infant School is fantastic. It has strong leadership, a caring ethos and is overall an excellent school, meeting the needs of ALL children. The Junior School has been in turmoil for a few years. The 'Partnership' approach has provided structure and leadership. However the School seems to be dominated by the needs of the partnership school and focus on the children at Bitterne Park Junior School has been lost. The Junior School Head Teacher is often absent and unavailable to parents and children. How is taking on the Infant School going to be managed? The Junior School Head has a 3 year contract and seems to be managing the School by bringing in Teachers from Partner Schools. This does not seem to be a long term plan for the future and development of the School. The Schools should remain separate. If not they should be merged or the Juniors closed and the age range of the Infants expanded with a NEW Headteacher for both Schools appointed. <b>THE INFANT SCHOOL SHOULD NOT CLOSE.</b>
28.02.13	Parent / Carer Infant and Junior School Child	No	No	
28.02.13	Parent/carer of infant and a junior school child	Yes	No	We have children in both the infant and junior schools and therefore have good experience of the management and teaching in each. On this basis we feel VERY strongly that it is the junior school which

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

04.03.13	Parent / Carer of Child	Yes	No	<p>should be discontinued and the infant school expanded. In our opinion and experience the infant school has better management, better teaching and an overall better ethos than the junior school even taking into account the leadership of Gerida Montague and the acting headship of Jayne Broach. The infant school is the superior school of the two in every way and we have grave concerns that if the junior school was allowed to expand it would weaken the new primary school. The junior school should be discontinued so that the infant school can bring its expertise to the new primary school and make it just as successful.</p> <p>I do not agree to closing the Infant School as it has established School Governors unlike the Junior School.</p>
04.03.13	Parent / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	
06.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	No	
06.03.13	Parent / Infants Riverside Pre School	Yes	No	<p>I have no objection to joining the Schools, but I vehemently object to them being under the control of a 'Superhead'. She already has 3 Schools, she doesn't need another one! As far as I gather, she is rarely at BP Juniors and doesn't know her children's names. She may have improved the academic side of things but several parents say that it is no longer a caring and nurturing environment - unlike the Infants which is lovely. I also know a teacher at the Juniors</p>



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

06.03.13	Parent / Child Junior School	No	No	<p>who says that staff morale is at an all time low. If the Infants joins with the Juniors under the 'Superhead' I will be looking for another school to send my 3 children to. Please seek to employ a new Headteacher to oversee the merger of both schools! The Infant School has always been the stronger school of the two. Consistently achieving better Ofsted Reports. The Junior School has only just a received a "good" ofsted and the new management has not had long enough to prove its consistent capabilities to reassure me that they will do a good job in managing the Primary School.</p> <p>I think it is a good idea to have one School not two, but as a parent who has experienced both Schools, I have more confidence in the principles and practises of the current Infant School and would therefore prefer to discontinue the Junior School and expand the age range of the Infant School. Whilst Mrs Montague has achieved a huge amount of success in revitalising the Junior School, the atmosphere, positivity, engagement etc of the Infant School is better established and inspires more confidence. I would support the Infant Schools proposal of the Junior Head leading the transition and the Infants Governing Body becoming the Governing Body for the Primary School (with specialist support for areas which would be "new" eg, year 3 - 6 curriculum). Will be good to only have one uniform!</p>
08.03.13	Parent / Child Infant and Junior Schools	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

08.03.13	Parent / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	
08.03.13	Parent / Carer of School Child	Yes	Yes	
08.03.13	Parent / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	Would the School Uniform change?
08.03.13	Parent / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	
08.03.13	Parent / Carer of School Child	Yes	No	Our Questions:-
12.03.13	Parent /Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	
12.03.13	Parent / Child Infant Juniors	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent / Junior School Child	No	No	Management of Bitterne Park Junior School would be better employed in broadening the range of activities available to the pupils. Why discontinue such a wonderful Infant School? The nurture that is well established over a number of years is irreplaceable there. Discontinue the less successful school and build onto the Infants. (not physically - but mentally) working with the well-established staff ethos, procedures and curriculum that clearly work. With a Headteacher who CARES about the children above all. MAKE A FRESH START employ a new Headteacher that has no other schools, no agents or the stake in what happens. Employ a
15.03.13	Parent / School Child / Local Resident	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				Headteacher that is agreed to by each Gov Body for the best of each School. This is a legal requirement. You are asking for trouble if you believe there will be no resentment from the Infants School Staff towards a Headteacher who is fabricated to takeover and who has not been democratically employed through a thorough process of interview etc. Who says the Headteacher of the Junior is the best candidate to work with the Infants too? Each school at present has a different, ethos, way of working etc, it needs to be handled SO well so that the excellent staff in both Schools (bit particularly the Infants) are NOT resigning willy-nilly in protect. I see it happening, very sad!!!!
15.03.13	Gov / Parent Infant School Parent Infant / Junior	Yes	No	
18.03.13	School Child	Yes	Yes	
19.03.13	Parent / School Child	Yes	No	I am in support of the creation of a Primary School but have serious concerns with regards to the option of using the Junior School Management Team. I do not feel that the existing Junior School Management Team are sensitive to the needs and high quality of BPIS. The staff and management of BPIS appear (on the ground) to have more to offer in this merger arrangement than BPJS. BPJS management staff spend significant periods off site at other Schools. This is disruptive to the delivery of education to our children at present and these planned changes will

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

only exacerbate this situation, if the BPJS management staff are driving the process.

(Yes with a dedicated exclusive Headteacher) I have waited until today's in school consultation to respond as I was sure that I'd learn more be persuaded (or not) about this proposed merger. I was not comfortable about some of the personal comments about the current (and today I learnt) permanent Head of BPJS. I was also not convinced that you've fully understood that at least for me the objection is not to the person of Mrs Montague but to her role. I want my children to be cared for, nurtured, led, developed etc by a full-time dedicated, exclusive headteacher. This is so very important in EYFS, and has, I believe, been one of the factors in making BPIS such a creative, attentive, nurturing learning environment. There is a huge loyalty to the staff and Schools of BPIS and rightly so. I am sure that Mrs Montague could only develop and enrich the Infant School if she were fully available - not effectively spread across the equivalent of 4 schools. As parents, our experience of the IEB and BPJS is impersonal unapproachable and not joined up - we don't want this to be our experience and BPIS. It may well be "the governments preferred model" but it's not working well enough at BPJS for me to be persuaded that stretching Mrs M further (by taking on BPIS in addition to Holy Family and Sinclair) will help take BPIS from good, outstanding or indeed much

19.03.13	Parent / Infant Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
----------	---	-----	-----

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

else. Merging BPIS and BPJS with a full time dedicated head and a specialist KS1 and EYFS or equivalent deputy is the model that I'd like to support and I hope that you'll give consideration to.

Booth schools currently have temporary heads in my view. It is the Infant School that has a long term proven track record in terms of Ofsted, but have importantly (as a parent) have the trust and earned confidence of the parents. The Junior School is now up to standard but is lacks the warmth, nurturing and sensitiveness that Mrs Conner and her Team fostered and work hard at for years. If the Schools are to combine it should be on an equal footing. I feel strongly there should be an open and transparent selection process for a dedicated head who wishes to apply for this long-term opportunity not as a change management project. The current Junior Head was brought in for crisis management to bring heads together, do it my way or elsewhere. This is a very different situation requiring a different skill set. We are growing a new School not trouble shooting; nurturing and valuing our pupils and teachers is key and a leader sincerely strong in this area as well as administratively strong should be selected to lead our Primary. This is to sensitive a growth to be part of an "empire" with countless deputies/senior team stand-ins. Please; an application process for a Headteacher who wants to commit to our community, we are not a

19.03.13	Parent / Infant / Junior School	Yes	No
----------	---------------------------------------	-----	----

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

"franchise". This is really important.

I was at the 2.30 meeting at BPIS this afternoon and could not get my points across as I had to leave to get my kids before it was time for my questions to be answered.

I wanted to summarise the views of some parents there: they are worried that Gerida will not have sufficient time to take on the role of HT successfully as she is an ht of 2 other schools. It IS personal for some there and I understand that as a parent.

As a teacher myself I have heard many many things that worry me about her leadership style and I am strong and wilful, believe you me! So I can stand up to most! That aspect is something I do not relish ...the infants school becoming eg; a well oiled machine of children getting results at the expense of fun, happiness and the spirit of primary education. ....

The overriding question I wanted to put to you was: how is it fair that she is being given automatic ascendancy to ht of the infants without an interview, application and selection process by govts??and the chance for it to be opened up to other aspiring HTs who would take the opportunity with glee to take on a 2 school merger into a primary school after a fair and clear selection process? I would like to know when

19.03.13 Parent /  
School Child

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

exactly the HTs contract became permanent ??  
 Seems convenient that it was just at consultation point  
 ...and if it was so, what is the point of all of this  
 consultation ?? She will get it case closed. So  
 disappointing ....and perhaps even illegal in many  
 respects

This is not a consultation. It is already decided, this  
 is just jumping through hoops (GM is choosing her  
 office? Council want a new uniform) both schools  
 should be dissolved and a new one created. The  
 current temporary head of the Juniors should have to  
 apply to be head. The school should have its own  
 identity/budget. GM is not a head teacher, she just  
 turns a handle, sends over paperwork and clones a  
 school good for the city and budgets NOT for children.  
 School should be able to survive on its own budget  
 not a blurred one. Short termism by the Council will  
 not make for a sustainable future. Ticking statutory  
 boxes won't make well educated children.

I am writing because I am very concerned about some  
 of the proposed changes at my daughter's school. I  
 have found Bitterne Park Infant School to be a lovely  
 introduction to the Education system for my daughter  
 who is now in year 1. It is a caring and nurturing  
 environment run by staff who know all the children in  
 the school. The staff really care for the children and  
 are passionate about education. There seems to be a  
 really positive atmosphere amongst them and within

19.03.13	Parent / School Child	Yes	No
----------	--------------------------	-----	----

20.03.13	Parent Infant School	No	No
----------	-------------------------	----	----

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				the school.
24.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	No	I am writing to express my views on the proposed merger of my daughter's school, Bitterne Park Infant, and the school she is moving up to in September, Bitterne Park Junior.
24.03.14	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	No	
				Having attended the meetings on the proposals I am still confused as to the options available for debate. I am in favour of an all through Primary. It seems the LEA is in favour of sharing continued leadership across both Schools and yet this consistency is not considered acceptable by many parents as the Juniors already, without another 270 children joining! I would like to hear more of the "specifics" of this proposal. What will the Leadership structure look like? What are Mrs Montague's plans for BP? We are having to make decisions and second guess her plans /vision. Will she appoint a "head of School"? Details please!!!
24.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	No	It is important for a young child's development and education that we have an infant school with designated head teacher. An infant school supported by a specific head teacher can indicate 100% of resources to infant development without a focus on the Junior level. I would encourage effective
26.03.13	Parent Pre School Child	No	No	



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				<p>communication and dialogue between infant and junior school but it is important that infants have the intimacy of a small school with a head teacher dedicated to the needs of infants. I am ashamed that a labour administration would contemplate such a move. The infant level is the most important in a child's development and it is important that it is supported with a dedicated infant school and head teacher. This move is just an attempt to save money at the expense of child development. Like all consultations I expect that the decision has already been taken by the cabinet, leader and Executive Member. Has the Scrutiny Committee undertaken a review of the effectiveness of the policy, called in expert witnesses and drawn on research from other cities both in the UK and Europe?</p>
26.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	No	
26.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior Child Local Resident	Yes	No	
26.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School	Yes	Yes	<p>Whilst I support in principal the creation of an all through primary school in Bitterne Park I do have some important concerns:- a change such as this is challenging for all and we will need a dedicated and supportive headteacher. I do not support the current arrangement of sharing a Headteacher with other schools at this key time in the schools development. Our children and teacher will need nurturing, support</p>

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

and visibility of the headteacher during this time. The current administrative standards at the Juniors are shambolic compared to that at the Infants especially for time pressured working parents. I worry we will become even more marginalised from school life and that our children if the Junior's organisational standards become the norm for the infants. Notice of events is poorly timed, they are often at inappropriate times (4.30pm) and lack of details means we do not know what is expected of us. There are few opps for parents of Juniors to attend assemblies, shows etc. Please, please, please do not lose the fantastic work the infants do in this area which means I can be part of my children's school life. Whilst I support the increased focus on academic success at BPJS my child seems to be taking tests after test most weeks. This seems quite restrictive and I would welcome the introduction of the Infants "themed" based learning which seems to capture the children's interest more. Many thanks.

I would like to bring up one salient factor in these discussions. Forming a merger or not is not a matter of "principle," as it was repeatedly stressed in the consultations. It is a matter of ensuring that the ensuing primary school puts in place structures -- administrative and educational -- that enhances and enriches the learning experience of the children and incorporates, as best as possible, the diverse ways in which parents imagine their children's ideal development paths. It is therefore encouraging that

26.03.13 Parent /  
School Child

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

27.03.13	Parent School Child	No	No	<p>Ms Gerida Montague sent around her responses to many of the issues that were brought up in an emailed document earlier today, Monday March 25. In particular, her reference to spreading good practice from both existing schools to the merged one does indicate an awareness of the execution of lofty "principles" no one would typically be opposed to. There is a very strong sense of community and care for the individual child at the infants school which I feel is at risk of being lost if it is merged with the juniors. As a parent I can currently go into the Infants and promptly be given a meeting with the Head teacher to share any concerns or views I have. Being a parent of a young child at a School where the head is overseeing 600 pupils is concerning - especially as I understand that the Headteacher is also overseeing the other schools. I cannot possibly expect to have much contact with the headteacher or be able to influence now my child is educated. The concern with the infant school being the one to close is also that we will have minimal relationship with the leadership team and again be just one voice amongst many. I do not support the closure of the infants school - it is a happy safe and nurturing environment and should not be closed just because there is an acting headteacher - I am supportive of developing a primary school but I am not happy that there will be no interview process in which governors and stakeholders can have a say in who will lead the school. I am also unhappy that parents have been</p>
27.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

27.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes(BUT)	No	<p>talked to as though this is a foregone conclusion. I personally have felt patronized, ignored and the whole process has felt underhand.</p> <p>In principle I am not against a Primary school, however I have a lot of concerns regarding 'how' this is done, who is involved and the importance of retaining the very positive aspects of both schools. I actually feel to close both schools and open a Primary school would 'feel' better than closing one and extending the other. I believe that this is a complex merger and to do this well the individuals involved are going to need to have the confidence of the staff and parents. I also believe strongly that this needs leadership (head teacher) there full time - a head that is the face of the school and who staff, parents and pupils can go to, who they know and who knows them. If we continue to have the skills of an Executive Head then I feel it would be crucial to have a 'Head of School' of 2: a 'head of the lower school' and a 'head of the upper school'. This would keep the familiarity between head and pupils.</p> <p>I am a parent of a child at Bitterne Park Infant school, and a parent of a pre-school child. I wish to respond to the consultation questions posed on the proposed merger with Bitterne Park Junior school.</p> <p>I am a parent of a child at Bitterne Park Infant school, and a parent of a pre-school child. As part of the pre-statutory consultation, I wish to address to the following two questions:</p>
27.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	No	
27.03.13	Parent of infant school child			

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

1) Do you support the proposal to create an all-through primary school by merging Bitterne Park Infant and Bitterne Park Junior schools?

2) Do you support the proposal to create an all-through primary school by discontinuing Bitterne Park Infant School and extending the age of pupils at Bitterne Pak Junior School?

The answer to both is that I don't know at this moment in time if I support or not these proposals. Although I have no objection in principle, very limited information has been supplied to elicit a positive support from parents.

I am familiar with the set up and running of the Infant School. Although there are over 250 pupils, I feel that it is still possible to have a direct and personal relationship with the head teacher if there is the need to discuss matters of concern. There is an established good working relationship between the head teacher, the school teaching staff, the governors and the parents. Pupils enjoy their time at school. We haven't yet come across bad behaviour.

It appears as a parent that by supporting the above two proposals we are risking losing all of the above for an undefined new and bigger entity. All we know so far is that the new primary school will comprise over 800 pupils. It is still, at this moment in time, very unclear to me how the new school will be run.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

What is the proposed school model? What is the proposed structure of the senior leadership team? Who are its members and their roles? Who will talk to me as a parent if there is a specific issue regarding my child that I wish to discuss? A head of year? Head of school? A deputy head?

Only on the 25th March, we learnt in a letter from Gerida Montague that the proposed model is based on an Executive Headship, but no background information has been provided about how such a model would be beneficial to the merger of the two Bitterne Park schools. It would be helpful if examples were provided.

I look forward to receiving further information. I am very hopeful that educational standards can be further improved for the benefit of the all children. I am a parent at Bitterne Park Infant school (I have a child in year 2 and a child in Foundation Stage, and a two year old who will join the infants in 2015). I am writing to share my views on the proposed merger of Bitterne Park Infant School and Bitterne Park Junior School.

**I support the proposal to create an all-through primary school.**

**I do not support the proposal to discontinue the Infant school.**

27.03.13	Parent of infant school child	Yes	No
----------	-------------------------------------	-----	----

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

I am a Primary school teacher and I see the value of having a though primary school, as opposed to split infant and junior schools. The benefits for the children, staff and families are enormous.

However I have huge reservations about the discontinuing of the infant school. In my opinion this is a fantastic school and its merits need to be acknowledged and used to create an effective all through Primary School.

In my opinion as a parent, these are the main qualities Bitterne Park Infant School has to offer:

- **partnership with parents and the local community.** Bitterne Park is a very unique and strong community. The infant school makes great links with this, inviting parents in to work alongside children, celebrate their successes and share in their learning at home. Parents' thoughts and opinions are valued and heard - there is an open door policy where parents have a constructive communication and relationship with teachers and the school. From my understanding this is not currently the case in the junior school.
- **a creative and stimulating curriculum** which is child centred and captures the interest and imagination of the children. My children have both been thoroughly engaged by the topics they have encountered. Teachers at the infant school then

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

use this starting point in a meaningful way to further children's learning in all areas. They still manage to deliver quality teaching and learning in all subjects and without losing any weight in core subjects particularly maths and english. From my understanding the junior school's curriculum currently does not offer the same level of excitement and stimulation for the children.

- **a culture of creativity, performance and celebration.**  
Children are regularly given opportunities at the infant school to perform and celebrate their successes. Parents are regularly invited in to share in this, through open afternoons, class assemblies, end of term performances etc. The school also makes excellent use of outside agencies to enhance teaching and learning.
- **a nurturing and caring environment**, where the children feel safe and happy. My children have all loved coming to school right from day one. They feel valued and understood and are enthusiastic about all areas of school life. The teacher's know individual children and their needs, and use this to develop the children in the widest sense.
- **a dedicated and skilled team of staff.** I am concerned that after the merger, infant school staff will have a very different style of leadership, jobs and responsibilities will change, as will the culture of the school as a whole, and ultimately we may



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

lose the committed staff that the infant school has.

My second major concern is the leadership structure currently in place in the Junior school. Although the model of an 'executive head' may work in some cases, I do not feel it is the right approach in Bitterne Park. Bitterne Park has a very strong community and the school is at the heart of this. We therefore need a headteacher who is committed to this, who knows the families and understands the values of the community, who is present and accessible to staff, parents and children. I am extremely uncertain whether Mrs Montague can deliver this in her role as headteacher of 2 other large primary schools in different parts of the county.

Mrs Montague undeniably has an excellent track record of turning failing schools around. I can see that she has done a good job to get a better level of teaching and learning at the Junior school from that of previous years. However Bitterne Park Infant School is currently a 'good' (and very nearly an 'outstanding') school. In my opinion a real challenge for a headteacher is to take a school from 'good' to 'outstanding' and then maintain these high levels of teaching and learning. Is Mrs Montague committed enough to Bitterne Park to ensure that this happens in the long term?

As the Infant school is currently without a permanent

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

headteacher, I would therefore be in favour of creating a new primary school from the existing infant and junior schools. In my opinion this would allow a new headteacher and governing body to be appointed who could build on the merits of *both* schools and work closely with the local community to create an effective all through primary school for Bitterne Park.

Oakwood Infant and Junior:

Date Received	Relationship to schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary my merging the two schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary by closing the infant and expanding the junior	Comments
11.02.13	Parent School Child	Yes	Yes	None I am emailing in response to the consultation document which was circulated to parents last week.
12.02.13	Parent / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	I fully support the LEA's strategy in keeping the proposed Junior School maintained status. Opening up to competition would not be beneficial to my children's education. Mr Taylor has proved to be a very able and energetic Headteacher. All my older children, who have moved to secondary school, have benefitted from Mr Taylor's leadership. So I fully

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				support the proposal that Mr Taylor remains in the role of Headteacher for the proposed Junior School, as I am sure he will lead a successful transition to the new situation. Begs the question why this was not proposed when Mrs Moore left the Infant School a few years back?
25.02.13	Parent / Child Infant and Junior	No	No	I am concerned that the focus and quality of early years will be lost if the Schools merge with most time and importance put in favour of KS2 and year 6 sats my main concerns are: a) that by merging both schools the wonderful ethos at the infant school will be lost and b) the automatic presumption that the current junior school head would become the head of the primary school. I feel the position should be advertised.
26.02.13	Member of staff Infant and Junior	No	No	I would like to offer my support for your proposal to merge Oakwood Infant and Junior Schools. I was a Governor at Oakwood Junior from 1999 until 2011 and Chair of Governors from 2003 to 2011. In my last two years as Chair of Governors it was clear that there was tremendous scope for the two schools to cooperated and perhaps move towards a soft federation. Unfortunately at that time I met great resistance from the Infant School Governing body. I am therefore delighted to see that the retirement of the Infant School Head has presented an opportunity to merge the Schools. Ian Taylor is in my view an outstanding Headteacher and will bring real creativity and energy to a Primary School. I very much hope that these proposals gain support and are seen through to a conclusion.
04.03.13				
12.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

13.03.13	Parent / Old School Pupil			<p>I am responding to your letter regarding the proposal to merge Oakwood Infant and Junior Schools to form Oakwood Primary School. Whilst I no longer qualify as a parent of a pupil currently at either School, I have been actively involved with both Schools over a period of 35 years. I have 4 children; all of whom were educated here at various times from 1978 to 1998. My wife was employed as a teacher at the Infant School for a period of 22 years prior to retiring. I have been a committee member of the PTA (Oakwood Schools Associated) for 16 years and have served as Treasurer for the past 12 years. I currently have 3 grandchildren passing through the system and a further 3 having now graduated to higher education. My son, Michael was recently appointed Chair of the Infant School Governors. I trust you will agree that I am therefore more than qualified to comment on your proposal.</p> <p>Without knowing all of the details of how the layout of the School would be, if the Infants would mix with Juniors? I would not feel comfortable sending my child to a School with children a lot older than him, specially a first year infant. I think there should be some more information on how this would work and if the children would eat together, use the same toilets etc - I would feel very uncomfortable with this.</p>
18.03.13	Parent / Infant and Junior School Child	No	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

19.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	<p>Drop in Consultation - This wasn't quite as advertised. With rows of chairs it was a little difficult to join in without feeling you were interrupting. It would have worked better to have been able to ask questions individually rather than in front of everyone. The Council representatives sat behind a table. This created an instant "them and us" situation, which would have been easy to avoid. I fully appreciate it must be a difficult situation for the Council representatives but I feel it is important to respond to questions positively and not treating parents or responding to them as if they are clueless. In these situations a smile goes a long way and creating an atmosphere of "where in this together" has the potential to stop negative feelings. These are some of my observations of the drop in. The process could easily be improved. I fully support the Schools becoming a primary School.</p> <p>To be in all through primary, the two Schools will need to be linked so movement between the Schools can be done without going outside. A simple walkway would be great. Money therefore needs to be made available for this to happen and other changes too to make the merger a success. Having a Primary School is so much better for the children and their education and that is what counts. A fantastic opportunity!</p>
19.03.13	Members of Staff / Local Resident Parent / Carer of	Yes	Yes	
21.03.13	School Child	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

22.03.13	Parent / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	I am in favour of merging Oakwood Infant and Junior Schools with the current Headteacher becoming the Primary Head. I am confident that his enthusiastic manner and effective leadership will benefit the Infant School and enhance the quality of the children's education. My only concern is a change in uniform, it would be pleasing if the main colour remains as brown continuing the history of uniform at Oakwood Schools.
22.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
22.013.13	Parent Carer of School Child	No	No	I think it stinks people will lose jobs and one person cannot look after such a big School. To save money maybe you should make everyone pay for trips not just the workers. As workers are worst off than the spongers, that I have to work hard for. Don't think it will be good for Infants as the Infants is a much nicer and friendlier place than the Juniors. Load of **** cos you will only do what you want to do so why bother asking.
22.03.13	Parent Carer of School Child	Yes	Yes	
22.03.13	Parent Parent Child	Yes	Yes	As long as it doesn't affect my daughters learning then I don't give a ****.
26.03.13	Oakwood Infant	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

26.03.13	Parent Child Oakwood Infants	Yes	No	I am concerned over the current layout of the 2 school building as how this will allow one "all inclusive school" where there are currently 2 distinct sites. How will this be addressed? I also do not believe that pre and initial consultation has been handled in a proper way, with information getting out before it should unsettling staff members. How will this be rectified to maintain a stable staffing structure? How will the possible skill gap of the current leadership be addressed to ensure there is a balanced approach to all age groups not just focus on the key stage 2?
----------	------------------------------------	-----	----	--

Tanners Brook Infant & Junior:

Date Received	Relationship to schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary my merging the two schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary by closing the junior and expanding the infant	Comments
06.02.13	Parent Hearing Impaired Child	Concerns		As a parent of a child at both these schools and 1 child is hearing impaired I am concerned as to no mention in the proposals of the Hearing Units at both these schools. What will happen to the units, will they merge and therefore be able to take less children in or will the two units remain separate and take in the same amount of pupils. My child has only just started in Reception, and is also under

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

13.02.13	Parent / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	Statement, and therefore still has many years there of which she will need the support of the unit. I do have concerns over the size of the School as eventually there will be 840 pupils when the current YR's reach year 6. What provisions have been made for the building and infrastructure?
13.02.13	Parent / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	
13.02.13	Governor / Member of Staff Infants	Yes	Yes	To see the Schools become fully integrated staff and office facilities should be in place at the start of the Primary School. To have separate staffs rooms and offices will lead to two groups carrying on as before. Given that there does seem to be a lack of motivation and morale amongst staff at Tanners Brook Junior School - demonstrated by the lack of liaison and support amongst staff members during consultation evenings with parents / carers, it is a good opportunity to now change the dynamics of the School. It will give leadership staff the opportunity to recognise strengths and weaknesses in order for the school to be a more positive learning environment. I hope that by implementing these changes the divide that seems to exist between these two individual schools can be eradicated. In transition the warmth of the Infant School that does exist does not seem to generate into the Junior School. Had an alliance and co-operation been managed by the two schools when considering inset days, fundraising events and concerns, it would of cemented a more professional, community orientated reputable learning environment. I wish
14.02.13	Parents / Child Junior School	Yes	Yes	



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				every success to Miss Baker who has the capability of now promoting a more wholesome consistent learning environment and atmosphere to benefit future generations.
18.02.13	Parent / Child Infant / Junior School	Yes	Yes	I hope that during the consultation period the LA do listen to concerns and opinions from all involved and base decisions on all 'evidence' and not on personal opinion or financial issues. I hope that the Council put the needs of the present pupils and future ones at the forefront of all discussions and decisions. I hope that the Schools involved will receive the support of the LA during any transition and into the future and not be left to deal with change on their own. I hope it is carried out with thought and care with less haste than normal. Would it be carried out properly!!
01.03.13	Parent / Child Infant / Junior School	Yes	Yes	I am a parent of children who attend both the infant & junior school.
04.03.13	Parent / Year 4 Child	Yes	Concern with Infants Taking Control	I am the parent of a child in year 4, this is my third child through this school. I attended the consultation meeting on the 28th February and was surprised at the lack of parents there. I felt that it was more like a staff meeting and think that there should have been a Junior School Staff meeting prior to the parental meeting. There were maybe questions that the parents didn't want to raise in front of the teachers. I have a few questions which I didn't want to raise: Future leadership arrangements, I do have concerns whether the Infant School Headteacher is qualified and has the
05.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	No	
06.03.13	Parent / Junior School			

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

				experience to run a Primary School? The regards to timing and speed in which moving forward, the disruption of reconstruction of staff and the support to staff, this will not only affect teachers but the children in learning. My child has SATS in 2014, which is very important. Will children's learning suffer due to size of School? Also will teachers, Headteachers and parents have communication problems due to the size.
12.03.13	Parent / Infant / Junior School Child	Yes		
12.03.13	Parent/ Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	
12.03.13	Parent / Carer of School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Members of Staff Infant / Junior		Yes	
15.03.13	PTA Member / Child Junior School	Yes	No	A good idea in as much as parents of year 2 children would not have to apply for a year 3 place. I have had 4 children attending both Tanners Brook Infant / Junior Schools from 1995 to present date, with 3 more years remaining. My main concern is possible loss of employment for some very loyal and long serving staff members. Thank you for reading these comments.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

15.03.13	Member of Staff Junior School	Yes	No	<p>I question why the Junior School is being discontinued as there is a greater number of pupils there. Would it not be better to state the Schools are merging to become a primary, with one Headteacher. Sadly this "discontinued" is causing much angst amongst staff. There is also many concerns with the Infant School Governing Body becoming the Governing Body for the new primary. The possibility of Junior School Governors being able to help govern the new primary should be a given - not just a possible. Surely to help run a successful new primary, Governors from both Schools should merge together to reflect the skills and knowledge they have gained from Governing a Junior and Infant School. There should be a mix of the two Governing bodies. We are feeling very much as if we are one the side lines and everything is evolving around the Infant School, we are to just "slot in" as and when decisions have been made.</p>
15.03.13	Parent Carer School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Member of Staff Junior School	Yes	No	<p>I very much agree with the idea of Tanners Brook Primary School but would prefer this was achieved by closing/merging Tanners Brook Infant and Tanners Brook Junior School. This would allow the appointment of an experienced primary headteacher and also time for a governing body to be formed that represents the whole school rather than an Infant School governing body who are given the authority to decide who they will accept from the Junior School governing body.</p>
19.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
19.03.13	Parent Infant	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

	/ Junior School Child Parent		
19.03.13	School Child Parent	No	No
19.03.13	School Child Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School Child Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	/ Junior School Child Parent	Yes	
19.03.13	/ Junior School Child Member of Staff	Yes	
19.03.13	School Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School Child Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School / Pre School Child Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School Child Parent	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School Child Member of Staff	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	School	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	Parent	Yes	Yes

Consideration needs to be given to the buildings as it is difficult to be one whole, coherent staff if we are in two separate buildings.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

19.03.13	School Child Parent Infant School Child Parent		Yes
19.03.13	School Child	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	Yes
19.03.13	Parent Infant School	Yes	Yes

This makes sense and will prevent a new build elsewhere in the city. It will be nice to see Rita Baker take Leadership of the Primary School in the 2 Schools merge!

As a member of staff at Tanners Brook Junior School, I support the proposed merger of the Infant and Juniors Schools. I do have one concern, as it involves both myself and my team directly. I am the Teacher of the Deaf at Tanners Brook Junior School and am concerned that there is no mention of the existing Resource Bases for Deaf Children situated in both Schools. Do I assume that no change in provision is intended and that no mention of the provisions deliberate; as they are considered to be part of both Schools?

21.03.13	Member of Staff Tanners Brook	Yes	Yes
----------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----

On a more personal level, as I am currently on maternity leave, I have asked to reduce my hours from 5 days to 4 days in September. As this process has only just started, I will not be given a definite answer till all is sorted in July. This is making it very difficult to sort out childcare for my son and sort out my finances. I understand this process takes a while but I do think it should have been started earlier.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

Valentine Infant and Heathfield Junior:

Date Received	Relationships to schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary by merging the two schools	Do you support the proposal to create a primary by closing the junior and expanding the infant	Comments
12.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant School	No	No	I have concerns that this merger has been proposed as a result of issues with the reputation of Heathfield Junior School and a poor Ofsted Report and this merger is being considered in order to improve the reputation of the Junior School.
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant School	Yes	Yes	
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant School	Yes	Yes	(1) Would both Schools become one big School? (2) Would the merger effect class sizes? (3) Would the ofsted
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant School	Yes	Yes	
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

	Infant School		
14.02.13	Parent / Heathfield Juniors	Yes	Yes
14.02.13	Parent / Valentine Infants	Yes	Yes
14.02.13	Parent / Valentine / Heathfield		
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant	Yes	Yes
14.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine Infant School	Yes	Yes
18.02.13	Parent / Child Valentine / Heathfield	Yes	Yes

standard be kept to the high standard of the infant School (4) Would there be an increase in bullying due to the large age groups? (5) How much disruption would there be from the go-ahead dates, on the kids education? (6) Would the merger mean a higher budget for the School or just a cost cutting exercise / staff reduction programme.

I feel this is a good idea due to the fact that the Head of Heathfield has been trying to push a close working relationship between the two schools where in the past the schools have not, the schools already have the same Governors and Uniform thanks to Heathfield Head and primary was just a matter of time, have been saying for years it should be, just hope that the Head of Heathfield stays as do the Heathfield Office as valentine office are not approachable.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

25.02.13	Parent/child of Infant School	Yes		
25.02.13	Parent/child of Infant school	Yes	Yes	
25.02.13	Parent/child of Infant and Junior School	Yes	Yes	
25.02.13	Parent/child of infant school	Yes	Yes	I do support the proposal to create a primary school from both schools. My only worry is will this mean bigger class rooms? More children in each class - more teaching assistants? If so I wouldn't support the proposal.
05.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	Yes	
05.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	Yes	
05.03.13	Parent / School Child	Yes	Yes(Concerns with Parking)	Someone is going to have accident it's a death trap!! Parking!! The Council need to make a raised pedestrian area NO parking. The lollipop man needs to stand at the 'T' junction are to safely cross children to both schools SAFETY should be first. The management - Head Mistress and Office Staff at Valentine are weak, rude and unapproachable. The Junior Schools administration are amazing. With leading from the front with the Head Teacher, right through the School, I have made a number of complaints to the infants about their behaviour, discrimination etc, and just get told, they are re-training their staff!! You need to do an inspection of the Infants in disguise or talk to the parents about what goes on when they have no "important visitors". I support this proposal with the proviso of Billy Davies at the helm.
08.03.13	Parent / Carer School Child	Yes	Yes	



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

13.03.13	Parent Child Infant / Junior School	No	No	I have a child at Valentine Infant School and one at Heathfield Junior. At Valentine there are 4 classes in the Reception year so they can have up to 120 children in that year. If they continue to allow 120 children to join the School each year and they become a Primary School, they will have 840 pupils eventually over a 7 year groups (28 classes). I believe this will be too much for one School and one head, leadership team, Admin Staff to manage effectively.
13.03.13	Parent Child / Junior School	Yes	Yes	
13.03.13	Parent pre-school child / school	Yes	Yes	
				Areas of support for the existing pupils/staff in the proposal or merger. The structure of teaching methods, different styles from Infants to Junior School. Combined management structure, utilising knowledge / skills of both School sets. How this would effect, school budgets, curriculum of national standards. The way in which the Ofsted Inspectors report outcomes work. Changes in size of class groups? Support networks for children, with special needs / challenges. Access to School i.e. main entrance, of large amount of children. Children's safety in access School. Schools rules i.e. antibullying, appropriate behaviour / standards, monitor of national guidelines, i.e. pupil tracker system in place by Heathfield.
13.03.13	Parent Child / Junior School	Yes	Yes	
13.03.13	Parent Child / Junior School	Yes	Yes	
13.03.13	Parent Child	Yes	No	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

13.03.13	School Child Parent Child / Junior School	Yes	Yes	I feel the two School's should stay separate, as if they did become a Primary School the children in year six would be at an disadvantage when leaving to go to Senior School, as they would have never have had a transition into a new School. This would be a horrible and scary experience for them. I am also concerned about my children hearing unacceptable language from the older children which is heard when they are leaving school in the afternoon. I do not wish my children to starting copying this at such a young age of four and seven.
18.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	No	No	
18.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	No	No	
St Monica Infant and Junior:				
<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Relationship to schools</b>	<b>Do you support the proposal to create a primary my merging the two schools</b>	<b>Do you support the proposal to create a primary by closing the junior and expanding the infant</b>	<b>Comments</b>
13.02.13	Parent Children in Infants and Juniors	Yes	Yes	Thank you for your letter stating the sad news of Mrs Paris retiring. Although she has been amazing and very supportive with our eldest son I am thrilled that a consultation is taking place to consider both Infants and Juniors merging.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

28.02.13	Parent/carer of Junior School	Yes		
28.02.13	Member of Staff Parent / Junior School	No	No	
04.03.13	Child	No	No	My daughter has been moved a lot through her School years and I want her to stay settled. As a Governor my main concern is that the current Governing Body of SMJ's is included in all the discussions regarding the change to primary, and that the steering committee is equally balanced with representatives from both Schools, also that the LA has a strong input. I would not want the excellent ethos of SMJ's to be affected by this change, so that the impact on the children and their education is only a positive one. There is a lot of expertise on our Governing Body, built up over many years, and I would not want this to be lost. As a Member of Staff, I feel that, similarly, any changes to staff structure should be done with equal weight given to each school and with the input of the LA to guide any decisions made.
05.03.13	Member of Staff / Governor Junior School		Yes	
08.03.13	Parent / Infant School / PreSchool Child	Yes	Yes	
11.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	Some Concerns	I am the parent of a child attending St Monica Infant School.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

12.03.13	Parent / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent / Pre-School / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child / Resident	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School / Pre-School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent of School Child	Yes	Yes

I have no problem with the School becoming a Primary. My concerns are having just one Headteacher for both Schools. Can it not be a Primary with two Headteachers working together? Or maybe an acting Headteacher for the Juniors. I just think its too much for one Headteacher and the school would benefit from more Senior Staff.

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Junior / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Pre-School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Nursing School / Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	No	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child		Yes	Not massively clear on what the difference is between "merging" and "discontinuing" is. I'd like to see the School become a primary but all children to stay in the existing buildings as I don't see that the Infant School would be big enough for all the children from the Juniors to join them on the Infant School site.
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School	Yes	Yes	I think it is a brilliant idea and Mrs Bevan-Mackie will do an amazing job as she has done at the Infant School. We feel that although a lot of change behind the scenes, the children will feel that School continues as normal. We're very happy with Mrs Bevan-Mackie's leadership and are confident she will do a great job at the Junior School / Primary School to.
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School	Yes		
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Pre-School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	No	No	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	Over the moon to hear this news. My daughters will benefit from having Mrs Bevan-Mackie as their Headteacher as will all the other children. I feel she and her team are more than capable of making this a smooth transition. My daughter was worried about the transition to the Junior School despite her older sibling being in attendance. This will settle her in to the new environment very well!
15.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent / Child Infant School	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
15.03.13	Parent Infant School Child	Yes	Yes	
21.03.13	Member of Staff Junior School	Yes	Yes	Additional Comments - Hopefully this will achieve a much better consistency of levels. Better curriculum can be achieved - no overlapping of things taught, or teaching of things already covered.
21.03.13	Parent Child Infant / Juniors	Yes	Yes	
21.03.13	Parent Junior School Child	Yes	Yes	

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

21,03.13	Parent Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent / School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent Infant / Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	School Child Parent Junior	No	Yes
21.03.13	School Child Parent Junior	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	School Child Parent Junior	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	School Child / Resident Parent Infant / Junior	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	School Child Parent Junior	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Parent Junior	Yes	



## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

	School Child / Pre-School		
21.03.13	Parent Junior School Child	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Staff Member Junior School	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Staff Member Junior School	Yes	Yes
21.03.13	Staff Member Junior School	Yes	No

Hopefully this is not a money saving scheme and the children, their education are being kept at the forefront of all decisions being made. I assume the Headteacher x 1 will have lots of support as this is a huge task considering it is currently being split over 2 Headteachers!

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

### Notes / Comments from consultation meetings

Bitterne Park Parent Consultation Meetings – 18/03/2013

2.30 – 3.30

- What's the difference between pre-statutory and statutory consultation?
- Consultation with stakeholders – isn't there an over representation of junior school stakeholders in the consultation?
- If the primary goes ahead, will infant governors be represented on the primary governing body?
- Has the process for merging the GB and other school boards already started? This suggests that it's a foregone conclusion
- Why is the primary proposal being put forward? It will cause for unsettlement for the schools
- What are the advantages of primary schools?
- What are the advantages other than attainment/performance?
- Concerns about junior HT becoming primary HT
- Will parents be listened to?
- Some parents would like a brand new HT for the primary
- What can't the infant appoint a new HT?
- Why can't LA end the junior HT contract?
- Junior schools is not a happy school
- 1 parent supports the proposal and Mrs Montague – why don't other parents feel the same?
- Is this a national or local policy?
- If the junior school HT does become the primary HT, will she be the HT only at Bitterne Park (i.e. not HT at other schools as well)
- The infant school doesn't need "turning around" or changing
- Majority of parents don't oppose the idea of an all through primary
- Is it possible for one person to be HT at three schools? It is sometimes difficult to meet with / see the junior HT
- Some parents support the primary proposal but would like the HT of the primary to be the HT of just one schools
- Ofsted rating for junior only been held for 2 terms – is the school in a position to take on the infant school?
- Why a September 2013 implementation?
- Can the implementation date be changed?
- Is the junior school fit enough to take on the primary?
- Support proposal if it's done at the right time and in the right way.
- Don't oppose primary option but concerns about who leads the school and how they do it.

5.30 – 6.30

- Lucia Ward (Infant CoG) – governors support all through primary development
- What are the benefits of merging infant and junior schools (aside from commercial benefits)?

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

- Favour all through primary option, but have concerns about closing the infant school and their leadership team and the junior school taking over.
- Concerned at losing the great nurturing aspects of the infant school
- Attainment higher when pupils leave infant school to when they are assessed at junior school – concerned that junior school standards may bring down standards at the infant
- Are pupils being over assessed at year 2?
- Not such good education in the junior school. Concern that junior school could lower attainment in infant year groups.
- Parent works in a 3FE primary and supports all through primary education if the appropriate leadership structures are in place.
- Concern that junior HT works across three schools
- A large primary school need the correct leadership structure
- AA – do stakeholders agree with an all through primary?
- Parents won't agree to a primary on any terms. No opposition to junior HT but the HT of a primary needs to be at the school %100 of the time
- Don't agree to a primary if it has an executive HT
- Support the primary option if the HT is exclusively the HT of the primary
- Difficult to distinguish between support the primary option and supporting the process for how the school gets there
- The other schools the HT is at are on the other side of the city
- How does the executive HT model work? What does she delegate and to whom?
- Are there examples of an executive HT working across 3-4-schools?
- Performance and results at junior school have increased
- Does the school have soul and is there someone at the junior school that has a vision for that school?
- Culture/warmth/nuture is a huge part of education – is this present at the junior?
- Holy Family and Sinclair (other schools that junior Ht is exec HT at) have excellent standards. Parents children happier in junior than the infant
- Was there a consultation on a junior HT prior to current junior HT taking this post?
- Is the junior HT there for the foreseeable future?
- If the primary school comes into existence, is there a contingency plan if standards decrease / don't improve?
- Creating a new school is a big job – difficult if HT is not at the school all the time, other schools may be neglected
- How much can one person take on?
- The leadership model that is being proposed is one that parents don't understand
- HT needs to be there at all times – the HT presence at all times is important
- Junior HT is a fantastic teacher and leader, but is not present at all times
- No criticism about education at infant, but a feeling that junior pupils aren't well cared for
- Junior HT hasn't engaged with parents
- HT needs to be at the school 100% of the time

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

- Shame to lose essence of infant school but junior school will likely take on the positive aspects of the infant
- If junior HT becomes primary HT, what will happen to the governing bodies?
- Currently no parent representation on junior IEB
- Lack of communication from school to parents
- Split site school – have staff been consulted? What might a new staffing structure look like?
- When would stakeholders have a chance to see the leadership structure?
- Difficult for parents to comment when they don't have all information available
- What is/are the vision statement intentions for the junior/primary?
- Will the ethos/culture of the infant be maintained
- Chair of IEB – IEB are working with infant GB to that there will be infant governors representation on IEB/junior/primary governing body. Infant GB will be robustly represented on new GB's – whether for junior or primary
- Will there be a new uniform?
- Parents feel that this is a done deal
- Are parents being asked a bout a primary or what the make up of the primary would be?
- Support for primary, support for a single HT but there is opposition to an executive head (who oversees two other schools) for the primary

### Oakwood infant & Junior Parent Consultation – 11/03/2013

- Will there be funding to physically bring the two buildings together?
- What are the timescales?
- Bringing the schools together is a positive move
- Will there be support available to the schools through the process?
- The term closure is too emotive
- Who will be the governors of the primary?
- Parents value the intimacy and community feel of the infant school – some parents concerned that this element would be lost in a primary
- Money will need to be spent to bring the buildings together to make the proposal work
- Where can people get more information on funding available and an idea as to how it will be spent to bring school together
- Several parents raised concerns about how buildings will be linked
- Will the school increase beyond 2FE as a result of nearby housing development plans (Lordshill Way development)
- No objection to the principal of all through primary, but it's the small things that people are concerned about (uniforms, linking buildings etc)
- Hope for a gradual integration not large upheaval
- Closed consultation – primary option is only one that is being put forward – questions could have been asked about federation, executive headteacher etc. more information required in consultation document
- What will admissions arrangements be for 2013/14 and 2014/15 entry

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

- Is this a cost saving proposal?
- Response form doesn't allow room for opposing the consultation – the questions are biased to encourage a positive response.
- Will uniforms change?
- Concerns about practical issues – e.g. phones, fire alarm etc.
- Parents would like to retain the stability that is in place across the schools and favour retaining one of the HT's rather than appointing a new person

### Tanners Brook Infant & Junior Consultation Meeting – 28/02/2013

- There could be significant disruption to pupils at the school
- Does the infant HT have the skills to run a primary school?
- Will support be put in place for the HT
- There was no mention of the hearing impaired units (Resource base for deaf children) in the consultation document
- Where will the HT be based?
- No organisation of this process – seems like everything “will be sorted out in September”
- Will both school offices be maintained?
- Support for HT
- Governors? Infant GB will be primary GB and don't have to take current junior governors on board
- Ofsted grading of primary? School will adopt Ofsted rating of infant school – “Good”
- Seems like the merger is a done deal
- There are staff management and job security issues that need to be answered
- Could the merger be delayed for a year? This would give more time to get all the arrangements in place.
- Most parents think it is a done deal
- It might have been better to have a meeting at the start of the consultation to explain what the proposal is
- Too much repetition in the consultation document
- A short and concise letter would be more appropriate
- Could the junior school advertise for a HT?
- What would happen if the junior had a headteacher in place?
- Concerns about having a HT in place who is competent at running a primary
- The school will be much larger – is it standard that schools are this size?
- Will there be redundancies?
- The timescale is quite short
- What if staff start looking for jobs elsewhere because of the uncertainty?
- More information should be communicated to staff
- The merger may disrupt children who are taking exams
- What if infant HT doesn't want the primary HT job?
- Few parents attended the meetings, this may be because they think it's a done deal

## Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation

- The document reads as policy rather than information – this indicates that it's a done deal
- Does the LA have the manpower to all the schools going through the process
- Is this a budget saving exercise?
- Is there an option for the junior school to recruit a headteacher?
- All staff at the meeting were junior school staff
- The majority (if not all) parents were junior school parents
- LA officers advised that people should send in their comments on the proposal and that staff should attend the staff specific meeting for information on HR issues. If they can't attend ask a colleague to ask questions or send them to LA prior to meeting to have them answered at the meeting.

### St Monica Infant & Junior Primary Development Meeting – 12/03/2013

- How will the sites be managed? Will the HT operate across both sites? Will there be a deputy head on each site?
- The school days currently run at different times so that parents can collect children from the infant and junior school if they need to – will this continue or will all year groups start and finish at the same time?
- Will the HT perform a more administrative role if she is HT of the primary
- No issues with the proposal but the timescales are quite tight. It's comparable to the Oasis mergers which were quite difficult.
- Will the governing body change reconstitute?
- Will the uniform change?
- Infant school HT currently has time for all parents/children at the school – it will be difficult for her to have the same relationship with all pupils at the primary (over 700 pupils)
- It's a concern for one HT to manage such a large school
- Concern that the HT won't always be visible if she is looking after both sites
- When can GB start making decisions about the primary
- Will teachers work across different key stages / year groups?
- There are already strong links between the schools so this is a progression on those links
- How will this affect junior school pupils who are due to take exams next year?
- Will it be possible for all school assemblies with so many pupils?
- Some school already split assemblies between lower and upper school
- It would be helpful to have an evening meeting to allow more parents to attend
- Will the infant governors "take over" the juniors? Can the LA force the infant governors to take on some junior governors?

## **Appendix 2 - responses to the consultation**

St Monica Infant & Junior Primary Development Meeting – 20/03/2013

- Support both HT's and sad that junior is leaving
- Too many children staff for one person to manage
- HT needs to be there to give personal attention
- Only advantage is removal of infant to junior transfer
- Two sites is too much for one person to manage – will there be deputies on both sites?
- Good standards in infant school need to be sustained. Don't want merger to negatively affect progress of either school
- Schools have potential to be an outstanding
- Will Ofsted rating change or an inspection triggered?
- Will all jobs be safe?
- Is it a policy to only have primary schools?
- When will changes be implemented?
- When will primary governing body come into place? Who will be on the governing body? Will governors be re-elected?
- Two sites difficult to manage if there is only infant representation on governing body
- Who will be headteacher or deputy headteacher at the junior when the current HT leaves and where will they be based?
- Will it change children's way of learning?
- Infant head is quite new – will she have time to support both sites?
- Parents want structure and don't want schools to start failing
- Better communication is needed by the LA, schools and governors
- Will the leadership team be restructured?