



Proposed Changes To The School's Admissions Policy for 2020/21 Consultation Summary Report December 17th 2018

Governors and Trustees have recently consulted on a proposal to amend the Admissions Policy oversubscription criteria for Prince Henry's Grammar School, so that it includes a preference to students attending a named feeder primary school - Bramhope Primary School.

The consultation was held for seven weeks, from Friday 5th October 2018 until midnight on Friday 23rd November 2018.

139 responses were received (see details below). 17 respondents (12%) were in favour of the proposal. 122 respondents (88%) were not in favour of the proposal.

All responses, in full, have been shared with all members of the Board of Governors. A summary of responses was shared with all members of the Board of Trustees. The responses to the consultation were considered in the Governors' Full Board Meeting 04/12/18, where a detailed and robust discussion took place. At the end of the discussion governors agreed a recommended course of action, which was presented to the Board of Trustees 10/12/18. The Board of Trustees also discussed the responses and unanimously agreed with the recommended course of action. Therefore it has been decided that:

In response to feedback from the consultation, the original proposal will be amended so that the Admissions Policy oversubscription criteria for Prince Henry's Grammar School will include a preference to students attending two named feeder primary schools – Bramhope Primary School and Pool Church of England Primary School. (Full detail of where this preference falls within the oversubscription criteria is provided in Annex A.)

Key reasons for deciding that Bramhope Primary will be a named feeder school in the oversubscription criteria:

None of the issues raised during the consultation provide strong reasons to withdraw the proposal (see table of issues and responses below).

Key reasons for deciding to add Pool Church of England Primary as an additional named feeder school in the oversubscription criteria:

- The majority of the concerns raised in the consultation related to the few students in Pool and surrounding areas who are outside of the "nearest school" boundary. Naming Pool Primary as a feeder primary in the oversubscription criteria alleviates many of these concerns.

- For those few children who live outside of the “nearest school” boundary - on the edge of Pool and the Arthington area - there are genuine transport difficulties: Although there is another school that is nearer by straight line distance, public transport links are inadequate. Transport links to Prince Henry’s are considerably better.
- Pool Primary also has close, useful and longstanding partnership links with Prince Henry’s.
- The majority of Pool children will have a higher priority because Prince Henry’s is their nearest school, however a few children each year may be at risk of not securing a place as they live outside of the “nearest school” boundary. Naming Pool Primary as a feeder primary may help reduce the stress for these few children and their families for whom there is no other reasonable journey to another school due to the inadequate public transport links.
- Naming Pool as a feeder primary will have negligible impact elsewhere because the majority of Pool children will be eligible for a place under the higher priority oversubscription criteria of “nearest school”.
- Governors had already agreed to review the Admissions Policy oversubscription criteria in autumn 2019 in order to take into consideration the issues linked to the Pool children who live outside of the “nearest” boundary. Given the response to the current consultation it makes sense to make the necessary amendments at this stage rather than waiting until autumn 2019.
- Governors considered naming all schools in the Family of Schools as feeder schools but it was decided that this would be superfluous because for these children Prince Henry’s is their nearest school so they will always have priority over any named feeder school.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

The summary below seeks to fairly represent the areas raised as concerns and areas of support. Where an identical response has been sent more than once from the same address this has been included only once in the summary.

Supportive of proposal – there were 17 responses in favour of the proposal.

School/Area	Number	Nature of feedback
Bramhope	13	Agree due to partnership working and clarity for parents and children.
Pool in Wharfedale	2	Agree despite issues in Pool.
Other	2	Brief statement agreeing with the proposals.

Raising concerns about the proposal – there were 122 responses not in favour of the proposal

School/area	Total	Parent/other	Nature of concern
Pool/Arthington	58	Parent – 52 Parish council – 1 School Governors – 1 Church – 3 Headteacher - 1	Transport to School – 39 Unfairness of new arrangements – 40 Current links between Pool and PHGS – 40 House prices and community impact – 24 Widen catchment (change boundary) – 42
Menston	24	Parent – 23 Headteacher - 1	Unfairness of policy since Menston closer than Bramhope – 12 Unfairness in principle – 11 Issues with travel/ecology – 2 Issues with admissions to other schools – 3 Unhappiness with quality of education at other schools - 3
Otley	5	Parent – 2 Other – 3	Seeking clarification that Otley children would not be affected – 4 Seeking clarification of 'nearest school' – 1

			Unfairness of 'selection' – 2 Accuracy of policy - 1
Wider community	25	Parent – 12 Other – 13	Unfairness of selection – 18 'Only doing it for results' – 3 Issues with Transport/Ecology – 9 Equality of access – 10 Concerned at removal of choice – 1
Other	10	Parent – 1 MP/Council – 5 Other – 3 Diocese - 1	Elitist/selective decision – 4 Concerns re villages inc Pool – 1 Unfair/social justice issues – 2 Questions re current policy – 4 Strong partnership with Pool - 1

Key Strands of Concern and Governors' Response*

Concern Raised	Governors' Response
The proposal is unfair because children who attend Bramhope may gain a place whilst children that live in Menston and are nearer to Prince Henry's may not gain a place.	The governors' proposal to make Bramhope a feeder primary took into account the close partnership that exists with Bramhope because of the Family of School work. In addition governors considered the partnership work that has developed, over and above Family of Schools partnership, in preparation for Bramhope to join Prince Henry's to form the Collaborative Learning Trust e.g. shared staffing, shared governance, shared financial services, shared educational improvement plans. In coming to their final decision governors took into account the fact that Pool Primary also has some strong links with Prince Henry's through the Family of Schools partnership and that these links have been established over many years.
Menston children have no other school they can reasonably attend There are also strong links between Menston and Prince Henry's	The vast majority of Menston children have a choice of at least one (and in some cases two) high schools that are nearer than Prince Henry's. Both of these schools are easily accessible by public transport. Although there are growing educational links between Menston and Prince Henry's these are not yet as established as the links that are very well established in the Family of Schools partnership.

<p>Transport issues – In particular for those children living in Arthington and surrounding areas, where there is a lack of public transport to the one other school which is nearer by straight line distance (in comparison to the good transport links with Otley).</p>	<p>Governors acknowledge that it is easier for students who live in Arthington and surrounding areas to travel to Prince Henry’s Grammar School in comparison to travelling to the other nearer school.</p>
<p>Community cohesion – the boundary for “nearest’ school” splits the village of Pool. Last year this resulted in some pupils in Year 6 not securing a place, this is likely to continue in the future and cause emotional stress for the children and families who live outside the ‘nearest’ line.</p>	<p>The vast majority of pupils at Pool live <i>within</i> the “nearest school” boundary and therefore will always have a higher priority than that proposed for the feeder primary school. However governors acknowledge the emotional stress that may occur for the few that live outside the “nearest” boundary, as there is no other reasonable journey to another school due to the inadequate public transport links. Governors also acknowledge that making Bramhope a feeder primary may negatively impact on the few children who live outside the “nearest” boundary, as there may be fewer places available through the ‘distance’ criteria.</p>
<p>The risk of some children in Pool not getting a place at Prince Henry’s could negatively impact on house prices and the budget of Pool Primary school.</p>	<p>Governors have considered what is best for <i>education</i> provision across the wider community overall. It would be inappropriate to take into account impact on house prices and individual school budgets.</p>
<p>Unfairness of Bramhope students having a higher priority than Pool students despite living further from the school, especially given that Pool share the same links through the Family of Schools and cluster etc. The decision to name a feeder school is not “transparent and made on reasonable grounds”. There is an expectation that children in Pool will have the opportunity to attend Prince Henry’s</p>	<p>Governors also acknowledge that Pool Primary also has some strong links with Prince Henry’s through the Family of Schools partnership and that these links have been established over many years.</p> <p>The governors original proposal to make Bramhope a feeder primary took into account the closer partnership that has developed with Bramhope, over and above Family of Schools partnership, in preparation for Bramhope to join Prince Henry’s to form the Collaborative Learning Trust e.g. shared staffing, shared governance, shared financial services, shared educational improvement plans.</p> <p>Such strong partnership (with both schools) provides transparent and reasonable grounds for selecting as a primary feeder school.</p>
<p>The boundary line for “nearest” school is out of date as it no longer includes all of Pool village.</p>	<p>The “nearest” school boundary is something that was established by Leeds City Council. Although it has been part of the school’s Admission Policy for many years, it has always been based on the distance from the school - it was never drawn around the edge of the village of Pool and therefore it cannot be out of date, as the distance from school hasn’t changed. Over the years more houses have been</p>

	built in the area that are on the other side of the “nearest” school boundary.
It is fundamentally unfair to introduce a ‘selective’ admissions policy.	The Admissions Policy itself isn’t ‘selective’. Any student can apply and gain a place at the school so long as there are places available. The proposed changes do not alter this. The Admission Policy states: <i>“If the number of applications does not exceed the number of places available, all applicants will be granted a place at the school.”</i> All school Admissions Policies are required to state the oversubscription criteria to be used to allocate places should demand for places exceed the number of places available. Such criteria are specifically designed to prioritise admissions as it is only used when there are not enough places to give to everyone who has applied. The consultation held by governors was only concerned with an amendment to the oversubscription criteria for Prince Henry’s.
There will be a negative environmental impact because of the increased bus or car journeys	The amendment to the Admissions Policy oversubscription criteria was proposed in order to give a higher priority to Bramhope pupils because these children have traditionally attended Prince Henry’s. Therefore the proposed change is unlikely to increase bus or car travel as children from Bramhope have traditionally travelled to Prince Henry’s anyway.
The amendment has been proposed to improve results and the school’s standing in the school league tables	The amendment to the Admissions Policy oversubscription criteria was proposed in order to give a higher priority to Bramhope pupils because these children have traditionally attended Prince Henry’s. Therefore the proposed change is unlikely to increase results as children from Bramhope have traditionally attended Prince Henry’s anyway.
The proposal will adversely affect Otley children	Prince Henry’s is the nearest school for all children who live in Otley. This means that all Otley children will have a higher priority than any named feeder school. Therefore the proposal and the final decision will not adversely affect Otley children.

*Please note it is not possible to report every single response. Only the key issues (mentioned by more than one respondent) are commented on in this summary, but governors in their discussion considered all responses that were received.