

## APPENDIX 2: CONSULTATION SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

## Qu 1 A total of 31 responses were received to the public consultation

5 school governors

4 parents

6 school staff

12 school head teachers

1 councillor

1 parish councillor

1 ex teacher and resident

1 internal team

Qu 2 How strongly do you agree or disagree that school leaders should be involved in identifying the most appropriate local school place for vulnerable children who are unplaced within a locality area having been unable to secure a school place through the normal admissions process?

94% of respondents were in agreement, with 2 respondents neither agreeing nor disagreeing. It was commented that leaders were best placed to know their school and the local context, and this was a recurring theme of comments made in response to this question.

The proposed Nottinghamshire FAP protocol describes how school leaders in a locality should be involved in identifying the most appropriate school place for vulnerable children unplaced within locality having been unable to secure a school place through the normal admissions process.

Qu 3 How strongly do you agree or disagree that monthly meetings of school leaders and Local Authority officers are sufficient to ensure that vulnerable children are placed as quickly as possible into education?

71% of respondents were in agreement. Of the respondents who did not agree that monthly meetings are sufficient there was a range of views expressed. Some respondents felt that monthly was not often enough, whilst others felt that meetings were not needed at all.

The proposed Nottinghamshire FAP protocol continues to specify that panels should meet at least monthly in order that vulnerable children without access to education can be placed in a timely manner.

Qu 4 How strongly do you agree or disagree that it is reasonable, in cases where elective home education has been deemed unsuitable and pupils have not secured a school place, that fair access locality panels should identify an appropriate mainstream school place as opposed to applications for admission to school going through the usual admission process?

61% of respondents were in agreement and 32% disagreement. The remainder of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed. A number of comments were received regarding placements having to be right for the child and school, and with the correct support in place. The intention of locality panels identifying appropriate mainstream school places when a place has not been secured is to ensure that these discussions take place in an open manner with all school in an

area, in order to identify a solution that is appropriate for the child, family and schools in the area.

The proposed Nottinghamshire FAP protocol supports this model of working by classifying children where Elective Home Education has been deemed unsuitable as FAP in order that their needs can be discussed in this way and appropriate placements agreed by locality panels where needed.

Qu 5 How strongly do you agree or disagree that the proposed process described in section 3.3 of the draft Nottinghamshire FAP adequately describes the steps a primary school/academy would need to take to refer a proposed refusal as described in School Admissions Code 2014 (3.12) for consideration?

5 strongly agree 16 agree 5 neither agree nor disagree 2 disagree 2 strongly disagree

13% of respondents did not agree, with the remainder being in agreement or neither agreeing nor disagreeing. There is currently no specific primary process contained within the Nottinghamshire FAP and, as such, there can be a level of confusion from primary settings about when this refusal is appropriate and the correct process to follow.

The proposed Nottinghamshire FAP protocol includes this process in order to try and provide clarity to all schools and academies regarding the process for under PAN refusals.

Qu 6 How strongly do you agree or disagree with the proposed operation of Nottinghamshire FAP and that its operation is compliant with the legislative context required by the School Admissions Code 2014 and the Department for Education Guidance, November 2012 – Fair Access Protocols: Principles and Process?

81% of respondents agreed with the proposed operation of Nottinghamshire FAP and that its operation is compliant with the legislative context required by the School Admissions Code 2014 and the Department for Education Guidance, November 2012 – Fair Access Protocols: Principles and Process, with 13% in disagreement.

Of these responses those received from schools, academies and school governors (23) were compared to the total number of schools consulted with, as indicated in the initial communication sent out to all Nottinghamshire schools and academies. This stated that 'Based on the consultation feedback the new Fair Access protocol will be adopted if the proportion of schools expressing a disagreement is in the minority in comparison to the total number of schools consulted.'

The number of school expressing a disagreement in comparison to the total number of schools consulted was 0.85%. It is therefore proposed that the Fair Access protocol consulted upon, as attached at Appendix A, is adopted.

Qu 7 Are there any other vulnerable groups of students that you feel should be supported by Nottinghamshire's FAP in addition to the groups of students detailed in section 2.4?

Responses to this question were split, with 19% of respondents stating that there were additional vulnerable groups they felt should be included, 38% stating that there shouldn't be additional groups added and the remainder either not answering or not expressing a view in agreement or disagreement.

The respondents who commented on additional groups they felt needed adding highlighted children moving from abroad and children at transition points and where the application is received just outside the end of co-ordination. Numbers of young people falling into these groups can continue to be monitored by the Council and future additions proposed if needed.