## Appendix C

## SCHOOL HOLIDAY CONSULTATION DATA ANALYSIS 2017

## Summary

1. A school holiday consultation was conducted to consult on two proposed holiday models:

- Option 1: (6 week summer break, fixed spring break) (current model)
- Option 2: (5 week summer break, 2 week October half term, fixed spring break)

2. The consultation ran from the $29^{\text {th }}$ August to the $8^{\text {th }}$ October. The survey consisted of 24 questions in total, a list of which can be found in appendix $A$.
3. A total of 6509 consultation responses to the survey were received via survey monkey, email and postal responses (received on or before $18^{\text {th }}$ October- any postal responses received after this date have been excluded from the analysis). By response method we received:

- 43 responses received via e-mail
- 135 postal responses received
- 6356 responses received via the online survey monkey


## Key findings

4. Overall responses to question 3 regarding the preferred model that respondents would choose showed that $42.1 \%$ of respondents favoured option 1 and $57.4 \%$ of respondents favoured option 2 ( $1 \%$ of survey respondents didn't answer).
5. The majority of parents ( $60 \%, 2951$ of 4937 parents), non-teaching staff ( $60 \%, 441$ of 729 non-teaching staff) and governors ( $53 \%$, 212 of 397 school governors) preferred option 2. However, the majority of teachers/ head teachers (55\%, 787 of 1419 teachers/ head teachers) and trade union reps ( $79 \%, 19$ of 24 trade reps) preferred option 1.
6. $53 \%$ (645 of 1211 respondents) in Rushcliffe preferred option 1, whereas the majority of respondents in other districts all preferred option 2. However, Rushcliffe had the highest weighting in terms of responses at 19\% (1210 responses).

Responses to question 13 (area- other) showed little difference from the overall location analysis.
7. Common comments provided against Q4 (preferred dates) and Q14 (additional comments) included: no change preferred; 6 week summer break is too long; and 2 weeks in May would be better.

## Data analysis

## Responding role

## Questions 5-11 (Are you responding as...)

8. Of the total consultation respondents:

- Parents were $63 \%$ (4937)
- Teachers or headteachers were $18 \%$ (1419)
- Non-teaching staff were $9 \%$ (729)
- School governors were 5\% (397)
- Trade unions $0.31 \%$ (24), which equates to $0 \%$ when rounding is applied
- 'Other' were 4\% (320)

9. The below table (table 1) shows the percentage of respondents who preferred option 1, 2 or who didn't respond (N/As) by respondent role type.

Table 1 Preferred option by respondent role

| Option | All | Parents | Teachers/ <br> heads | Non-teaching <br> staff | School <br> governors | Trade union <br> rep | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option 1 | $42.1 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Option 2 | $57.4 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| N/A | $0.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Notes

- The category 'School aged pupil' has been removed due to there being no responses
- N/A is the number of non-respondents, this figure appears higher by respondent role due to rounding
- Some respondents selected multiple roles in response to the consultation survey i.e. parent and teacher
- 'Other' category includes: Family relations (i.e. grandparents); teaching assistants; retired roles; carers; university related roles; relations to those working in the school system i.e. partner of teacher; roles external to school system

10. Parents (who accounted for $63 \%$ of overall responses) preferred option 2 with $60 \%$ in favour (2951 of 4937 parents), this is in line with the overall consultation results (at 57.4\% in favour). Non-teaching staff and school governors were also in favour of option 2, this goup accounted for $14 \%$ of responses, 1126 of total respondents. However, there was a stronger preference for non-teaching staff in favour of option 2 ( $60 \%$ ) than school governors (53\%).
11. Teachers and head teachers (who accounted for $18 \%$ of overall responses) preferred option 1 with $55 \%$ of respondents selecting this option and $44 \%$ of respondents preferring option 2. Trade union reps were also in favour of option 1 with $79 \%$ responding in favour, however, trade unions respondents accounted for only $0.31 \%$ of respondents ( 24 people).

## Location

## Question 12- Area

12. Just over $97 \%$ of respondents responded to question number 12 with their district area. The majority of respondents were from Rushcliffe (19\%), with a fairly even spread of respondents from other district areas within the county at 10-15\% each. The following list shows the number of respondents by district area:

- Rushcliffe 19\% (1210)
- Gedling 15\% (958)
- Mansfield 15\% (952)
- Ashfield 13\% (815)
- Broxtowe 13\% (836)
- Bassetlaw 10\% (643)
- Newark 10\% (632)
- Out of county areas 5\% (287)

13. The below table (table 2) shows the percentage of respondents by area who preferred option 1 or 2 (or didn't answer, indicated as N/A).

Table 2 Preferred option by district area

| Option | All | Ashfield | Bassetla <br> $\mathbf{w}$ | Broxtowe | Gedling | Mansfield | Newark | Rushcliffe | Out of <br> county |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option 1 | $42.1 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $53 \%$ |  |
| $32 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Option 2 | $57.4 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| N/A | $0.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Notes
Respondents from areas outside of Nottinghamshire County districts include:

- Derby City/ Derbyshire 1\%
- Nottingham City $4 \%$
- Doncaster/ Leicester City/ Leicestershire (less than 1\%)
$N / A$ includes unanswered question

14. These figures show that all district areas of the county preferred option 2 with the exception of Rushcliffe where respondents preferred option 1. The distribution of respondent roles (parents, teachers etc.) of Rushcliffe respondents were approximately in line with the overall role distribution of all respondents (within 3-5\%).

## Question 13- Area- Other (Please specify)

15. Question 13 provided an option, 'other', for people to advise of their area outside of the given options. There were 239 responses to this question ( $4 \%$ of total respondents), of
which $61 \%$ of respondents favoured option 2 and $39 \%$ of respondents selected option 1. This supports what we can see at a total level and when compared to the majority of districts within the county (with the exception of Rushcliffe). Areas provided under reason 'Area- Other' included specific towns/ villages within the districts or where people had detailed areas in which they live and areas in which they work.

## Commentary

## Questions 4 and 14

16. We received 2066 comments provided in response to Q4- 'For your preferred option, are there any specific dates that you would change? - Please tell us which dates and your reasons why' (excluding 4443 comments which were 'no response'). We also received 1843 comments in response to Q14, 'Do you have any other comments?'
17. Comments against questions 4 (alternative dates) and 14 (additional comments) were categorised into relevant themes. Further detail on the methodology can be found in appendix 2. Due to time constraints only 991 of these additional comments (just over $50 \%$ ) were able to be categorised into themes. A further check was therefore completed on $10 \%$ of the remaining number, which established that all of these additional comments were already covered in the themes previously identified. We are therefore confident that all the themes emerging from comments have been covered in this analysis.
18. Table 3 shows the number of respondents and \% of total respondents who provided commentary by the categorised theme. The majority of respondents who provided commentary ( $952,22 \%$ ) commented that no change was preferred which was reflected in recipients who preferred option 1 (the current model). The next common themes were a ' 6 week summer break is too long' and ' 2 weeks in May would be better'.
19. When comments provided in questions 4 were looked at in relation to the comments provided by parents, the majority ( $17 \%$ ) advised that 2 weeks in May would be better, $16 \%$ advised that no change is preferred and $15 \%$ commented that the 6 week summer break is too long.
20. When comments provided in question 14 were analysed by teachers/ head teachers, the majority ( $15 \%$ ) preferred no change, followed by align with the City/ other counties (13\%), 2 weeks in May would be better (12\%) and bring the summer holiday forward (10\%).

Table 3 Q4 \& Q14 commentary summary by theme categorisation

| Theme | Count | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No change preferred | 952 | $22.7 \%$ |
| 6 week summer break is too long | 602 | $14.4 \%$ |
| 2 weeks in May would be better | 448 | $10.7 \%$ |
| 2 weeks in October would be better | 346 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Align school holidays with schools in the City/nearby counties | 332 | $7.9 \%$ |
| Cap the summer holiday at 4 weeks | 224 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Bring the summer holiday forward | 209 | $5.0 \%$ |
| 1 week would be better in October | 172 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Longer Christimas instead of October half term | 166 | $4.0 \%$ |
| Change to allow cheaper holidays | 160 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Other | 210 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Flexible holiday allowance | 103 | $2.5 \%$ |
| Full weeks, not half weeks | 88 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Easter in the middle of 2 week break | 81 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Spring holiday should be fixed | 52 | $1.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Equal length terms | 32 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Have the summer holiday later - start in Aug | 20 | $0.5 \%$ |
| More info/options needed | 20 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Response unclear | 14 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Too many holidays | 13 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Group inset days together | 12 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Flexible Easter break | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Better holiday club provision | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| Ensure consistency between primaries and secondaries | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| Total | 100 |  |

Notes

- Data excludes respondents who didn't answer the question
- Data has duplications between comments from Q4 and Q14 removed
- Data includes a pro rata count of additional comments in Q14 (over 50\% analysed) due to time constraints


## Risks

## 21. The below table shows identified risks to the analysis and mitigation undertaken.

Table 3 Risks and mitigation

| Risk | Description | Action/ Mitigation |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Some comments have included reasons } \\ \text { for their justification and a suggested term } \\ \text { date pattern going forward (Q4 is really } \\ \text { formed of 2 questions) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { For the pruposes of this analysis the first } \\ \text { response within a comment has been } \\ \text { categorised and reported on by theme. It } \\ \text { is recommended that future consultations } \\ \text { contain filters to identify reasons behind } \\ \text { responses and to capture suggested term } \\ \text { dates. }\end{array}$ |
| 2 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { The response theme category 'Align } \\ \text { school holidays with other counties' has } \\ \text { been reported at a top line level, however, } \\ \text { responses include a mixture of City and } \\ \text { other Counties }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { It's possible to report on people who want } \\ \text { to align with the City and external } \\ \text { counties from the raw data, if required. } \\ \text { Consider drop down boxes for future } \\ \text { consultations. }\end{array}$ |
| 3 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Some respondents may contradict their } \\ \text { preferred option with the comments they } \\ \text { make in Qs 4 and 14 }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Checks and balances were ran against a } \\ \text { sample of comments, a very low } \\ \text { contradiction rate was found. }\end{array}$ |
| 4 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Individuals may have submitted multiple } \\ \text { responses through completing the survey } \\ \text { more than once, thus impacting the } \\ \text { reporting }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { The percentage of IP Addresses that } \\ \text { appear more than 3 times is less than 9\% } \\ \text { of all responses. Of those it can be } \\ \text { assumed the majority are libraries or } \\ \text { other public spaces, representing a }\end{array}$ |
| legitimate source of respondents. The |  |  |
| value of 3 IP Address hits or more is |  |  |
| chosen as it is assumed some families |  |  |
| will be responding from one location (i.e. |  |  |
| a household of 2 parents and 1 child). |  |  |$\}$

## School holiday consultation questions

| Column | Question no. | Question |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 1 | What is your name? - Name |
| B | 2 | What is your email address? - Email |
| C | 3 | Please indicate your preferred model: - Preferred option |
| D | 4 | For your preferred option, are there any specific dates that you would change? - Please tell us which dates and your reasons why Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) |
| E | 5 | Are you... - Parent |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| F | 6 | Are you... - Teacher/Headteacher |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| G | 7 | Are you... - Non-teaching school staff |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| H | 8 | Are you... - School Governor |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| 1 | 9 | Are you... - Trade Union Representative |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| 」 | 10 | Are you... - School age pupil |
|  |  | Are you responding as (please tick all that apply to your response) - |
| K | 11 | Other (please specify) |
| L | 12 | Area - Area |
| M | 13 | Area - Other (please specify) |
| N | 14 | Do you have any other comments? - Comments |
| 0 | 15 | Last Modified Date |
| P | 16 | Response ID |
| Q | 17 | IP Address |
| R | 18 | Created Date |
| S | 19 | Citizen Space Version |
| T | 20 | Consultation State |
| U | 21 | Browser Identification |
| V | 22 | Submitted Date |
| W | 23 | Visited Pages - Introduction |
| X | 24 | Visited Pages - Questions |

## Methodology

The data analysis was broken down into 3 stages:

- Stage 1 Data collation and cleansing

Survey responses were collated from the different sources including: survey monkey (via Excel), e-mail and postal responses (received on or before $18^{\text {th }}$ October- any postal responses received after this date have been excluded from calculations).

Comments provided in response to questions 4 and 14 were categorised into the following themes:

- No change preferred
- Other
- Response unclear
- Spring holiday should be fixed
- Easter in the middle of the 2 week break
- Full weeks, not half weeks
- Cap the summer holiday at 4 weeks
- 6 week summer break is too long
- 2 weeks in May would be better
- Have the summer break later- start in Aug
- Bring the summer holiday forward
- 1 week would be better in October
- 2 weeks in October would be better
- Longer Christmas instead of October half term
- Change to allow cheaper holidays
- Align school holidays with schools in the City/nearby counties

The rate of duplication between comments provided in Q14 was $20 \%$ when compared to comments provided in Q4, these duplications were removed prior to analysis. A selection of comments provided in Q14 were checked against those provided in Q4, of which none included contradictions.

Please note: Comments such as 'better for children' have been classified as 'no response' since no additional information has been provided further to their chosen option of preference.

Please note: Only the initial reasons provided by the respondent against Q4 has been categorised by theme, this has been included as a risk.

- Stage 2 Data Analysis
- Stage 3 Presentation of findings (compiling the report)
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