

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
001	GDJ/O	Y						Welcome opp to improve provision. Care need in appointing new H/T
002	PDJ	Y						This option allows for a more integrated age range. The gap between 3-19 is too large and no proof this option benefits the pupils
003	PDJ	Y	N					Needs H/T with experience of KS1 & 2 thus being in touch with staff and pupils.
004	RA	Y						Acknowledge SEN support benefits in 3-19 option, but disadvantages outweigh this option.
005	PF	Y						3-19 reservations about favouritism of children already in school and those joining at age 11. If 3-19 goes through, would want new H/T. Appoint an appropriate new H/T for Option 1.
006	PF							Not only Dunmore pupils going to Fitz so advantages of 3-19 invalid. Not confident in LA appointing a good H/T when haven't done so in past. Option 2 seen as experiment. Ref to capital invest of £300k for obvious nursery provision.
007	PH	Y						Strong p/ship of p/s H/T collaborating/supporting each other in Ab. Serious concerns of existing leadership team/H/T of Fitz taking over running of p/s in terms of curriculum experience.
008	PDI/PF/RA			Y				Strong leadership in Infant to be capitalized on. Option 1 untenable and will diminish quality of school if present H/T not retained. Option 2 seems like a career advancement plot for H/T Fitz and social experiment. Arguments ill considered and lacking in evidence.
009	PDI							No provision is acceptable
010	PDI	Y				Y		H/T should be Mrs K in Option 1. Option 5 - get new H/T.
011	PDJ		N					Would take child away if Option 2 goes ahead. Children's benefit is important.
012	PDI/RA/O			Y				But with Infant H/T remaining
013	PDI/PDJ		N	Y				Also think Option 1 good idea but Option 3 preferred choice.
014	PDI/PDJ		N					
015	PDI/PDJ/RA							Good to be consulted. Appalled and lack of info of choices presented.
016	PDI		N					
017	PDI/PDJ		N					Options paper joke - JM gave clear indication where her views lie.
018	PDI		N					
019	PDJ		N					
020	PDI/PDJ		N					
021	PDJ/PF/RA		N					
022	PDJ			Y				
023	PDI							Feeling not been given a say in children's future. Passionate views aired at public meeting hope you take into account and that 3-19 not a done deal
024	PDJ/PF			Y				Don't believe all through would benefit children.
025	PDI/RA					Y		
026	PDJ							Concerned about affect on partnership secondary schools if link p/s with secondary school, mixing p/s and sec pupils in same school not sensible
027	PDJ/RA	Y						Feels this option will promote excellence and forge links between the 2 schools.
028	O							Fitz children bad reputation - feel Dunmore is decent school
029	PDJ/RF		N					Also child at L/mead. Leadership worries of 3-19 option. Leave Dunmore as primary and keep caring nature.
030	PDJ		N			Y		
031	PDJ							Panel did not seem to want to listen to views of parents - felt decision had already been made
032	PDJ	Y	N					Don't want child to be experiment.
033	PDJ	Y	N					No merits in joining with Fitz - downsides far outweigh possible advantages
034		Y						This option would work best - would enable children to stay as children in primary years without teenagers around, and ensure smooth transition from KS1 to 2
035	PF/RA		N			Y		Feel school is growing in stature term by term
036	PDI/DJ	Y	N					Option 1 is best interest for children's education. Feel Dunmore had had enough turbulence. Fitz don't have skills needed to run p/s
037	RA/O	Y	N					Option 1 in best interest of children. Option 2 not good idea to mix children (language issues and behaviour)
038	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					P/s H/T needs to be hand on and involved with children. Becoming part of large school spread over several sites seem all too impersonal.
039	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					Option 1 in best interests of children. Option 2 unacceptable because Dunmore has been through enough and experimental stage is not needed. Results of Fitz have a long way to go before they are in a position to attempt new venture.
040	PDI	Y	N					Security, H&S concerns in 3-19 school. Will lose family-friendly atmosphere. Option 1, but only make changes to junior and leave infant staff alone.
041	PF	Y	N					Not sure parents would take Option 1 as many parents removing children, concerns about low birth rates in age range. 3-19 combination is too much for 1 H/T. H/T Fitz efficient manager not sure she has interest in primary aged children. 3-19 option would alter balance for Ab secondary p/ship - negative point.
042	PDJ							Acknowledge action needs to be taken. Concerned about Infant H/T.
043	PDJ/RA							Presentations weak and misleading. Feel autonomous p/s H/T is essential. Secondary teachers do not have same approach to learning/children and trained differently. Concerns children would not want to stay at same school for 15 years - keeping children in 6th form when already at school for 12 years is issue.
044	PDI/PDJ							Concerns with speed of decision needed. Concerns re 3-19 merger - Fitz improving but not model school. Would welcome chance to meet with Fitz H/T.
045	O	Y	N					Option 1 would benefit children most. Option 2 disaster and irreversible.
046								Both Infant and Junior offer excellent provision. D Kenyon should have been given more support from LA when put in Special Measures instead of being hounded out of his job in a despicable manner.
047	O	Y						Option 1 would benefit pupils education for continuity reasons. No point in Option 2 re: easing transition point if pupils can still choose to attend another school. Dunmore seen enough upheaval - why have result fall in first few years with merger with Fitz.
048	TJI	Y	N					Option 1 will improve continuity for children and allow a suitable H/T to be appointed. Strongly oppose Option 2. Will also add to instability and results may fall after working so hard to put procedures in place to raise standards throughout time in special measures.
049	PDJ							Options not thought out properly. Option 2 "dodgy" - won't be an improvement but sending Junior into further chaos. Advertise Junior H/T post. Stop consultation. Teacher/parent/children moral at all time low - how can you expect to get school out of special measures.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
050	PDI/PDJ/TA/O							Current uncertainty whether from lack of effective headship or current debate is very damaging. 0-19 is ill thought out. You cannot argue there is no "break point" and that existing secondary arrangements are unaffected. Drop this.
051	RA							Consultation flawed - very clear predisposition towards Option 2. No evidence that Fitz management is capable of coping with the extended functionality. I am not convinced that any of the overwhelmingly adverse views against Option 2 will be considered.
052	PDJ							Viewpoint swaying away from statistics & education. Has SEN child - extremely worried by impact, the uncertainty and overall situation is leading to psychological and physical problems in relation to a big change. It is hard as a parent to watch child grind teeth in anxiety.
053	PP	Y	N					Fitz leadership team already has large task in trying to turn around school consistently underperforming but is now showing some signs of improvement. 3-19 option split balance in Ab, would be deterrent to parents considering Dunmore as nursery/primary school. Balance already disturbed by parents removing children and placing in other Ab p/s resulting in large classes. Badly handled by LA, why consider combining pri and sec simply because they are on adjacent sites.
054	RA/O	Y	N					Don't feel Option 2 can meet the needs of either end of the age range. Suggest status quo, but if there has to be change then Option 1. To achieve by Sept 07 too soon - more consideration/planning needed.
055	RA/O	Y	N					Have just chosen secondary school - wouldn't want to make a decision for a 3 year old for secondary schooling - different criteria for p/s and secondary. Understand and support many of the reasons for joining the infant and junior schools.
056	PF	Y						Fitz has no experience of p/s education and expertise would be taken away from secondary school sector of amalgamated with Dunmore.
057	PDI/PDJ/RA	Y	N					But keep the infant H/T. Currently 1hr round trip to bring children to school - does this because they are happy - please do not change this.
058	RA	Y						Secondary schools need considerable improvement and the focus should be to improve them and not to combine with a p/s.
059	RA/O							Will any H/T lead the school in the right direction (ref to past history) and previous issues sorted? Ab has developed over the past 2 years and still ongoing - Ab cannot withstand a closure of any state school.
060	PP/RA	Y	N					Option 2 reduced choice overall for parents in Ab. Would not want children to be part of guinea pig school. Not convinced would result in economies of scale as relevant specialist will still be required for the different age ranges. Option 1 would most quickly and cost effectively solve the Dunmore crisis and prevent the hemorrhaging of pupils into other local schools. Best long term option.
061	RA							Most parents and residents would have knowledge, expertise or information to make the decision - would hope H/T, teachers and experts of LA would have. Common sense says that if Dunmore is the problem it seems silly to extend it to Fitz and create cumbersome and enlarged problem which LA has no experience of.
062	PDI/PDJ							Children v happy at Jnr school. Many pupils leaving because of proposals which are not detailed enough, v poor and vague. Please listen to parents and put children first. Feels children will be guinea pigs if merge with Fitz. Don't want children exposed to abusive behaviour/language etc. Individual ethos of Dunmore will be lost and children will become a number. Feels class sizes will be very large in other schools as parents take children away. Feels LA should take blame for position of Jnr school. Feel if LA make wrong decision it will affect 3 schools and children only have one chance at education. Sort out Jnr school, leave Infants alone. Option 2 will be too big a school for current H/T to cope with. Feels H/T wouldn't care enough about all children and not just career development and results.
063	O	Y	N					Reasons for opposing Option 2 - lack of experience of current snr leadership team at Fitz, particularly S Tranter, in managing the primary age range and new school would not align easily with the existing schools in Ab.
064	PDI/PDJ/RA/O		N					V pleased with schooling her children had at Dunmore. Option 2 - too big, breed more problems. Favour Option 1 under 1 head with 2 deputies. No link with Fitz. All land to be retained by Dunmore schools.
065	RA/PP/O							Consultation in present form should stop. Further time should be allocated for the Infant and Jnr schools to join together to make one united unit.
066	RA	Y						Option 1 so it's the same as all other schools in the town/district and county.
067	O	Y						
068	O	Y	N					Totally against 3-19 school under Fitz name - feels the needs of children and community under this system would be inadequately met. Angry at treatment and insensitive actions of the LA on Dunmore staff, esp KS1.
069	PDI	Y	N					Hope that proper thought, prep and planning goes into the process to enable smooth process with little disruption for children and retaining all the skills and expertise of the existing staff.
070	PDJ	Y	N					Against Option 2 because Las evidence at the public meetings and in consultation doc is at best incomplete, at worst inaccurate and misspelt. No proper detailed information and explanation on Option 2 the obvious and logical option has to be Option 1.
071	O	Y	N					An all through P/S to be introduced in a planned way, with separate H/T for Infant and Junior working closely together. Could eventually lead to a single primary h/t being appointed once close working between KS1 and KS2 has been established.
072	PDJ							Do not feel enough evidence has been produced to convince me that a 3-19 school is the right option. Do not want daughter to be part of an experiment - has had enough disruption during her time at Jnr school. Feel there are benefits for a 3-11 school therefore happier with Option 1. Very disappointed by lack of info in the consultation doc.
073	PDJ	Y						Of the 2 options stated and the consultation provided by the LA the only possible option is Option 1. Disappointed by attitude of LA at public meeting, and apparent lack of knowledge on the subject matter. Has been very poorly managed and a wasted opportunity to gain any unity for the 3 schools involved.
074	PDJ							Believes process is being rush through and decision taken prior to establishing/considering further options. EG why not consider all through P/S with Linda K as H/T. 4-19 option would destroy fabric of sc and create great uncertainty. From what I have gleaned schools which have pursued this option have not proved particularly successful and this measure appears to be one considered purely for expediency and cost cutting.
075	PDJ	Y	N					Don't see any harm in having 2 H/Ts. That said, if they cannot recruit a H/T for Jnrs then a merger with Infant could be good as long as it is done sensitively, regarding all staff and pupils, keeping space they currently have i.e. playing fields. Feel 3-19 option is not appropriate for young children to mix with older ones and not had enough info on it.
076	GDJ	Y	N					Disappointed with lack of transparency and knowledge on the 2 options. Don't feel timescale stated is sufficient to get a new H/T for Option 1 so is the Option 2 already decided? Would choose Option 1, not because it has a better argument, but because due to lack of LA help, it is a proven track record and less riskier of the 2 options. Option 2 discounted due to lack of info and no good case proven.
077	O	Y	N					Sensible to join schools together, but as a member of staff not happy about being "taken over" by Infants. More fairer for both to close and reopen with a new name and new H/T. 3-19 option interesting with good IT prospects, but would not be happy for my child to be involved in it.
078	PDJ							Have experienced both school and feel the views of Ofsted do not correspond with my experience of school - surprised at level of negative comments. Feel that the mention of the Jnr school in special measures should not be an issue in consultation paper, it is on target to come out of special measures by next year. Worried about effects these comments have on staff and stress on children. Shocked on speed of decision and short consultation period and feel children are forgotten within the procedures for change. Chose the schools because we believed they would provide education we required in a friendly supportive environment. Feel both schools have provided this and gone beyond expectations. Concerns of merging all 3 schools will produce a large organisation with diluted managerial support - Jnr school lacked significant managerial support and led to some of the failings in Ofsted assessment. Inappropriate to develop 4-19 establishment as not proven as effective and lack certain aspects of managerial support. Detrimental affect on some children, esp. younger children when they need to feel secure in a comforting environment.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
079	PDJ	Y	N					Children and teachers have had a lot of pressure recently and have made a supreme effort to improve performance of the school. Now need stability. Linda K should be made H/T of an all through P/S. 3-19 should be scrapped - nobody wants it.
080	PDI	Y						Have read consultation paper and attended both public meetings. Option 1 is best choice for wellbeing and educational stability of children.
081	PDJ	Y						Have read consultation paper and attended both public meetings. Option 1 is best choice for wellbeing and educational stability of children.
082	PDI/PP/RA		N			Y		No confidence in the way LA has handled presentation of options. I won't be railroaded into making a choice. Provide another option i.e. status quo. Will take children out of Dunmore than have them exposed in any way to any staff of Fitz.
083	PDI/PDJ							Can't understand logic in Fitz being allowed to take over a school in special measures (when it has worse SATs results than Junior school). Better for Fitz H/T to keep her school on track. Evidence of this type of merger could cause a dip for 3 years. More sensible to get Jnrs out of special measures then merge Infant and Jnrs at a later date. Don't want to be railroaded. Stop and think what affect this is having on staff, parents and most importantly the children.
084	PDJ		N	Y		Y		Consultation exercise been handled v badly. Caused great concern to parents and staff which could have been avoided by careful consideration of the options. LA have opted for a v contentious option coupled with a completely unacceptable one (3-19) in order to make it more acceptable. Strongly feel stick with status quo or expand infant school. Would not send child to completely unproven 3-19 option.
085	PDI/PDJ/PP	Y						Since Jnrs unable to secure H/T Option 1 is best option. All other Ab Schools are through p/s so why should Dunmores be any different? Parents should be looking for long-term solution - Infants is excellent, but when children move up they deserve the same high standard. Parents are divided, all should have their opinion, but some are better at voicing it than others. As a parent, am prepared to ride the storm and hopefully the Dunmore schools will be even better for it.
086	PDJ/PF	Y						Works well in other schools in Ab. Concerned about 3-19 option. New to area and no guidance to go by in this area. If mistakes are made and rushed through could have affects on children's education. against closer links with Fitz benefiting those that can achieve higher than their year group.
087	?							Both parents and children need a "lead figure" on site. A presence around school, taking assemblies, meeting parents, being clearly visible and available is essential. Should not just fall into KS1 and KS2 leaders, especially if they are teaching for much of the time. Good links can be made between Yr 6 and Yr 7 if properly organised.
088	PDJ	Y						Having read the consultation paper and attended both public meetings, I believe that Option 1 is the best choice for wellbeing and educational stability of my child.
089	PDJ/PF	Y	N					Consultation process v badly organised. Option 2 is wrong and should never have been considered - other primary schools in the area have not been considered so why should Dunmore Infant/Jnrs? Option 1 is the right choice.
090	RA/O	Y						Would prefer Dunmore remained independent of the secondary schools. More choice would then be available when children move on to their next school.
091	PP/RA	Y	N					Feel that schools should be kept as small as possible. As a resident of Abingdon I have been shocked at the way Dunmore has been assessed when the vibes I get from staff and parents are that it is a lc school and on the whole are happy with the teaching provided, especially in the infants. The problems that exist should be addressed.
092	O	Y	N					Strong believe Option 2 not way forward. It has been badly received, has little support and would have such an impact on the balance of educational provision in the area that I fail to see how it could be implemented. Option 1 more acceptable and has greater chance of success. I do not feel enough consideration has been given to keeping status quo or extending age range of Infant. As a TA in infant school I am there, in amongst it all, seeing it work and it would be a very sad day that saw us losing any part of the success that we are.
093	O	Y						Urge LA to drop Option 2, unnecessary, unproven educationally and extremely unwanted as shown by attendees at the public meetings and in polls. I urge LA to implement Option 1 wisely, imaginatively and creatively i.e. consider that closing both schools is not the only way to achieve this.
094	O	Y	N					The current infant/junior school split is clearly not working. The failing junior school seems to be putting pressure on other p/s in Ab to take children starting KS2 as parents are opting out of jnr school. Feel Option 1 will unbalance current education system in Ab and would be too experimental at the current time.
095	TA							Could the H/T of Infants be offered a temporary role in transition as an adviser to integration of both schools? She should be deputy and her talents used and utilized. I work in a P/S in Ab and know the stress levels we are all under and I feel strongly that the staff should be given the change to heal the wound and be part of the schools future as a primary school. Belong to the Ab P/s p/ship where the other H/Ts could encourage and advise the schools head or heads that could help the process that means we would all be equal status in Ab.
096	PDJ/PF	Y	N					Feel strongly that the consultation process was flawed from the outset. Many local residents and other stakeholders have been ill-informed of the LA s intentions. This has led to large numbers of parents choosing to remove their children from the Dunmore schools because, as not given enough info, speculation about the schools and its land has been rife. Am concerned with timescale and hope the LA considers waiting until jnr schools is removed from special measures before proceeding. Feel current infant H/T should be considered for any new h/ship. Wonderful H/T and been v. badly treated by certain LA employees. How do you expect to keep future H/Ts when this is how you treat long-serving, v. hardworking current heads?
097	PDI							Have read consultation paper and attended both public meetings. Option 1 is best choice for wellbeing and educational stability of children.
098	RA/O	Y						All 3 of their children have benefited from the excellent education of infant and jnrs through to John Mason. As teachers we understand the vast range of learning from FS to 6th Form, also understand the value of close relationship in terms of management for staff as well as children. Miss Smewin and Mr Bird fostered this and a strong sense of belonging. Option 2 would not deliver this and would also shatter the excellent 6th form p/ship which is unique. Urge you not to take Option 2. We don't want a mega-school, our children don't want it - Option 1 can preserve the best of both infant and jnr whilst promoting new and preparing children for long lives in learning and living.
099	PDJ/PP/RA/O		N					V. sad that what was once an excellent school/reputation has been stabbed in the back. Feel being used as guinea pigs because someone sat in an office wants to try something new and save money. My children deserve more than this so do the staff that give up their lives to educate children. How can you damage and disrupt an excellent school (infants) that has done everything right. No one is happy with Option 2, it is our children and staff it is affecting, please listen to us.
100	O		N					Option 2 should be withdrawn as it provides no equality of opportunity for the children, parent, carers and staff of Ab town schools. Option 1 would provide this. Creation of the new school should be phased over time to ensure the success of the new venture.
101	P	Y	N					Option 2 should be completely abandoned. Infant and Jnr should be brought together at some time when issue of special measures and H/T is fully sorted out. The way the LA has handled the process is appalling. Prior warning to Ab P/Ship heads should have been in place prior to consultation. I don't believe pupil transition was not anticipated by LA. Consultation misleading levels in Jnr school are in line with expectations - why no?
102	O	N	N					Do not agree with any of our proposals. You should immediately stop the consultation a there has been no consultation before the 2 options were sent out. No briefing to any member/authority was given. Option 2 out of the question as concern for equality for children, community and staff. Disregard Option 1 also. consultation should stop, hard work to be done as to how to bring the infant and jnr together, therefore diligent work needs to be done to combine. School needs to come out of special measures and then a plan needs to be put together appropriately to bring infant and jnrs together.
103	PG							I believe the imposition of a large school will have serious disadvantages for the moral and spiritual development of children and also for staff. Young children are far better off in a family environment, large institutions make matters impersonal for everyone. Good teamwork and other interactions between teachers are also more difficult to achieve. Keeping the buildings and entrances to the prim and sec sections of the school separate will still mean the transition from one to the other and mixing with older children will still be an enormous step.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
104	RA	Y						Should be a year of consolidation between the schools so that any issues are sorted out. H/ship to be advertised nationally. New governing body - one for the 2 schools. All staff should be re-appointed (if they wish to apply).
105	RA	Y						
106	PDI/PDJ		N					Totally disgusted with the way in which this process has been handled from the issue of the letter (17.10.06) to date. The consultation meetings, whilst v. well attended along with the consultation paper gave little or no more info that we as parents had already found out. Urge you to drop 3-19 option and go back to the drawing board and liaise with people who matter i.e. govts, teachers, and parents to establish the best way forward.
107	PDI/PDJ		N					Since the issue of the letter on 17.10.06 the schools have been in turmoil. 44 children have been pulled out of the schools and parents, teachers and children have been deeply upset by the proposals. The consultation process, including the 2 disappointing public meetings, did nothing to allay the situation. I urge the LA to remove 3-19 option from the table immediately. The LA should then work alongside the schools govts, teachers and parents to establish the best way forward. The process should then be carried out with the proper research, in a totally transparent way and within a more realistic timetable.
108	RA	N	N					Absolute rejection of either option. There will be no benefit to joining with Fitz either geographically, in terms of equality or pastorally. Comprehensive schools are far too big creating a v. impersonal atmosphere where the Head and most staff don't know the children's names! Worked in Pri education for 22 yrs, I know the importance of staff who know children's names and backgrounds. All through Pri denies parents a choice on type of education, something Dunmore has excelled at. As you say, the Inf is an excellent school so why change something that works? Surely the Jnrs should be improved first and then reconsider. Appalled at dreadful treatment of loyal staff of Inf and at the tragic effect this is havin gon their lives. Sad part of all this is one feels there has been a hidden agenda. Why would Jnrs go on Special Measures when v. capable people have applied for H/ship and rejected. Coupled with the planning permission that has been granted for properties surrounding the school and offers for others, leads me to think that this is just an opportunity for yet another experiment in the education world at the expense of children. Strongly urge a complete stop on either options. Please listen to public opinion.
109	PDJ		N			Y		Uncertainty of job security of all staff of both schools should be addressed as a priority as stress is affecting staff, parents and children. A time of stability is needed at Dunmore to get the school out of Special Measures and only then should changes in structure and/or management occur. Full consultation is needed with all staff regarding any changes. My preference is for a new H/T to the Jnrs and to keep schools separate but with close liaison. Second choice is to join schools by extending the Infs to incorporate Jnrs so no staff are lost. Totally oppose Option 2 and will not be sending child to such an impersonal establishment, the merits of which are not proven.
110	TDI							Young children thrive in smaller units. Inf children are individuals known by everyone who works in the school. Many parents choose to send their children to Infs for that reason. Not in a young child's interests to become merely a number in a huge organisation such as 3-19 school many of which have hardly yet been properly tried and tested for sufficient length of time. At present time, leave Inf as it is, advertise nationally to appt experienced H/T for Jnr. Once the turbulence of leadership has been eradicated and the Jnr has had a proven period of stability a merger should then be considered. Less disruptive to children's education and well being. Different structure could be achieved and a natural point of change (i.e. the present Inf H/T retirement). Parental confidence must be re-established and as a consequence in the future there would be less opposition to a changed structure of an all-through P/S - a smoother merger could then ensue. Option 2 should be completely eliminated from current or future consultation process.
111	PDI	Y	N					Option 2 wrong for Dunmore schools and for Ab. Dunmore schools v. special and provide a v. good environment for children to learn. A P/S is best way forward.
112	RA					Y		Consultation process intrinsically flawed. Under-advertised and consultation period too short. Option 1 removes choice for existing structure. Undermines and threatens high quality education provided at Inf school. Back door solution to Jun school problems. Option 2 places undue pressure on remainder of Ab schools being inundated with applications for children to enroll who have no desire to see their child enter what they perceive to be an experimental education factory. Clear from consultation document that the need for change is driven by Jnr school problems. It is not acceptable to seek solutions by disrupting status quo. Identifying and resolving these problems have been dismissed too early and needs more work.
113	P							No formal communication with H/T prior to consultation, no agreed strategy from LA on transfers from Dunmore, Inaccuracies in consultation paper, no leadership or clear strategy from LA, Option 2 should be withdrawn, need to re-evaluate and extend consultation and deadline periods for implementation.
114	O					Y		3 sons attended - did extremely well and would like to support school staying as it is or forming a pri school age range.
115	O	Y	N					Option 2 not proven.
116	RA	Y						
117	RA					Y		Option 2 not been proven, but would support Option 1, but not combining with Fitz
118	O	Y						Option 1 would bring inline with other Ab pri schools and would benefit greatly. New H/T should be Inf H/T - highly valued by parents and children. Unfair to be made to resign and re-apply - is this the thanks she gets for all her hard work? Option 2 daunting for children at young age to be governed by sec school teachers some of which do not relate to younger generation. Pupils deserve to be loved, nurtured at a young age to grow into caring independent adults. Option 2 alien to other Ab schools, wouldn't be same caring school the pupils are used to and may end up producing cold, uncaring individuals.
119	RA							Starting school is where the seeds of education are planted and need v. special experience - Dunmore is excellent in nurturing and caring for this stage. Placing small children into an academy cannot be way forward, and is not proven success. Children are becoming stats for league tables, no wonder we live in a society where there is so much abuse, violence and greed. The fabric of society is deteriorating and there is little respect for anyone. Support school remaining in pri school p/ship.
120	PDJ							No strong reason for Option 2 put forward. Strength of feeling against this option can't be ignored. Can see need to secure good mgt of Jnr school and Option 1 is preferred option but not at the expense of the excellent, nurturing atmosphere and staff at Inf school. Was asked to give trust when Mr Lester arrived, but feel this trust has been betrayed and the schools are much more unstable than before. son lost friends who have moved and now reluctant to go to school. If Option 2 is adopted, would remove child from school and either educate privately or move from Ab.
121	TDJ	Y		N		N		H/T to be appointed to oversee the merged. Feel it is really important to be able to track SEN pupils from an early age and ensure the transition is smooth, this would be easier in a pri school. Not in favour status quo or extension of infs.
122	PDJ	Y		N				Strongly opposed to Option 2 as not enough is yet known about this type of school and we feel far from ready to agree to this change. Option 1 is much more acceptable as far as the children and their education are concerned.
123	RA/TA							Have worked in Infs for 10 yrs and always found children of this age need very close and nurturing care that they receive here. 2 children went to Fitz and 1 to John Mason - not environment I would wish for children when they were in infant years and maybe not even old enough at jun school age - outlook and behaviour of senior school is so totally different.
124	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					Option 2 - strongly opposed for reasons raised at public meetings, agree in principle to Option 1 but feel there are significant risks with the proposed rush timescale; namely that a H/T may not be found and continued disruption. Mr Lester should be allowed to continue his good progress, he is in best position with work with Inf H/T to oversee the change in mgt structure and LA should guarantee he will remain in post until schools are merged and a permanent H/T is found.
125	PDI/PDJ		N	Y				Option 2 - too large, impersonal and intimidating for young children. Accept Option 1, only if it was carried out very sensitively and carefully, but reject timescales proposed by LA. Believe Jnr school should come out of special measures so that underlying problems are solved. All staff guaranteed jobs and H/T of Infs should be offered H/Ship by extending Infs age range. Will preserve special qualities and give continuity for children.
126	PDI		N	Y				Feel children would benefit by being joined to Jnrs and could be achieved by extending Infs good practice to include Jnrs.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
127	PDI		N					Don't believe Option 2 will help improve children's education in the slightest and adding disruptiveness and anguish to children.
128	PDI			Y				For Jnrs to have best change to turn itself around as quickly as possible is for it to be joined to Infs school with present H/T. This is necessary to get school in upward trend and to raise moral for everyone.
129	PDI							Option 1 - proven track record, Option 2 is far from proven. Were the LA considering this option from a stable position it might be an achievable objective. Given the existing instability in Jnr school, this option is reckless at best. Extremely disappointed at conduct of consultation and apparent lack of preparation and research undertaken to support such a significant and irreversible change.
130	PDI		N	Y				Suggest Option 3 with current Infs H/T. Presentation at consultation meeting seem flawed in many ways and I hope you take note of the wishes of parents, teachers and governors.
131	PDI		N			Y		Chose school because it is an Infs school, were impressed by ethos and friendly personal I/ship team. Option 2 too risky and would destroy the prim I/ship provision and would move children to another pr school if this happens.
132	PDI		N			Y		Feel v. strongly about putting inf and jnr children with secondary school, concerned about bullying and bad habits. Can't understand why schools and teachers can't be left as they are - you say you want what's best for the children, so why not leave them where they are, settled, happy and feel safe.
133	PDI		N			Y		Approached matter with open mind, but after reading consultation paper and attending meetings I feel no better informed as to how Option 2 would work. Feel Option 2 had barely been researched. Feel Option 1 is too risky given timeframe - if a suitable H/T is not in place by Sept 07 then the future of both inf and jnr schools is in jeopardy. Urge you to at least attempt to recruit H/T to Jnr who could concentrate on building on the progress made recently.
134	PDI/PDJ		N	Y				never had any problems with either school, appaled at the way staff are being treated. The H/T and staff at Infs is excellent and are being unfairly penalised through no fault of their own. Joining with Fitz will not benefit any of the children. Let H/T of Infs take over Jnrs and let existing staff retain their jobs.
135	PP			Y				Suggest Option 3 - the v. successful In H/T to take on Jnrs, but it appears not an option after she was told "her job is being swept from beneath her feet" as told by a member of staff. Parents to not want to lose her. Option 2 is too big for one person to have overall control and could result in successful nursery and Infs not achieving its current levels. If Option 3 is not considered, then I would favour Option 1.
136	RA		N			Y		As seen at the public meetings, residents of Ab are opposed to any change, generations of children have attended with no complaints. Panel members had no answers to q's raised so it seems the case or change has no real foundation. Surely the education of the children of Ab is the prime importance and any other reason, whether financial or not, should not be the prime reason for unsettling changes. Similar schemes have not worked in other areas and proved v. expensive so please listen to the majority and scrap this v. controversial and potentially damaging plan.
137	PDI			Y				Put current Inf H/T in charge of Jnr school as well and given the right resources and backing she would turn the school around and get it out of special measures and get it back to being the best in the area. She is liked and respected by the teachers, parents and most importantly the children. Give this lady the job.
138	PDJ/O		N					Absolutely against Option 2, evidence so far shows this is not the best way forward for any school that it is in special measures or without strong I/ship already in place. I suggest the H/T of Fitz continues her efforts to try and get her own school up to the standards required.
139	PDI/PDJ							Proposals have been rushed through with no proper thought. Presentations a waste of time, giving no proper views, evaluations or comparisons. Stop this now. Re-open the consultations, with experts, advice and info so people can make an informed decision.
140	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					
141	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					
142	PP		N			Y		Chose school as were impressed with warm, friendly atmosphere. H/T has brilliant reputation and Inf has no faults, any merger will destroy a perfectly well run school and will end up losing H/T who has gained respect and trust of all pupils and parents. Jnr school problems need to be resolved without upheaval of Infs and Nursery and definitely without involving Fitz. Option 2 - no way a H/T from secondary school can give the same warmth and understanding for 5 yr olds.
143	PDJ	Y	N					Option 1 big task should not be rushed, permanent H/T needs to be in place. Well planned and correctly staffed transition is essential to the success of the plan. Values of the school (e.g. Music/Sport) should be at least maintained - they should be allowed to get pushed down the priority list.
144	PDJ/GDJ	Y	N					Don't start new P/s without new H/T being appointed, do not rush closure through for Sept 07 if better to wait until Jan/Sept 08. Infs and Jnr schools are good schools.
145	PDI/PG	N	N			N		Option 2 not appropriate for Dunmore, Fitz, Ab. Fails to meet criteria for successful amalgamation across the age range. Option 1 is not necessary to achieve the prime motivator (securing a Pri/Jnr H/T). Status quo may not achieve all objectives, but has considerable, proven advantages. Innovation and P/ship should be pursued for I/ship arrangements that satisfy the long term needs of the school, other than closure of both schools.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
2000	PDI							Chose Infs as were v. impressed with H/Ts passion for infant education, comprehensive knowledge, wonderful intimacy and sense of calm orderly behaviour she encouraged in the pupils. Feel that Dunmore Infs is . Unusual and incredibly special. How often does one find a school where gifted teachers with passion, commitment, genuine care and excellent reaching ability penetrate every aspect of the education process? Therefore, v. surprised that LA want to interfere with this school and the manner in which the 2 proposals have been handled. the gap between receiving the letter and the consultation evenings caused mass panic with applications to other Ab schools which has a knock-on effect on confidence and moral amongst remaining pupils and teachers. Whatever decision hope staff valued, appreciated and respect shown towards experts in their field.
2001	PT							I think it would be best to convert the school into an all-through primary school, as this is a known format for schools, and can therefore be well supported at a difficult time. It would not be wise to transform the school into a 3-19 age school as it is too big a jump for existing leadership at the three schools, frayed as it is with the Junior school's recent special measures. Let the junior school join with the infant school, the staff reapply for their jobs and settle into the new format before an all-new project in schooling is tried.
2002	PDI/PDJ					Y		Your letter highlights two options for consultation. Is there a third option – Dunmore Infants and Juniors remain, with – at some stage – a permanent head being appointed to the Juniors? Or has a decision already been taken to adopt one of the presented options? Is there any information you can give on the timing of the adoption of any option? (The rumours on the school playground yesterday was that the schools would be closing in Summer 2007.) I would hazard that these uncertainties cannot be good for the likely numbers registering Dunmore Juniors as their first choice on the CAPF, which I assume will impact those at the school – should it remain – due to a reduced income.
2003	PF	Y	N					Why not train the current Infant School Head to be able to cover both Infant and Junior? Is it not possible to walk between the two sites? I don't have a problem with Dunmore becoming a Primary school I do not want an all-through 3-19 school. I haven't figured out why Oxfordshire feels it has to "innovative" and the forerunner in trialing new educational ideas, most likely to the detriment of the children's education for the first few years of these trials. (Rush Common had enough problems when John Fisher and Maxine Evans wanted to change the timings of the school day). I should know about these "innovative" ideas, I was the first year of comprehensive education in the West Midlands and it was a shambles! Whether we reached our full potential by the end of our schooling will never be known. To remove points of transition up to the age of 19 is not a good idea. It does not prepare young people for all the change that they will meet in life. This goes for the more able students and the less able students. Plus all the other concerns listed in the official "Options" document about the 3-19 school.
2004	PDJ	Y	N					Dunmore has always had an excellent reputation. We felt it was a very caring school with good standards in teaching and pupils behaviour. We felt that the transition to the juniors was smooth and came very naturally. Our eldest son and his year group have just left Dunmore with high levels in their SATS despite the unsettled situation regarding head teachers and then the poor Ofstead report, which quite frankly we were all shocked that a Beacon school could supposedly go down hill so much in the space of a few years to a 'failing' school. He was always happy at school apart from the unsettling time in losing the last head, Mr Kenyon, who all the children liked and who we all thought would be great to stabilise the running of the school after all the temporary leaders. I can see some of the thought and reasoning behind merging the Infant and Junior schools, providing it is done in a sensitive way. I am concerned that the staff will have to re-apply for their jobs and what Linda Konieczny's position will be. I am also very concerned about the rumours of selling off some of the land. We do not feel comfortable that our youngest child would be mixing with secondary school aged children and vice versa. The different age groups have very different and specific needs, emotionally as well as educationally. We also want to be able to choose freely where our child will go to school and although in the reports that we have had it says that there would still be an option we could be ostracizing our child from where the majority of their friends may be going. I trust that you will seriously consider the effect that this proposed merger will have on the children, not just considering this as an experimental exercise or for financial reasons. After all, the children's education and emotional wellbeing is paramount.
2005	PDI							Really impressed with ethos of Inf school. Teachers and staff work hard and daughter happy and thriving. Lots of people removing children from school. Please take great care when choosing the future. Only one chance at education, should all be striving for what is best in the long run for all children.
2006	PDI/PDJ		N			Y		Dunmore Infant School is an excellent school. We believe that a school of this size benefits from being a dedicated infant school, rather than a primary school. A combined infant and junior school would lose the personal touch. The timing, style and speed of the merger are wrong. The option to retain the status quo. Transfer teachers. Delay merging schools to a more appropriate time. If the infant and junior schools have to be merged, at least wait until the junior school is out of special measures and a new head teacher is established. This will greatly increase the chances of a successful merger. We are very strongly against merging with Fitzharry's. This will create a school that is too large to manage effectively, has none of the caring ethos and community atmosphere that characterise the existing Infant school, and is likely to lead to discipline problems and exposure of young pupils to inappropriate behaviour, bad language and bullying. We feel that academic standards are also likely to decline.
2007	PF					Y		I propose that there is a 3rd option, to leave the infant school as it is, leave the senior school as it is and use the money that would be needed to fund the changes in options 1+2 and human resource which would be put to better use in bringing the junior school back up to a high standard. I really, really hope that parents views (and childrens) are listened to and that a decision hasn't already been reached as the rumours are implying. Apart from 2 people who stood up and said they didn't mind which way things went, certainly the rest who were there, were definitely against any change
2008	PF		N					The first thing to say that I am not opposed in principle to a 3-19 through school, but the way in which the LA have gone about this has created a great deal of anger and mistrust amongst the community and has probably set any prospect of this back a decade. I think you have totally miscalculated the effect that your approach has had. In an attempt to fix one problem you have created a number of others, and the one that concerns me most is the affect it will have on Fitzharrys. The perception at the consultation meetings was that it was a fait accompli, and that Fitzharrys was trying to lead some sort of takeover - you did nothing to dispel this perception and left Fitz hanging out to dry. At this time I can not support Option 2 with the current climate and fully support the Fitzharrys governors request for this option to be withdrawn. I feel that the current head of Dunmore should be given time to complete the task he was given to do, i.e. bring it out of special measures by July and then the future of the schools be considered. How you could throw this at him at this time beggars belief.
2009	PDJ	Y	N					Dunmore is a well run school. Children in Jnrs need a period of calm and stability and will be achieved in the shortest timeframe if the Inf and Jnrs merge only. 3-19 option too large and impersonal and caring environment will be lost. Worried about staff moral and effect on remaining children.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Brief Summary of comment
		All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation	
2010	PDJ	Y	N					Dunmore is a well run school. Children in Jnrs need a period of calm and stability and will be achieved in the shortest timeframe if the Inf and Jnrs merge only. 3-19 option too large and impersonal and caring environment will be lost. Worried about staff moral and effect on remaining children.
2011	PDI	N	N			Y		Impressed by teaching, happy atmosphere and dedicated staff and excellent leadership in Infs. Succession of H/T in Jnrs has clearly caused problems. A combined pri does not seem a sensible option - problems of jnr school may drag down the inf school. LA should concentrate on getting jnr back on rack. 3-19 option would see the children lost in an impersonal sea, no caring atmosphere and nurturing environment. Keep status quo and employ a committed H/T to the jnrs seems the preferred option.
2012	PDI		N					Favoured ethos of and high level of pastoral care under the extremely caring and highly capable leadership of H/T. Appalled at the way this has been handled - too short a timescale. Jnrs need to be stabilized. Informal suggests parents views will not count. Option 1 just neater - no evidence of advantage to children. Consultation short on substance - do not know who either option will work in practice. Children would be an experiment.
2013	PF/RA	Y	N					Feel Fitz should concentrate on goals expressed by H/T. Feel option 2 detrimental affect on other 2 sec schools. Children cope well with transition period.
2014			N					Handling of situation appalling. Can't see how school could go wrong and measures should have been taken a long time ago before situation evolved. H/T, govts, teachers and OCC should shoulder responsibility for failing. Options been poorly communicated. Don't see any advantages of option 2 just a strange experiment with no proven track record in success. Feel Fitz is starting to improve under new H/T and feel merger could bring both schools down.
2015	PDI		N			Y		Feel school should be left well alone. Can't see benefits of sharing school with teenagers.
2016	PD					Y		Queried the grounds for OCC's belief that both options would provide better educational opportunities.
2017	PF	Y						Feel that all staff at both schools should re-apply for jobs in any merger, including H/T of Fitz - feel LA does not value inf teachers to same degree as senior teachers. Queried the burden of admin on H/T in Option 2 - the job ends up being done less well. How can one H/T have expertise over all age range. Not enough evidence to suggest Option 2 will be a success - now is not the time to introduce a far reaching experiment. Feel that schools could remain separate and still maintain good curriculum links. Re: funding - one chance at additional funding for special projects instead of 3
2018	PDI		N					V. impressed by standard of care and education exemplified by Infs. Concerns with Option 2 but can see advantages for Option 1. Process badly handled, lack of detail which had led to uncertain speculation and fear with pupils being withdrawn. Option 2 - no meaningful long-term results to examine to convince of any advantages. Feel no guarantee that children will fit into the "specialisms" of a merged Fitz school. Fail to see that a H/T can equally support and understand age range in Option 2.
2019		Y	N					Option 1 provides consistency and equality of opportunity to children in Ab. This could not be realised in Option 2. Feel it would be better for Jnr school to be secure and then ask new H/T to develop a phased merge of Inf and Jnrs. Concerns about the way OCC has handled process.
2020	PDJ				Y			Many parents welcome opportunity for change and are open minded about proposals. Feel Option 2 is a fantastic opportunity for children's education going forward by creating an innovative and creative environment. Concerns over extending infants into jnrs and keeping inf H/T.
2021	PDJ		Y					Feel Option 2 is exciting and offers fantastic opportunities. Don't feel a child needs to be nurtured by the H/T of a school to progress. The consultation is not about personalities but what is best for children. Feel presentation could have been better researched.
2022	PDI	Y	N					Feel we are running away from problem with Jnr school rather than solving the problem. Feel the problems could re-occur if the schools do merge. Feel more time should be allowed to solve current difficulties. Option 2 recipe for disaster. Option 1 is minimal change for children.
2023	PDI/PDJ/PF							Worried Option 2 school would be overwhelming vast. Feeling putting a H/T in charge of Inf and Jnr age children without training could seriously damage the children's education. Feel teachers are being treated shabbily.
2024				Y		Y		Inf school is excellent with loving and caring environment. Doesn't feel that because the jnr school has problems we should close both school and demoralise staff. Suggest status quo or extend age range of Inf. Vague proposals with little detail. Takes the proposals as an admission of failure by LA re: jnr school.
2025	PDI			Y				Consultation period too short. Unfair that Fitz teachers will not have to reapply for their jobs. Chose Infs for high standards of academic performance, if schools merge there will be a change of eth no guarantees change will be for the better therefore gambling with child's education. If Inf H/T is redeployed in a less empowering role may not have same influence over the school. Concerns that extra funding will be directed to secondary aged children. Don't want same building for teenagers as 5 yr olds. Feel stakeholders views will not be acted on. Request teachers not made to reapply their jobs.
2026	PDI	Y						As parents, asked to complete a form for transfer to Yr 3 - don't know what the school structure will be then - v. scary when dealing with child's future. Co-incidence that preference forms are due in before public meetings. Excellent school - caring, nurturing, excellent teaching - shouldn't be lost whatever decision. No significant benefits for Option 2 - no evidence, few schools up and running. Concerned at numbers leaving and moral, stress on teachers. Believe H/T needs to be experienced with pri age children. At age 11 will have to make choice to remove child from current school if prefer another sec school with different specialisms - feel the Ab sec school p/ship will be damaged by a 3-19 school. Concerned Option 2 decision already taken by LA.
2027	PDI							Most worried that caring atmosphere would be lost with a merger with Fitz. Concerned about implications of educating 4 yr olds with 18 yr olds.
2028	PDI					Y		Concerned requested to complete preference form for Yr 3 before the public meeting takes place. Infs is excellent school, o/standing l/ship, caring, friendly atmosphere supported by Ofsted report. School's character and standards would be damaged by any change. Feel Jnr problems should be addressed and Ofsted monitoring suggest improvement. Feel whatever calibre of H/T appointed, the additional responsibilities for the Infs and (possible) Fitz would inevitable mean that their efforts would be diluted.
2029	PF	Y						Not surprised action being taken. Took child away in Jnrs because of problems. Feel Fitz has improved under present H/T. Concern with Option 2 would place significant burden on H/T and have adverse affect on standards. Firmly believe that early years are critical in learning and development of young people so solid infant and jnr teaching essential.
2030	PDI							Shocked, distressed, disappointed and disgusted by proposals and speed. Why destroy a successful school because LA's inability to appt a suitable H/T for Jnrs. Why is Infs H/T being overlooked? H/ship of Jnrs. Why urgency for academy, prefer implementation over 5 years (natural cycle), schools would be afforded an opportunity to develop a unified personality at more relaxed pace rather than one being viewed as taking over the other. Feel children will be social experiment when we can offer no example or supporting data of such a facility up and running. Feel the LA has set out to destroy spirit of successful community - turmoil and disruption heaped on children - how LA have repaid loyalty of a successful H/T and staff. Considering pte education.
2031	PDI/PDJ		N			Y		Chose Dunmore because of caring ethos, good SATs, separate Inf and Jun age groups. When Jnr went into special measures kept children there because of good teaching. Distressing to hear of staff in tears and children transferring to other schools. 2nd choice to merge Inf and Jnr but keeping all staff in place. Against Option 2 - fitz low reputation. Query decision already taken to merge with Fitz, fear stakeholders views won't be taken into account. Timescales too quick. Why now when could have taken action over last 4-5 yrs for Jnr school? Concerns about Inf H/T not having role in any new school. Concerns re: selling off of land, re: teachers reapplying for posts. Is the Fitz option driven by extra funding to improve academic standards?

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Brief Summary of comment
		All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation	
2032	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					Feel Option 1 will provide continuity of children and staff and best way forward for education. Friendly and caring environment will be maintained. Option 2 not in best interests of community esp. for younger children. Will undermine the Ab P/ship currently provides fantastic range of education for all which Ab can be v. proud of now and in the future.
2033	PDI							Feel Inf school being dragged into Jun school problems. Concerns re Fitz behaviour. Concerns re entrances for Inf/Jnr and Yr 7 upwards if Option 2 goes ahead. Feeling of disbelief, shock and sadness. Inf is caring, kind and positive outlook.
2034	PF					Y		Sep structure for Inf and Jnr successful. How has Beacon school been allowed to disintegrate into special measures? Queried how we will make new structure work when old one doesn't. Feel that teachers in Jnr school have made H/T job difficult. Option 2: mgt team at Fitz not strong enough, don't feel the sampling of curriculum for gifted children a realistic proposition, raised concerns about SEN provision as high priority, this option gets LA off the hook in failing to appt Jnr H/T, although will result in Jnr being removed from special measures can't see an advantage for children as not dealing with problem inside Jnrs, no advantages to Fitz re: Dunmore site. Too big to manage effectively, leave less choice for Ab children to attend at sec age (as will be considered outsiders), upset balance in Ab. What if H/T leaves, experience will be so unique will not be able to get new H/T. Educational experiments fail, get basics right in Jnrs. Option 2 ill conceived and badly thought out.
2035	PDJ	Y	N					Can't see benefits of Option 2 for children and Jnrs have had enough stress without another change. Transition of Option 1 needs to be carefully thought out and well planned. Concerns re: children transferring. Children's needs come first and great care needed with teachers who we value and need to retain.
2036	PDI					Y		Info provided is inadequate re: implementation and detail on running. Timetable rushed with Option 1 meaning it would open with no H/T in place. Situation has caused fear and damaged good work within the schools. Parents don't want Option 2, void of substantial info concerning. Feel Option 2 favoured by LA because Fitz won't have to close. Consultation handled poorly. Inf and Fitz are good schools and are at risk. Would like to see Jnr get Beacon status again. Feel railroaded and confidence lost. Both options present greater risk. Way options presented indicate a bias. Feel that the H/T of Fitz is more valued than H/T of Inf.
2037	PDJ							Chose Inf because of reputation, ethos and good attainment. Concerned that decision has been taken to consider amalgamating such a good school with Fitz and speed of decision. Transition stages went smoothly and considered as step towards independence. Contained in same environment from 3-19 with no "fresh" re-assessment and no opportunity to experience change is not good. Felt Options paper lacked support for Option 1 and gave no new info. Main concerns is that LA see this as a quick fix to take Jnr school out of special measures and solve l/ship problem.
2038						Y		Feel Jnr school needs to improve not simply being taken out of special measures by a merger. Good communication needed with parents re: separate FS and KS1 provision. Surely Fitz staff should re-apply for their jobs, not just Infs & Jnrs. Why is it acceptable for Fitz H/T have no experience of Inf and current H/T treated differently and unfairly? Option 2: no hard evidence that model is effective and unsubstantiated. Re: gifted children opportunities, this means that sec staff will have no exper. in teaching younger age group. We state that we want to replicate qualities and ethos of Infs in any new establishment, surely this will be easily achieved by retaining existing staff? No need to create a blank sheet as this could continue as now with right support and encouragement. Support Option 1 by keeping Inf H/T and Deputy with KS2 experience.
2039			N					Communication of proposed changes has been poorly handled, has made the task of Jnr and Inf H/T unnecessarily difficult and resulted in many children leaving Dunmore. Strong feeling that Long Furlong pupils would not have same access to specialist teaching and facilities and therefore be disadvantaged if they opted to joint 3-19 school in Yr 7. Feared parents would find it harder to find a place at a new 3-19 school in Fitz. Observed that Option 2 failed to address issue of l/ship at KS2. 3-19 school would unbalance existing o/ship. Perceived that Dunmore staff were not receiving fair treatment re: jobs. Poor communication with neighbouring schools.
2040	RA	Y	N					Sec school mgt cannot be expected to have skills and experience to cover wide age range. A P/S would have small, friendly secure atmosphere and not be part of enormous superschool. H/T shd be physically present and approachable. Dunmore needs to become a well run P/S not placing undue strain on a good sec school.
2041		Y	N					Concerned about speed of consultation. Keen to preserve ethos of Dunmore and the creation of an all through Pri would achieve this and bring in line with rest of Ab. Option 2 is largely untried, create anomaly in Ab, would call into question existing 14-19 p/ship and special school status, spell the end of separate and unique education provision. Seems to be an experiment and is simply expediency to resolve Junr school problems.
2042								Larkmead welcomes students from all the primaries in Abingdon and surrounding areas, including from Dummore Junior School. This is based on a free choice and the match between the needs of individual students and the provision and ethos at Larkmead. Whatever the outcome of the consultation at Dunmore, we would expect the choice of secondary school at age 11 to remain free and real so that Larkmead and the other secondary schools can continue freely to attract students from across the Abingdon catchment area. This apart, we consider that the best way forward for Dunmore Junior School should be based on consultation with relevant parents, staff, governors and other stakeholders and Larkmead does not have a view on the options suggested.
2043	PDJ	Y	N					Your task is to achieve this with the minimum of disruption to the staff of Inf school for who there is a great deal of feeling among the parents.
2044	RA	Y	N					
2045	RA					Y		All through P/S is good idea and inline with rest of Ab. But why penalise staff in Infs by re-applying for jobs? All policies need to be reviewed regularly to check they are appropriate. Option 2 - Relies on one H/T covering 100's of children's school careers. Places too much responsibility in hands of 1 person. Option 3, keeps existing staff with new H/T. Leave Inf H/T in plac until retirement and appt. Inf Dept. Leader at that time.
2046								to expand Fitz would unbalance the 3 sec schools. By saying one school will help ease the transition from pri to sec, what of the children from other pri schools - they will be disadvantaged. The H/T of Fitz is in her first H/T ship and has never taught at pri. The opportunity to create an innovative and integrated model of provision that has been achieved elsewhere is only an advantage if you know it works and as yet the experiment is very new and not truly tested. Parents may feel their children are subjects of an educational experiment. Leave Dunmore as separate school whether as it is c a pri school. No return address given for responses.
2047			Y					Option 2 - provided it is monitored closely it will be a good thing for children's education. If Jnr school is currently failing its pupils then it must not be allowed to continue.
2048								Infs school is excellent - impressed with standards of pupils' education. A merger could jeopardise this. Can understand how the Pri option might work for us and still retain atmosphere of the Infs. Parents need reassurance that this is possible. Option 2 - can't see problems with the passage to sec school, so how would Option 2 benefit our children?
2049	PDI		N			Y		Shocked and horrified at either option. Why would anyone want their 4 yr old educated with 19 yr olds? League tables published show that Academy schools are in bottom 200 in England. Her 5 yr old has teachers who know her and family and care about her future in a larger school this care would disappear. Feel that the H/T of Inf and children are being used as scapegoats for a bigger political agenda. Feel daughter's education will be badly affected of absurd proposal.
2050								Wants re-assurance that schools won't be sold off for housing. No confidence in public consultation - feels it's all done and dusted.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
2051	PDI/PDJ	Y	N					Inf H/T showed hostility towards Jnr school and lack of co-operation has been evident. No continuity in child's education. Having an all through Pri would enable the school to be more streamlined enable children to be more settled. Saddened that teachers have to reapply for jobs. Alarmed at the number of children removed, urge LA to consider the welfare of the remaining children carefully. Option 2 - why do we think partners would want the school managed by someone with no experience at pri level. Good to have a point of transition - helps them grow up. Feels Jnrs will be out of special measures before long anyway. Beneficial for staff and parents to see school come out of special measures by own merits and not because the school is closed. Concerns cancel out advantages. LA reminded that each child is special and only get once chance at good experience of education.
2052	PDJ					Y		Shocked and angered at proposals. Having listened to reassurances by Jnrs and LA that school making progress now feel let down. Staff moral affected and children worried. Chose school because of separate environments. Great concern with timescale for decision indicating a decision has already been made. Cost cutting reasons and opposed to best interests of children. Sadden to think that caring, friendly, supportive ethos could be unnecessarily lost. Urge you to keep status quo. Any decision should be based on best interests of children.
2053	PDI	Y						Disgusted, taking good-excellent Inf school and ruining it. Feel that Option 1 would be lovely idea, but because householders are being offered large amounts of money can't see we would merge the Inf and Jnrs together. Feel decision already made. Feel children not been considered. don't want child to be guinea pig, what if it goes wrong, will no longer be a school but a business. Support Inf staff as feel their hard work has been ignored.
2054	PF	Y						Not enough detail on Options. Whole education system in Ab should be examined where a pooling of resources should improve the education of children. The O of a continuous curriculum in a 3-19 school was raised, I have not heard this is a problem either from teachers or school inspectors. This would be overcome by a review of the whole school system in Ab. Talk of £300k being invest, but no detail of where from - would this involve selling any land or a private company running on the site.
2055	PDJ	y	N					In favour of Option 1, preferably with existing Inf H/T. Option 2 too big and impersonal and concerns it would divert Fitz H/T energies.
2056	PDI	Y						Consultation period seems too short. Feel that the proposals do not make us feel they are for the good of the children. Feel the welcoming, loving and nurturing environment of Inf will be lost if becomes part of a bigger school. Following public meetings, unprofessional presentation. Option 2 bad example as in area of high deprivation and the other had £25m investment. Concerns of Fitz H/Ts ability to communicate effectively with all age ranges. Qs not given direct answers. Suggest all through P/S with current Inf H/T given opportunity to consider an application.
2057	PDJ		N					Feel that a merger would lose the warm and caring environment of present Infs. Concerns re Inf H/T losing job. Concerns re children leaving school due to uncertainties with knock on effect to staff, health, stability of school and happiness of children. No benefits of Option 2 would cause disruption, chaos unrest and anxiety. Impersonal environment, not good to mix 8 yr olds with sec age children. Could be difficult to choose sec school when reach age 11. Following public meeting, v. little detail how either option would work. concerns of speed of decision making creating mistrust worry and unease. Concerns re children leaving school. All teachers, staff under considerable stress. Children should be of paramount importance. Prefer to keep Dunmore separate. Transition stages help children grow. If they do merge plenty of consultation with teachers, parents and govs needed. Option 2 - impersonal, not enough evidence will achieve beneficial results in long term.
2058	PF							Felt not enough indepth info gained from public meeting or q's raised therein. Concerns as daughter starts GCSE yrs and standard of education could dip - how will we ensure this does not happen? Feel LA and school have not explained proposed option to Fitz parents.
2059	PDI		N			Y		Shocked at speed of decision, worried that caring atmosphere in Infs could be lost. Teachers will not be at their best now as they know their jobs are on the line and children not getting best education. Concerns of young children mixing with older ones, and concerns re: H/T Fitz not being a "young people's person". Status quo suggested. Concerns re: loss of Inf H/T.
2060	PDI					Y		Attended public meetings with open view but concerned about timescales of implementation. After the meeting, even more concerned, appeared decision had already been made. Think LA prefer Option 2, but not best for children. Not opposed to Option 1 but status quo is preferred. Q's raised at meeting were unanswered, suspect there is a lot parents aren't being told - sympathy with staff who must find it hard in these difficult circumstances. Whole way matter handled is a disgrace, upsetting for parents, teachers and children.
2061	PP	Y	N					Ideal opportunity to streamline pri education in Ab. Absurd to introduce a new model of education which has not been tested locally and there is evidence that an all through pri systems works where, also the root of Dunmore problems are they did not reflect local system.
2062	PP							Concerned that prospective parents have not been consulted.
2063	PDI		N	Y				Infs has good ethos, well managed and professional and caring staff. Children valued, good behaviour, H/T visible and approachable, happy place, children enthusiastic and eager to learn, provides exactly the nurturing environment that is required, good Ofsted. Option 2 concerns: speed of decision, information delays, after cutoff date for school choices, impact on staff and children, concerns about 4 yr old in huge, impersonal environment with administrators who don't have experience in pri classroom., social problems, poor Ofsted report for Fitz, Dunmore staff losing jobs, referenc etc Hays Report re: detrimental effect on children. Both staff should be treated with respect and measures put in place to protect morale. See LA as trying to take advantage of the good reputation of Infs school to drag Jnrs out of special measures. Feel LA has no real interest in children or parents wants/needs. Whole way incident has been handled is dreadful. Feel LA value mony/stat more highly than children and staff. Child's viewpoint: Teachers are kind, H/T is nice and learning is fun, does not want school closed down.
2064	PDJ							chose schools because of good reputations. Although child not showing signs of this affecting him, with more and more children leaving not convinced how much longer this will last. Hope staff are getting assurance and support they need re advice and future career prospects. Concerned about Option 2 - 4 year olds mixing with 18 yr olds, school could be hard to manage, lose personal touch.
2065	PDI/PDJ		N					Utter horror at proposals. Feel we are trying to ruin a superb school and superb teaching staff and a fantastic H/T. Queried reasoning behind Option 2, what benefit to inf and jnr school children. LA has made this decision already, if so, want assurances at age 11 children won't have to go to Fitz - worst nightmare.
2066	PDJ							Feel H/T of Inf should be given P/S H/Ship. Raised concerns that H/T of Fitz does not have KS1 & 2 experience, but Inf H/T has - as parents you expect us to leave someone with no experience in this age range looking after out children. Have already removed child from Fitz due to bullying, lack of care and compassion, understanding from staff there. Should concentrate more on gett Jnrs of special measures and current H/T said he would stay and long as it took so why change and urgency to move him. Are our children not important enough, of are they just guinea pigs, what happens when it all goes wrong?
2067	PF	Y	N					Disappointed and saddened by LA response - neither option appear to consider the place of schools within the wider Ab community. Excuses of limited pool of H/T and studies suggesting transitions between schools may negatively impact on some pupils are weak and carry flaws. An all age school would preclude valuable experience of being "top" of the school with additional responsibilities this brings. Queried whether H/T of Fitz appropriately qualified for KS1 & 2. If we are to consider Option 2 then H/ship should be advertised. Serious and damaging consequences in Ab p/ship Least disturbing option would be to focus on finding a suitable H/T for Jnrs, however the result will provide the best educational environment and opportunities for children.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
2068	PDI/PDJ	Y						concerned excellent reputation of Inf school will be lost. Dumbstruck that incredible work of current H/T could be at risk due to circumstances beyond her control. Concerned at the speed of decision and short consultation time, low morale and anxiety being passed on to children. Option 2 - impersonal nature of a large establishment and implications of education age 4 to 18. Concerns that individuals stand to gain more than children would.
2069								Although Fitz exam results have improved they are still below local and gvt averages. Unfair to put education of children at risk, children only get once chance at education, H/T can move on.
2070	PDI							Chose school because least daunting option for children coming from small village school. No indication at time of moving children to schools any major changes in near future. Feel let down and the possibility that I have chosen a 4-19 school without knowing it. Disgusted at lack of info that has been provided.
2071	PDI	Y						Communication between the 2 schools seems v. poor, but can't see why Jnr school can't be incorporated into Inf school retaining services of excellent H/T. Option 2 seen as experimental and would require much more detailed planning and organisation than the current very short timescale allows for. If Option 1 adopted concerns there is insufficient time to recruit new H/T for Sept 07 leaving children to move into the v. unsatisfactory position that currently exists in junr school. Consultation paper vague and hoped for more info so an informed judgment can be made.
2072	PDJ	Y						Totally inadequate consultation document giving no more info and we have already been given. Feel the LA have barely scratched the surface of issues which should have been addressed. Queries about how widely the paper has been distributed. Concerned about the future of her child, the terrible effect on Dunmore and its community. Feel majority of parents not in favour of Option 2. Lots of parents removing children from school. Majority of Dunmore parents do not send children to Fitz so why merge with it? Ab p/ship provides parents with choice to select sec school which will best suit child. Transition should be improved for children to whiever sec school parents select for them. Option 2 seen as experiment, can understand LA concern of finding experienced H/T to lead school after coming out of special measures and an all though p/s is tried and tested. Don't feel that evening meetings are acceptable when addressing parents with young children - difficulties with childcare etc.
2073	PDI		N					Inf school is good and friendly with good results and family atmosphere. If Infs merge with Jnrs standards would slip. Any upheaval would have detrimental affect on children. Education is about children in schools, not politics and cost-cutting. Feel the threat of merger with Fitz is a way of making parents believe a merger of Inf and Jnr least worse option. Option 2: how could H/T be effective over huge age range? Only advantage is shared costs. Concerns about 4 yr olds mixing with teenagers - intimidation. Process has been handled badly and created panic with detrimental affect on children. Hopefully LA will learn from mistakes and take decisive action once Cabinet decision is made. Merged Inf and Jnr school good but with continuity of inf staff, unfair to make them reapply for their jobs, we need an effective H/T in place from Sept 07 so we can move forward. Not equitable that Fitz is given opportunity to extend when Infs not - queried experience of KS2 experience amongst Fitz staff. Practicalities of children's point of view not addressed. Option 2 not tested and no evidence to show it works. Would want same mgt looking after her 3 yr old as her 19 yr old. Feel LA wants Infs to conform to rest of Ab. Feel don't need to change structure of school to get it out of special measures just need effective H/T.
2074			N					Option 2 ill-judged and inappropriate - wish option to be shelved. Lack of sufficient answers to parents and MPs does not fill me with confidence. Cannot risk children being guinea pigs in some unnecessary and inappropriate education experiment. Decision on child's school is to be taken in Dec with LA decision on future of Dunmore not being taken till Jan - unfair
2075	PF	Y	N					Option 1 has been proven locally and creates continuity for KS1 & 2. Fitz has improved over last 2 years and should be left to concentrate on this. Option 2 is dangerous experiment and if went wrong could be detrimental to all 3 learning groups and only one needs help. Far too disruptive for all teachers and pupils.
2076	PDJ							Concerned about pace of change and nature of process. Option 1 seems reasonable, whilst Option 2 appears to be an experiment but shows no evidence that this would benefit children at Jnr school. Raised queries on class sizes, difference in provision of support for SEN children, option of selecting different sec school at age 11, land and sports facilities.
2077	PDJ		N					Trying to keep open mind, but the consultation document gave v. little info about how proposed merger might work. Concerned about educating young people alongside 18 yr olds, worried about effect on p/ship of sec schools, difficult to give each part of the school the attention it would need, one section or another would be bound to lose out. Don't think the current H/T of Fitz has experience or skills to take on such a challenging role and difficult to find someone who had. Option 2 terrible idea.
2078	PP	Y	N					Application for school place has to be in before public meeting and therefore required to apply in good faith that we will like the proposed changes. Lack of info is creating a climate of worry and uncertainty. Lack of timely info is causing parents to look elsewhere, want to support local school and believe importance of school being at the heart of the community, but is increasingly difficult with so little info. Suggest bringing fwd of public meeting. Feel have not been given any education reasons for proposals leading to the assumption project is finance driven. Option 2 not viable option. See Option 1 provides real opportunity to improve quality of education for local children. Feel LA should take responsibility for the decreasing pupil roll and assure that no staff will be lost because of this (impact on school budget). LA should have thought more carefully about proposal and prepared evidence with the necessary rigour. Consultation doc lacked detail and evidence, expected to see detailed studies and inspirational accounts instead left the impression that the whole exercise as a risk itself.
2079								Felt everything is done and dusted. Too long to wait for public meetings.
2080	PDJ							Concerns at unbelievable speed of decision and non-existent period of consultation. Why are stakeholders only offered 2 options when 9 were up for discussion. Implications of educating young children with 18 yr olds. Future of 16-19 p/ship. Huge school - too big and impersonal.
2081	PDJ	Y		N				Disappointed in way Jnr school constantly put down being in mind (KS2 SAT results are higher than national and Oxon averages). Well on way to coming out of special measures. I would suggest the LA's poor handling of the process of merger for either option that has been the last straw for a number of parents - number of children leaving speaks for itself. Suggest inadequate support by former H/T of Jnr - what has LA learnt from this and can we be sure that a new H/T will be given adequate support and training. If you want Option 2 considered parents have to have full confidence in the person who would be H/T - she does not have pri experience, surely that is a concern? Feel a KS2 co-ordinator is specialist position and we would have difficult recruiting. Fact that low %age of children go to Fitz is an indication that Option 2 is not an obvious one. Possible impact on other sec schools in Ab. Option 1 would improve communications between key stages, offer more staff training and career opps. Got to get right H/T. Please recognise hard work of Jnr school staff and devastation to staff, parents and children of both schools. Not heard the LA acknowledge it has made any mistakes, or assessed own performance yet Jnr school staff are under constant scrutiny and pressure on daily basis.
2083		Y	N					Keep H/T of Inf school who does a fabulous job. Concerns about behaviour of Fitz, feel H/T there cares more about making the school look good, rather than welfare of her pupils and future pupils. Rumours about school land being sold - time LA started telling the truth instead of playing with children's future. Staff at Dunmore demoralised, so are they actually teaching to the best of their ability when they don't know if they will have a job.
2084				Y			Y	Option 2 unproven and it is shameful that something could be seriously suggested which experiments with the school lives of children at Dunmore. Whole business been badly handled, no attempt made to engage p/ship and support of parents - consultation doc inadequately argued and proof-read. Unseemly haste about process, feel aim of putting Jnr back on track for Sept 07 is being jeopardised by future caused by inept and insensitive treatment of those most involved. Could extend Inf school or federation. Single pri is a proper route to follow, but needs to be organised and managed in a sensitive and consultative way - fear irreparable harm has been done.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
2085	PDI/PDJ		N					Shocked at proposals and speed. V. concerned ethos of school will be lost through mergers. Inf school not broken - why fix it. Concerns for staff applying for their jobs if lose more children in competitive manner - fear NQTs will be favoured because of costs. Option 2: how can 1 person look after 3 schools and have full confidence of parents and staff and be available to answer any q concerns. Prospective parents put off by educating 4 yr olds with much older children. Could current Inf H/T run both Inf and Jnr school - risk of losing personal and caring approach. Queried shortage of H/Ts - if we can't get one now, when will we be able to get one? Only one chance at education, hope opinions listed to and noted, because my children matter.
2086	TDI		N			Y		Option 2 should be removed, this option has de-stabilised a good and well regarded Inf school and further damaged Jnr school - some parents panicked and removed children. Pity to lose special environment and atmosphere that exists. If merger deemed necessary, why rush, could be achieved by allowed Jnr school to come out of special measures and a new H/T appointed, then follow a period of time maintaining status quo before taking things further. Stressful for all concerned, pls consider carefully wishes of parents and other concerned parties before making any further decisions.
2087								Neither options satisfactory. Concerned Option 2 not in-keeping with other Ab schools and could put pupil numbers out of balance. Large school with such a wide age range would be unmanageable and H/T would be unable to keep on top of all issues covering broad spectrum. If more able children can sample sec school subjects could mean parents more likely to place children in this environment, would in turn have detriment effect on other Ab pri schools as brighter, more able children help to bring on other children in the class, if these children are not present the standard of all other pupils would not increase as much. Sad that pupils don't know their educational future, even sadder that a number of pupils have left. Difficult for staff to feel motivated and encourage pupils to work. Hope solution can be found which will provide best education for current and future children in area which in turn will not detrimentally affect the other schools in Ab.
2088	PF		N					Neutral on Option 1. Opposed to Option 2 - totally inappropriate response to the inability of Jnr school/LA to recruit a H/T. Today, smaller school sare needed where every individual can be taught as individual and given time and space to learn.
2089		Y						Option 1 - should be done with engagement of gov and staff of both schools and timetable for change lengthened. Extending Infs should not be dismissed, but explored. Option 2 - concerns: Effect on p/ship in Ab, larger school would be less inclined to work with other sec/pri, reason of transition can be addressed by p/ship working between schools, arguments for change in consultation doc are inconsistent - inf/jun not in line with rest of Ab, obviously Option 2 isn't either - KS2 knowledge gap in inf/jnr, also applies to Option 2. Option 2 not appear to have been researched. Impression is that the concern of children being used as experiment is all too true. concerns about governance for Option 2. Poor impression of CYP&F, appalled at effect on Inf school, by not preparing the ground with schools and parents, you have prompted an exodus of children which has been destabilising to both schools. LA should have engaged those involved and sought to be supported by those affected -it will not be much harder to recover any goodwill to support a change option.
2090	PP		N					Fitz is slowing developing and with more focus and effort may improve sufficiently to become average within next 12 months. Any additional task is likely to divert the l/ship team's attention and push Fitz development back by several years. I understand that KS2 l/ship wa sa pre-requisite for improving performance at Jnrs, which is not evident at Fitz. Feel v. strongly that the choice of sec education in Ab is disappointing and leaves much to be desired in performance, but do not feel Option 2 would be part of the solution to this problem. Would welcome more resource from LA in supporting and improving continuity from pri to sec education in Ab.
2091			N			Y		Option 2 - ill advised, spread of resources over such a wide age range would seriously compromise the learning and development of children and would prove unworkable in the long term. Children develop and change so dramatically in their school years that the obvious gap between youngest and oldest in terms of physical and educational needs would prove difficult to cater for. Time and effort should be given to support Dunmore as it is working towards taking out of special measures and develop confidence and skills. Combining Inf and Jnr would bring them into line with Ab p/ship and allow staff and snr mgt of those schools to more effectively and efficiently come alongside Dunmore in their journey back to full capacity.
2092	PDJ					Y		Would support Option 1 only if LA were able to produce plans that would allow a controlled and well managed transition. The LA has not shown how risks would be addressed in making transition. Case for Option 2 is seriously lacking - proposal has not been thought through and created considerable anxiety amongst parents and staff. I call upon the LA to recommend to Cabinet this option be dropped.
2093	PDI					Y		Disappointed in handling by LA of procedure. Parents/govs and staff are highly motivated towards providing best possible education and this should have provided an opportunity to have open and constructive dialogue. Instead LA's attitude has been characterised by poor info and unwillingness to explain how several decisions have been reached. Thus fostering belief of hidden agenda. Adverse affect of the confrontation between Dunmore and LA. LA's aim to provide best possible education but our actions have led to departure of 50 children. have now considered options - overwhelming concern that LA lacks competence to undertake management of such a project. don't believe it is impossible to recruit H/T for Jnrs, lower risk option than merger with Infs or Fitz would could undermine recent good progress of Jnrs and disrupt excellent quality of l/ship and teaching in Infs.
2094	PP	Y	N					Option 1 is way forard as it will create a school similar to other Ab Primary schools. Option 2 will create a school too big and vast and from a parents point of view would not consider for children w they are so young. Differing mgt qualities - appropaches, attitudes and behaviour. providing smaller and more intimate school where children can feel safe and secure must outweigh other issues raised in consultation paper. As parent, the choice to choose a sec school that will offer different aspects to education that suit different children's needs and personalities on offer at present in Ab - at age 3 you cannot know this.
2095	GDI		N					Happy environment, children learn, get results, parents happy. Security & stability open to criticism through fear of unknown. Lost a lot of supportive parents because risk was too great. V. strong EY team - have we sought their views? The thought of sec teachers, without EY experience, coming into n/s is thought provoking. I want to be part of an organisation who values and has experience of basic building blocks of children's education. Parents regarding choosing a school as one of the most important decisions ever, most teachers choose to work here because it is an Inf school. Long serving staff questioning whether they want to continue working for Oxon LA.
2096								During the time of our daughter in Dunmore we got the impression of a happy community with sense of purpose and good morale among staff and pupils. Pleasant atmopthee and pleasant place to come. One H/T created initiative for gifted children which would have offered children and most appropriate provision according to best practice, supported by a specially trained teacher. Surely this type of initiative ought to have been thought of by the Council, failing that, should have been embraced and supported every step of the way. Instead, she was left to secure funding herself. We are afraid this is a paradigmatic example of how "target culture" replaced sound judgement and innovative thinking. With financial backing and forward thinking Dunmore would have gone from strength to strength. It was after the departure of this H/T that school faced uncertain future, low staff morale - we would have been afraid to get involved with a school that failed to get support for such ground breaking and timely initiatives. When 2 H/T are forced to take indefinite sick leave, it is obvious that the problems are encouraged, if not created, by the external management. The Council is responsible for running to the ground a fine school and caring community. The council is urged to take emergency measures to keep school in its present format and strengthen it by boosting measures that would sigel to parents, teachers, children and prospective pupils tha the council is supporting the school.

Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation	Brief Summary of comment
2097	PDJ					Y		<p>Option 1 - accept proven model, though clearly risks with making transition, LA has provided no info on how this would be implemented or demonstrated that it has considered the risks involved or developed strategies for mitigating these risks. Option 2 - case put forward by LA is seriously lacking, not thought through and creating considerable anxiety amongst parents and staff. I call upon LA to recommend to Cabinet this option be dropped. Suggest status quo, however would support Option 1 if PA formulates and demonstrates plans that would allow a controlled and well managed transition.</p> <p>Re: process: poorly handled, parents removing children (destabilising effect on both schools, with knock-on effect on other Pri in Ab with pupil/class sizes increasing). Gov bodies should have been consulted on contents of consultation and handling - govts could have provided useful help and assistance and thus avoid some of the problems that have arisen. Consultation paper: insufficient detail, failed to present balanced view, provided too late, insufficient copies made available, insufficient effort to ensure copies were available to all stakeholders thus preventing some key public views from being heard, contained significant errors (date 07, instead of 06) and no return address for written responses. Public meetings gave little detail and evidence to support aspects of its own presentation. Meetings fuelled concerns already raised by parents and staff.</p>
								LA stated it would record all q's and a's, though it has since stated these will only be made available after the consultation process closes. Concerned at ongoing lack of info from LA and impact on public's ability to make informed decision. Ongoing refusal by OCC to release info under FoI relating to Jnrs and therefore directly relevant to public consultation and associated public debate. LA info may impact on public's ability to make informed decision.
2098				Y				<p>Feel Consultation paper was discussion document and as such should have contained Option 3 (status quo) and in interests of children as many options as possible should have been tabled for discussion, not just 2 presented - would have provided opportunity for hearing reasons why school as declined so rapidly. Option 1 seems to be all about structures, flexibility of staff, and alignment with other Ab schools than about interests of children. Another aspect needing careful consideration that if this option is adopted, it would be one of the largest pri in county and should not be taken granted that it will be simple for a new H/T to achieve overnight success - expand age range of infs best and least disruptive option. Option 2 is seen as opportunistic to use special measure situation to conduct dubious experiment. EGs in presentation bore little relation to Dunmore/Fitz therefore little relevance - emphasis on structure, career paths and rationalisation rather than education need of very young.</p> <p>Feeling at public meeting that both options unacceptable, as they stand, since they require Dunmore staff to reapply for positions despite being part of extremely successful team. Imperative that it is not penalised for situation beyond their control arising out of events only affecting the jnr school. Feeling that requirements leading to special measures have been exaggerated by Ofsted. LA should have handled the situation with greater sensitivity, with the loss of 50 children the unhappiness is now feeding through to remaining children. Feel options should be scrapped and new discussions initiated in conjunction with parents, govts, teachers to find solution beneficial to all parties - education and wellbeing of children is paramount and must take precedence.</p>
2099	PH/PG	Y	N					Should have been formal communication and consultation with H/T/CoG within p/ship prior to consultation paper's publication as any plan will significantly impact on p/ship. Agreed strategy re: pupil transfers needed to be put in place and admissions team aligned. Strong exception to the statement from LA that separate Inf/Jnr schools are problematic to the p/ship. Clarity needed re: what is considered effective l/ship and mgt - assumptions and implications within consultation doc (link to attainment). Effective change mgt principles not adhered to in proposals. Option 2 should be withdrawn as it provides no equality of opportunity for pupils, staff or parents/carers. Consultation should stop and careful evaluation should take place, followed by clearly defined stepped plan to bring the two schools together.
2100	PH/PG							<p>Consultation paper contains little impact on sec schools view that Option 2 would radically alter offer of JM and affect admission/budget. School would not wish to lose Dunmore students (well motivated). Concerned that under Option 2 land on Fitz could be sold off. Under Option 2 should eventually need to expand but at the expense of selling off L/mead/JM? Raised various financial queries. Accept l/ship gap at KS2, if Option 3 adopted then inf H/T could be supported by KS2 co-ord/asst. H/T. Govts would like to have seen full list of options. If longer consultation period scare factor would have diminished. Impact on town is far wider than immediate Dunmore area.</p> <p>Option 1 least detrimental. Important to consult 14-19 p/ship. Distribution of parental choice 0-19 would affect L/mead recruitment. Some concerns about lack of communication initially.</p>
2101	PH/PG							Option 2 not in best interests of Fitz, but will help to secure high quality teaching and learning at Dunmore. Concerns: timescales (8 mths in unrealistic), financial (injection of capital funding queries), consultation process managed and presented which has created a debate about the wrong issues. Last point has resulted in little confidence in support from LA, have had to endure vilification and local community's anger as it regards the LA as culpable in failure of jnr school and fearful of proposed changes which is neither understood or wanted. Feel Fitz has been cast in role of aggressor and instigator of hostile takeover - saddened that this view hasn't been challenged publically. Offered federation approach/shared services resulting in a solution that would meet the majority of stakeholders' wishes - securing best outcomes for children. Decision reached because of paucity of info, mgt of process and concern that outcomes would be jeopardised by timescales and poor support in atmosphere that is not conducive to this proposal.
2102	O							

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1 All through P/S	Option 2 All through 3-19	Option 3 Increase Infant Age Range	Option 4 7-19	Option 5 Status Quo	Option 6 Federation
<p>Neither children special needs so don't relate to her</p> <p>What behind reluctance to capitalize on strengths of successful head at infants</p> <p>Why head of infant is not being considered for combined school - Carry skills and successful staff on? Option to be considered.</p> <p>Transition points kinder/p/s/grammar/college – she was not affected by transition points</p> <p>4-19 – what happens when they enter society at age 19</p> <p>How can parents commit 4 and 6 year old to only couple years experience of schools 3-19</p> <p>KS 1 & 2 what benefit to learn key stage 3</p>	21/01	PDI						
<p>Asking question as parent</p> <p>Carolyn Chisholm school – obviously looked around country to find 2 best examples</p> <p>Spelling mistake Caroline – 2 yrs experience - £30m invest by N/hants – no children aged over 16 – not proven</p> <p>How many of this type of school in existence?</p> <p>All through school since Sept 04 – only occupied single site since Sept 05 – inner city schools (combined three failing schools) not representative of this case. H/t appointed 05. On 3/8/05 serious concerns at new academy. Serious concerns about standard of education</p> <p>Would LA take option off the table – representing view of all – non-starter</p> <p>Addressed to children – hardly say</p> <p>Logic – can close jnr and infant but snr school Headteacher can take over all three, but can't close snr school</p> <p>Yr 4 child since 17/10 his education has suffered worried about changes, detected atmosphere – risk to his education and option to status quo</p> <p>Have put the school in further danger</p> <p>Risk to children 3-19. All through primary preferred.</p> <p>Results or risk assessed – strategy to put in temp h/t – latest Ofsted Insp shows tem h/t well in place and on track. The LA have put the school further back.</p> <p>is there Enough info heard tonight to make decision of children's education</p>	21/02	TDJ						
<p>Transition point – minority go on to Fitz – 20% last year. Will parent have choice automatically?</p> <p>Argument for transition point lost – not applicable</p> <p>Spoken to Vice Principal of 3-19 school</p>	21/03	PDJ						
<p>There are problems in school – when parents collect children, older children exhibiting bad behaviour. Does go on, is seen by younger children.</p> <p>This successful school does have this problem as a disadvantage</p> <p>The issue of not appointing infant head in options paper said it wouldn't present an opportunity for fresh start therefore loss of continuity which is what we are suggesting.</p>	21/04	PDJ						
<p>Advantages is children get more experience, sample KS3 curriculum – surely disadvantages to other p/s in Abingdon – children sit and twiddle thumbs in KS3</p> <p>KS3 children who if had sampled, then discriminating against other children from other p/s at that level.</p>	21/05							
<p>Option 1 – selection process of head</p> <p>Option 2 – head already in post – no option on choice</p>	21/06	PJ						
<p>11 yrs of experience of respect and to repay Headteacher – destroy fabric and personality of school and morale – distress, trauma seems devious</p> <p>Lose good teachers.</p>	21/07	PDI						
<p>Opposition to all through because of uncertainty and risk because its seen as experiment. In principal prepared to consider all through primary but its not been argued/demonstrated that its been implemented in orderly manner in timescale. Martin Lester put in good mgt systems and turned it around – if that were the case need a transition period between getting existing school sorted out and bringing in new head. If you said a new head was lined up to work with Martin then it might be an acceptable way forward. Achievable in timescale?</p>	21/08	PDI/PDJ	Y	N				
<p>Speaking as parent – anger and frustration at last 5 weeks of vacuum of lack of info, trust, respect, transparency and clear communication – 11 weeks since decision took place. Refuse to release info on options discussed.</p> <p>Federation smooth transitions without having to close a school requiring staff to reapply for jobs. Delay for 12 weeks. Which 3-19 schools did we visited. /Scare/uncertain/demoralized. If want 3-19 Plan it over a period of years and produce argument. Handled – p/ship to federation and amalgamation – irreversible going from nothing to closure and irreversible closure in double quick time.</p> <p>Couldn't get all his points</p>	21/09	PDI						

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
			All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
Why are we considering an option incorporating the existing head but no option to go from infants using existing head. Head has no p/s experience?	21/10	PDI						
Option to extend infant school to age 11 – why not given option to consider. But we can go from 19 down to 3 with a head with no experience. All staff have to reapply for their jobs. Why? Why did you reject the through primary by extending the age range of infants? Infant school good record, run well, happy children. No notification to whole community who live in Farm Road and Sellwood Road.					Y			
Process if two school close and anybody have opportunity to apply for post of head when we can't find head to do the single job in junior school? Query re higher salary.	21/11							
17 children have left infants – confidence at all time low in future of school – excellent staff may be lost – devalued and choose not to reapply – so destabilizing so not improving situation at all	21/12	PDI						
Stay as it is – fighting everyone on stage would go for option 1 but LA seem to be pushing for 3-19 school	21/13	PDI			Y		Y	
If all parents to vote now – ethos of school at good level why can't juniors be involved in infant – If we vote now – decision will be made .					Y			
Children at Fitz and Dunmore – feel going to lose teachers now. Extend infant suggested	21/14				Y			
Confirm categorically that whoever will be advertised for all through school?	21/15	PDI/PDJ						
Extend age range of infant school underachievement KS 1 and 2 problems re headteacher- red herring. Cooperation between junr and infant – what is the evidence re cause of underachievement caused by current structure?								
Underachievement between KS1 and 2 – also red herring what basis for rejecting Option								
Request Option in consultation of extending age range of infant school. All like to see evidence rather than platitudes								
Practice of infant school - 2 head in 41 years – turnover of staff low – reason because of being a good school is because of staff good practice. Good EY team built on foundation and taken transition and produced but concerned about hierarchy structure –no confidence that job won't get done – voice won't be heard if 3-19.	21/16							
Is it the case that it will be possible to reopen consultation with at least another option to extending the infant school? Flawed consultation – unpopular options – evidence unwise.- presentation needs to change tomorrow evening. Politicians made options – so they need to answer when it can be stopped – more info risk assessment – 3-19 destabilise p/ship arrangement in sec schools in Abingdon.	21/17							
He had received a No of letters but wanted to wait til I hear the case – to give balanced view – wrote in to us about June got reply on 22 September – not fill him with confidence								
Mr Hopkins said he couldn't get answers around risk assessment how can risk assessment have 3-19 as option – best case is inner city school, while impact of destabilising infant school or risk not granted or some other risk associated with extending								
More info about risk assessment								
Urge not to choose cherry picked examples of options. Not evidence unfortunately and insulting to intelligence of Abingdon – way presented change tomorrow								
Key point – know can the consultation be re-opened - at next Cabinet meeting to be stopped to restore confidence in OCC processes to extend infant school to be included – answer to possible, legally or policy wise from government, or politically								
public undertaking - urgently legally able within timetable to have the option to choose politically to close consultation and reissue it.								
Option 2 – what will be the future of 14-19 p/ship very much valued by parents gives kids 16 really good choice – where does LA see this fitting in	21/18	PDI						
If option 2 happens is it true that Leadership Team and govts of new school could apply for foundation status and if they do would have control of land and LA would have little say on whether they would sell if off.								
Leadership issue vital part of managing school if option 2 goes ahead that leadership will have full experience of all KS stages – pls assure that head will have experience at all KS. In order to have sustainable head for junior school to appoint head of all through p/s need experience – does an academy head not need to have similar experience?	21/19	PDI						
How can head of 3-19 school have same kind of nurturing qualities. Different head needed for differing ages as children grow. Asking parents to mix all age groups together.	21/20	PDJ						
School Structure run by LA and governors – didn't anyone notice that junior school was going into special measures why didn't they have help before special measures?	21/21							
Is post of junior school head being advertised? Before current situation was the post advertised? Obviously not going to get head if post not advertised.	21/22	PDJ						
Change options – change 1st option for head to take over – third option will split parents vote.								
are children being asked? Many children may not like going to Fitzharry's.	21/23							
Guarantee that parents do not have to choose Fitz as only sec option in Abingdon								

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
			All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
Disappointed in document – 3-19 option. Since publication there has been an enormous disruption – exit interviews leaving school because of 3-19. Urge take off table invited poll – unanimous	21/24	PDI						
removed child from this school because children are being affected and forgotten	21/25							
All about headteachers and not children.	21/26							
Small is beautiful – long may it remain so. Prefer to include another option – infant remain as it is – reason why applied for job because that's the environment where she wanted to teach.	21/27	TDI						
Technical point – formal consultation – why would junr consultation be shorter? Assured with speed and urgency that these points will be addressed by Cllr Waine in particular – meeting of 3 cllrs made decision still took 5 weeks – request tomorrow night have answer.	21/28							
If Re-open the school as through primary school, is there sufficient time for advert of head and appointment made – is it the case that head has to give term's notice? Will an appointment be made by September? What's point of opening new school with no head? Don't change – leave as they are. League table Fitz 2 nd highest for poor attendance so how can they take our children on if they don't sort their own out?	21/29						Y	
Frustrate about children if do something and don't learn from it – what have the LA learnt? Will how we feel definitely make a difference to the process?	21/30	PDI/PDJ						
Never have I know anyone to be treated as Linda has been by IK? Highly respect by everyone – visited one Monday p.m. by a person – told in pte with no other member of staff being present, that her job was being taken away – then told not to tell a single soul. I am sure Dr Harris would agree that they would not be told not to say anything to anyone else if terminal illness. Then had to take a full staff meeting and had to keep it quiet until week before half term. Deserves an apology.	21/31	TDI						
Concerned on impact of staff – staff do sterling job – have to face situation on a daily basis over and above their normal duties.	21/32	PDJ						
What influence does current head at Fitz have over whole situation – 3-19 on whether she can cover it with help – she is still in charge of whole school – we want 3-11 with training.	21/33							
TAKEN AFTER MEETING: felt there was so much negativity in the room – she was all for change and thought it would provide a good opportunity which should be seized upon, but felt she couldn't say this due to feeling of the room. take emotion out of decision making and make a forward thinking decision for our children rather than based on current situation of keeping kids in status quo. Kids really important – good opportunity to move forward.	21/34							

Comment	Unique	Response	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
	No.	Group	All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
<p>Ask q as parent</p> <p>Comment on cases – during corresp with LA they said there were about 7 schools, last night when asked same question there was 7 - tonight there are 12</p> <p>London Academy - inner city school – only 2 years experience – only occupied single site since sept 05 – head appointed nov 05</p> <p>Ofsted reads well for his year – Dunmore jnr Ofsted report re special measures – recent Ofsted and HMI report school has much better reports.</p> <p>Went back one year on 3/08/05 comment about the glowing representation of 3-19 school – Headline: Serious concerns at new academy – standard of education – therefore LA should do homework before presenting it to public – saddened by lack of info – thought LA would be better prepared for tonight to answer this sort of question.</p> <p>So which is it - 12, 8 or 7?</p> <p>Funding arrangements in 3-19 school query:</p> <p>Couple of years down line with fresh start funding runs out – new government targets to be met – no money to address that.</p> <p>Schools presented have been in existence for no more than 3/4 years – no evidence of educational effectiveness – West London Academy has chequered history – is experiment. Sees options as quick fix to appt head for junr, maybe LA should address its own r&r for snr staff.</p> <p>Put to rest this is option about Fitz – it is not – even if Dunmore taken over by best sec in country – no thank you.</p>	22/01	PDJ						
<p>Transition infant to juniors – great deal of soul searching, sleepless nights, pulled children out of junr school because of period of instability going to happen over next couple of years – incidentally children not suffered by transtion/change – what additional benefit an all through 3-19 would give to her children as opposed to other schools in Ab. How would they address that children would have serious disadvantages/how would they address these and bring up to level of 3-19 with no transition periods.</p> <p>How 3-19 school would address issues of children been advantaged/experience of 3-19 as opposed to others coming in at age 11 how would their learning be enhanced?</p>	22/03	PDJ						
<p>Teacher well aware how difficult to input in short space of time curriculum where some kids have experience and others not.</p>	22/05							
<p>Staff development – recognize no decision has been made – noted that head of Fitz present last night. Ask the panel were they adversely affected by transition points in their own education – what makes the LA take the decision out of parents hands and take it on themselves. Not allow you to experiment – will pull children out of school – feel strongly – would educate privately as don't want them to be part of experiment academy. Want children to experience life/transition points.</p>	22/06	PDI						
<p>Junr – excellent at Ofsted with head only being there for 1 month – upset he was not given more support rather than having to leave through stress – one report he submitted to Ofsted was told someone else wrote it – excellent head.</p>	22/07	PDI/PDJ						
<p>Re presentation – consultation doc - well written well balanced – advantages and disadvantages – advantages in presentation but not concerns – failed to include in presentation for those not seen document.</p>	22/08							
<p>Feels she has let children down by not putting her point across because she felt intimidated last evening as her viewpoint differed from majority of that meeting. Has SEN child – spoke to some parents today - not as many people anti option 2, are more open minded but not enough info re benefit to children looking/going forward innovative idea. Curriculum access – wouldn't it be great to have more/good – understand infant parents concerns going fwd into environment of option 2 – would share concerns – acknowledge 3rd option presented.</p> <p>She has a suggestion of 4th option: appropriate to have 7-19 option keeping family centre, FS, infant, KS1 sep – 7-19 allow children to access innovate experience going forward. Promote debate - what was lost yesterday is the future of children for 11 to 2 years.</p>	22/09	PDJ				Y		
<p>Speaking as parent.</p> <p>Open minded of educational arguments put forward – disappointed in 3-19 info – not right info to make decision as soon as LA require. Passionate, strong argument from last night.</p> <p>Clarify matters from presentation – children's center offering option of change anyway – is this happening?</p> <p>Is other funding (not only Fresh start) available for other opportunities? If some funding is paid to a school – 3 schools 3 lots of money – not all about economies of scale. Taster for early starts 3-19 – amalgamation irreversible – collaboration not so structurally based.</p> <p>Long term relations with snr mgt – harder to get hold of distant between head and infants. Academy – has a sponsor been put forward.</p>	22/10	PDI						

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
			All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
Open to change – no need to foreclose consultation – can additional options plus 4th option tonight be put forward – 4 weeks left to end of consultation – when, how. Final plea – for denial at very least release list of options discussed at Members Briefing not necessarily discussion which took place. Recognise knowledge and expertise of panel – but options bad case for change. <u>Not here, not now, get it right.</u>								
3-19 option - do students have to be registered throughout school life? What about the other 2 sec schools in Ab – what are their views?	22/11	PDJ						
SATs result for last year – appalled to find that junr is failing when SAT are better than national average. With this in mind, that infants school done sterling job, pupils transferred are incredibly intelligent and not feeble minded – action too late by OCC. KS2 performance – does everyone agree is better than county and national averages since 1999	22/12	PDI						
Maintenance of performance – made reference to analysis of 2 mergers document. No evidence to support options presented. Looked at 2 schools – one school only has 2 yrs experience – 30m to build – is this a proven model? Not a good representation – only 2 yrs experience – limited experience. Saddened by lack of info.	22/13							
Parents concerned about second option – view as experimentation. Secondary schools and FE college have worked in partnership – gives choice/union to Ab. Feeling is – 3 schools went for specialist status together. Creating a 4-19 would destroy partnership working together. Knock-on affect with second option. How much consultation will take place with other establishments? The process should be advanced quickly to alleviate the stress relating to this issue. When process is over – important to reflect on lessons learnt. How are other schools being consulted on this? Anxiety around town from parents How did situation arise in first place and lessons to be learned	22/14							
Impact on this school (Fitz) – things improved under new Head but still not achieved targets for GCSE below OCC average – focus on Fitz not got on right track yet	22/15	PF						
Jan 06 elected chair this year. Satisfactory progress since put in Special Measures – value had been 100, 99.8 and 100 in last 3 years – as exactly what is expected. Disappointed with content of 2 presentations – superficial data presented. Other solutions – no discussion with gov bodies prior to decision to go to consultation on 2 options. No balanced and detailed cases given for either option. Please ensure any decision will be carefully thought through before implementation - lessons learned from this exercise so LA are prepared for situation in the future of others schools Not informed.	22/16	PDJ						
Not just speaking as SEN problem - anxiety through the uncertainty thrown round – what might be and what might not be – if presented positively to children may alleviate anxiety – is it too late to assure them?	22/17							
Issues raised about generic case made on how its not been properly aligned to Ab schools – align the case more to situation in Ab schools so better understand context of concerns in relation to Ab itself – 3-19 option – risk involved – LA to give us confidence at least in so far as process is concerned that risk is mitigated – study all schools, learn all lessons, look at Ab situation and understand whether risk is applicable or not so as to mitigate it. Standards dipped. Way forward informed consultation how will they be informed from now until end of consultation period re next steps.	22/18	PF						
Infant done excellent job children v happy – junr has seen lots of heads – do recognize there has to be change – open minded. Want something for children to be excited about – don't mind which option as long as LA deal with process properly and best education for children.	22/19	PDJ						
Open minded about change. Issue of 3-10 being for staff dev – Is sec teacher plenty of opportunity chose to work in that level. Not interested in infant teaching – definitely does not want their job especially at present/stress.	22/20	PDI						
Not made mind up – disappointed that we have not shown passion for either option – not sold to him – passionate about education – nothing to convince either option is right lack of info. Key info missing in 3-19 school is timescale required for example sites from conception to finish of project/launch – can it be done in less than 12 months. Has a delay been considered whereby all 3 schools can work toward alignment to make transition more straight forward thus reducing risk of losing staff.	22/21	PDI						
General comment – 21st century fitness – what is the criteria of it – what is trend towards it – timescale? Gov programme?	22/22	P						
Wants to give credit to team – schools always offered broad and balanced curriculum – all staff are EY trained – always celebrate children's successes, work hard toward 5 outcomes. PHSE coordinator working together with Jnr towards healthy school status. New initiatives – young children to develop and be confident. Children are safe because children come first at school – no 1 priority.	22/23							

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
			All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
School doesn't stand still – won 2 awards on sustainability. No awards won by sec pupils – won gold award for nursery children impressed what 3 yrs olds know about 3 Rs. Continue to strive that will give the best her team can.								
3-19 options p/ship school/children/parents. Concerned parents making decision to remove children. Children come first at Dunmore – ethos in publication to carry all way through – has no ambition to climb higher – scares her and parents not enough info to make parents feel secure – knock on effect to children. Please put children first, carry on with good ethos – whichever option chosen we need good head at top of it.	22/24							
Arguments in options paper – opinion and transition argument does not hold water. Buddy systems/visits already done in Dunmore – any evidence that there is any problem between the 2 Dunmores to necessitate merging. By age 11 any transition problems should have disappeared. Value added figures – Junr average – all through schools – Academy 100.3 middle KS2&3 97.2 bottom in country.	22/25	PDI/PDJ						
Advantage can get junr out of special measures – address underlying problems and solve rather than making them disappear. Leaves one argument that is it find a better head – speed of this will not solve problem – lost head of infant – hope she applies. Much better to let jnr achieve getting out of special measures on their own – don't see as opportunity as balanced/reflective view putting in new head. Then look at primary option.								
Interest in education – good. Challenges unleashed consultation expecting v little response – haven't given good leadership by LA on issues that we face – this is an opportunity for LA to do this – creating a division when all want same outcome. Process itself has taken effect off the issue – single objective.	22/26	P						
Wants to discuss proposals as influence on Ab as whole – have I chosen my school for whole of child's school life (3-19 option) – when get to age 11 you can still choose – is this is right, if so undermines argument of removing transition stages. Legislation – putting forward the option for combined school 4-11 p/s close both all have to reapply for jobs – why doesn't this apply to 4-19 option.	22/27							
What representation do I have on gov body on 4-19 and on leadership issue – not clear. Advantages for 3-19 option extra curriculum, good SEN – why can't this happen with same effort already Inconsistencies – current model is inconsistent with rest of Ab – on other hand 4-19 is inconsistent – not same argument Leadership KS2 because this is where it lacks (4-19).								
Failings of consultation is not input from all stakeholders – one group not got input from is children. School council, citizenship lessons etc. – get feeling of children.	22/28	PF						
Major issue is sustained leadership in jnr – want to know and demonstrate what efforts made to recruit head there – have other options been considered – pay higher salary – incentive scheme rather we experiment in recruiting head rather than experiment with children.	22/29	P						
Consultation: as officers we have recommended 2 options – IK is having meeting with p/ship – what not speak with head/gov /teachers/parent/children with list – problem recommendations before 2 options be produced. Same presentation as last evening which bear no relevance to option trying to put forward – examples not got children past age of 15 and the other is in an inner city. Pls do research first – withdraw options given to Cllrs, be effective and get everyone's opinion for sensible options. LA not correct not factual – do not waste children's time.	22/30	P						
Info rec'd prior to options paper – interest are children – why we didn't go to govs and heads for their opinions and why didn't they ask for parent input – are aware that we went to Fitz head. Will wait for Judith to respond directly to her queries.	22/31	P						
Quite right to get good leadership for each KS – what evidence that existing head and snr mgt team at Fitz will be able to cope with changed functionality of 3-19 school? Existing head will take over. Will existing personnel cope with increased functioning of 3-19 school – what evidence? Emphatic that snr team at Fitz will not have to reapply – why? Not consultation but railroading	22/32							
Vote of no confidence of OCC Mary Whinfrey – seconded.	22/33							
part conclusion – may surprise some to know he is not opposed to 0-19 as principle and taking forward in 21st century – only would like to know if 3 councils sought guidance of DFES – keen to know cllrs/officers have talked to the schools not just looked at Ofsted reports. 3 19 wrong for us now – does have some confidence but which schools and head did LA talk to – potential Selby Park – Doncaster – closest to our situation – great speed – 3 schools together in rural area – no others in competition. Taken on board by governing bodies from day 1 and consultation run by schools themselves. Spoke to Dave Harris head, he offered 3 reasons not to amalgamat schools: 1. If you have recruitment difficulties 2. Do not do it to rescue an underperforming school 3. Should not be for site or funding motives.	22/34							

Comment	Unique No.	Response Group	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
			All through P/S	All through 3-19	Increase Infant Age Range	7-19	Status Quo	Federation
Do believe in transition arguments – but not convinced. Can we categorically confirm – make recommendations and whole process being driven by political fix – LA do not understand what's going on in community – so at present, not here not now.								
Did start process open minded – no fixed views – read all info been given by LA not much – searched for more info and through foi – any mins of meetings where jnr school mentioned over last 6 months LA refused – why?	22/35							
Attended both meeting as Gov of jnr has been party to addition info therefore consulted (?) but perhaps I still feel uninformed – not enough info to make decision on these 2 options or any other option. E.g. LA implement any one of these two options – no evidence – how long will implementation process take? Process before Sept and informed of detail – how long to implement – lack of detailed thinking – not project which will happen in 2-3 yr – so from 07 could be 2, 3, 4 year process. Level of thinking and planning needed. Risks – IK said we carried out thorough risk assessment of two options and status quo – she said least risk is 3-19 option. 2nd least risk is primary option – actually it is status quo. Children suffered since Oct, continue to suffer until decision is made risk for child are huge if we put children's future in hands of LA – knows what he's dealing with with status quo – don't know the other 2 options.								
TAKEN AFTER MEETING: Impact on other p/s with parents removing children from Dunmore, because not sufficient info, and class sizes are becoming larger at Rush Common and having impact on their education too. Whole of Ab affected.	22/36	PF						
Since the letter first came out asked a series of questions from Irene – told answers at consultation – had paper – didn't answer questions – two evenings where hundreds of serious question have been asked – not had satisfactory answers. Explored further on the evening – when will we get answers that explain matters?	22/37							
Also like to know – extending infants why has this not been seriously considered and proposed as option as this has happened in other areas in county – seems to be lowest risk option here and popular option and the LA did huge amount of damage in Oxford re 3 tier reorganisation – now consigned to all school to 2-3 years of stress and transition worries for the teachers, parents, pupils, everyone just because there is a leadership problem in one school.								
Parents are looking to Governing Bodies to provide leadership but we don't feel we can at present – because not enough info at present in order to do that.	22/38							
Loud and clear – when and how will we get feedback from questions raised on two evenings.- Response to Govs pls.								
Like copy of records taken of last nights meeting and tonights provided to me by e-mail or by post within 7 days. pmwhinfrey@lineone.net. Pls advise me within 48 hours if this is not possible and the reason why.	22/39							