



Department
for Education

Consultation on improving information in identifying children missing education

Government response

July 2016

Contents

Introduction and the consultation proposals	3
Summary of all responses received	5
Government's response and next steps	7
Thematic question analysis	8
Impact of the proposed amendments	8
Collaboration between LAs and schools	10
Information sharing	11
Statutory guidance and departmental advice	13
Individuals or groups in particular circumstances	14
Equalities	14
Implementation	15
Other matters	17
Annex A: Statistical breakdown of responses to the consultation	18
Annex B: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	21

Introduction and the consultation proposals

Effective sharing of information between parents, schools and local authorities (LAs) is critical to ensuring that all children of compulsory school age are receiving a safe and suitable education. This document summarises the responses to the Government's consultation on improving information in identifying children missing education (CME). It sets out the Government's proposed action to improve collaboration, communication and information sharing. This will enable LAs in every part of the country to ensure children are in education and vulnerable children are not placed at risk.

The consultation was launched following Ofsted reports on Birmingham and Tower Hamlets schools in June 2015¹. Ofsted inspectors found that in many cases when pupils left a school, there was no record of their destination. Inspectors identified inconsistent practices for recording and reporting cases where children are removed from the school. They raised concerns about poor communication and coordination between schools and LAs on individual cases. This raised serious concerns about safeguarding issues with children potentially exposed to the risk of harm, exploitation or radicalisation. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector Sir Michael Wilshaw recommended that the Government strengthen regulations to ensure that schools provide regular and accurate information to their LA about children as they are removed or added to school admissions registers.

The Secretary of State accepted the recommendations and launched² the consultation to improve information in identifying CME. The consultation took place from 19 January to 7 March 2016.

The consultation set out proposed amendments to the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006 ("the Regulations") to improve communication and co-ordination between schools (including independent schools) and LAs.

The proposed amendments are intended to achieve this through strengthening the regulations so that LAs work with schools to obtain the information they need. The Government also sought to balance the need to avoid burdens on schools and LAs with the need to ensure that all children of compulsory school age are safe and receiving suitable education.

Under the Regulations, schools can lawfully delete a pupil's name from the register under fifteen grounds³. Currently, schools are required to inform their LA when they are about

¹Ofsted advice note on schools in Birmingham and Tower Hamlets:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ofsted-advice-note-on-schools-in-birmingham-and-tower-hamlets>

² Secretary of State speech on tackling extremism:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/nicky-morgan-speaks-about-tackling-extremism>

to remove a pupil's name under only five⁴ of the fifteen grounds, which means LAs are receiving limited information about children that are leaving schools. This gives rise to serious safeguarding issues that potentially expose children to the risk of harm, exploitation and radicalisation.

The proposals affect all non-standard transitions; this is whenever a child of compulsory school age leaves a school before completing the school's final year or joins the school after the start of the first year. Under the proposals set out, schools (including independent schools) would be required to:

- inform their LA when they are about to delete a pupil's name from the admission register under all fifteen grounds⁵;
- record details of the pupil's residence, the name of the person with whom they will reside, the date from which they will reside there, and the name of the destination school (where they can reasonably obtain this information);
- inform their LA of the pupil's destination school and home address if the pupil is moving to a new school; and
- provide information to their LA when registering new pupils within five days, including the pupil's address and previous school (where they can reasonably obtain this information).

The proposals will also give LAs the discretion to require the same information on children leaving or joining the school at standard transition points, which occur when a child of compulsory school age begins school at the start of the first year or leaves at the end of the final year of that school.

In addition, there are two other proposed amendments relating to sections 8(1)(f)(iii) and 8(1)(h)(iii) of the Regulations which will require 'reasonable enquiries' to identify a pupil's whereabouts to be performed collaboratively between the school and LA where there is continuous absence after a grant of leave.

³ Regulation 8 of The Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2006/1751/regulation/8>

⁴ **1** when the pupil has ceased to attend and is to be home educated; **2** has moved out of the area; **3** has been certified as medically unable to continue attending; **4** is detained under a court order; or **5** has been permanently excluded.

⁵ Regulation 8 of The Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006

Summary of all responses received

The consultation received 130 responses from organisations and individuals, which provided their views on the Government’s proposals to amend pupil registration regulations. Responses included views on the potential administrative costs and the potential benefits for children, families and organisations. Some respondents chose to answer a subset of the questions. Throughout the report, percentages are expressed as a measure of those answering each question, not as a measure of all responses.

The following table provides a breakdown of the categories of respondents.

Respondent Type	Total	Percentage
Local Authority	85	65%
School/College	19	15%
Professional Organisation/Body	10	8%
Other	11	8%
Individual	5	4%
Total	130	100%

A statistical breakdown of responses can be found at **Annex A**.

The majority of respondents welcomed the proposed changes to the regulations as an important step in improving information in identifying CME. Specifically:

- 91% of all respondents agreed that the proposals would support LAs in carrying out their duty to identify children missing education and that these, as a result, would establish a more consistent approach to information sharing between schools and LAs.
- 74% of respondents indicated that it was not sufficient to require schools to report to their LAs when pupils were removed or added only at non-standard transitions – supporting the proposal that LAs should have discretion to request this information at standard transitions too.
- 78% of LA respondents said that they were likely to use the proposed discretionary power to request information at standard transition points.
- 35% of LA respondents specifically commented that they believed some children were at particular risk of becoming children missing from education between standard transition points.

- 94% of respondents agreed that schools and LAs should collaborate when making 'reasonable enquiries' under regulation⁶ 8(1)(f)(iii) and 8(1)(h)(iii). This is in cases where a pupil has not returned for 10 days after authorised absence or has been absent from school for 20 days without authorisation.

The respondents included a number of national organisations including the Children's Society, the National Children's Bureau, the NSPCC and the Association of Education Welfare Management. Extracts from two of these organisations exemplify the majority of views of these organisations:

"The proposals outlined in this consultation should improve local authorities' ability to identify and respond to children missing education and should also help better co-ordinate local authorities' responses to wider groups of missing children like those who go missing from home or care."

- **The Children's Society**

"National Children's Bureau...welcomes the proposals outlined in this consultation, placing more comprehensive duties on schools (including Academies and independent schools) to report the removal or addition of pupils to their register to local authorities. This takes a step towards securing better practice in identifying children missing education and ensuring they receive the support they need to get back into learning."

- **National Children's Bureau**

A full list of all the organisations that responded to the consultation can be found at **Annex B**.

⁶ The Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006

Government's response and next steps

The majority of responses to this consultation agreed with the proposed amendments to the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2006 to improve communication and co-ordination between schools and LAs. Respondents acknowledged the practical need and moral purpose behind these proposals which will ultimately improve LAs' ability to ensure children are safe and receiving suitable education. 91% of respondents agreed that strengthening the Regulations would support LAs in more effectively meeting their statutory duty to make arrangements to identify children not receiving suitable education.

Having considered carefully the responses to the consultation, we will now proceed with the proposals. **The Government will lay the Education (Pupil Registration) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016 before Parliament in July 2016. The Regulations will come into force on 1 September 2016 and the duties will apply to all schools and LAs in England.**

Respondents made a range of practical suggestions to support the implementation of the amendments to the regulations, such as strengthening the '*Children Missing Education*' statutory guidance and improving school accountability. We will consider the suggestions when updating statutory guidance on '*Keeping Children Safe in Education*'⁷ and '*Children Missing Education*'⁸. **We will publish revised guidance this summer. We will also communicate the changes to schools and LAs during the summer term.**

While 74% of respondents supported the introduction of a duty on schools to provide information on standard transitions, 11% of respondents expressed concerns over the additional burden this could create for LAs and schools. To avoid imposing extra burdens, the Government will proceed with the planned introduction of a discretionary power to enable LAs to seek information from schools on standard transitions. Those LAs that wish to seek such information will be encouraged to do so in a planned way, working closely with the schools in their area.

The Government will monitor the impact of the Regulation changes and undertake a review before 1 September 2019. In particular, we will evaluate the extent to which the regulations are working as intended, and whether they have resulted in any unnecessary burdens.

⁷ '*Keeping Children Safe in Education*' statutory guidance:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education--2>

⁸ '*Children Missing Education*' statutory guidance:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/children-missing-education>

Thematic question analysis

Impact of the proposed amendments

Question 1a: The proposals set out in this consultation aim to support local authorities (LAs) to carry out their duty to make arrangements to identify children missing education (CME) by strengthening communication and information provided by schools about pupils added and removed from school registers. Will the proposals in the consultation contribute to achieving this aim?

	Total	Percent
Yes	109	91%
No	8	7%
Don't Know	3	3% ⁹

There were 120 responses to this question, with 87 providing comments.

The majority of respondents (91%) felt that the proposals set out within the consultation would contribute to the stated aim. Many respondents made additional comments stating that they were particularly pleased that the proposals would place a duty on all schools, including independent schools, which they felt would close an information gap that currently exists. While 11% of those that responded to this question raised concerns about the creation of additional burdens, most respondents recognised that the proposals would lead to an improved and increasingly standardised practice in identifying and recording CME, and ultimately help ensure children receive suitable education and are safe from harm.

Question 1b: Is there anything else, which wouldn't impose significant burdens on schools or LAs, that would improve LAs' ability to identify CME?

106 respondents made comments in answer to this question, generating many suggestions including: introducing accountability measures (for example adding an emphasis on CME processes within the Ofsted common inspection framework), defining schools' responsibilities in relation to CME, and establishing data-sharing agreements with agencies (such as HMRC, the NHS and Border Force).

Some LAs also raised concerns about the lack of LA co-ordination of admissions¹⁰ and the lack of registration of children who are home educated.

⁹ Figures will not always sum to a 100% due to rounding.

Question 12: Please provide any other comments here

There were 71 responses to this question, with the majority taking the opportunity offered by the final consultation question to reiterate their support for the measures within the consultation and welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposals, as illustrated in the box below. Some left comments unrelated to these specific proposals, which we will be considered further when revising statutory guidance.

“The LGA welcomes the Department for Education’s (DfE) proposals which will strengthen the duties on all schools, including academies and free schools, to inform councils when children go missing or move school. We believe that as well as helping councils identify children at risk, it will also help with identifying unregistered schools.”

– **Local Government Association (LGA)**

“We...wish to record our support to the proposals contained in the consultation in principle. We believe that the suggested changes will improve communication and co-ordination between schools and local authorities in an appropriate way and help in efforts to ensure that children are safe and being educated properly.”

– **Catholic Education Service (CES)**

“We welcome the proposed changes and believe that they will have the effect of improving LAs’ ability to identify children who become CME at non-standard transition points. This is a positive step.”

– **British Humanist Association (BHA)**

“The proposals outlined in the consultation document will serve to strengthen information sharing arrangements between all schools and LAs thus allowing greater focus on supporting the most vulnerable rather than simply seeking to fill information gaps.... Sharing this information, and any available intelligence, is the right thing to do. The Association believes the plans outlined in this consultation will assist in the identification of unregistered or illegal schools.”

– **Association of Director of Children’s Services (ADCS)**

¹⁰ The government announced in the ‘*Education Excellence Everywhere*’ white paper (page 17) its intention to seek views on requiring local authorities to coordinate in-year admissions: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/educational-excellence-everywhere>.

Government response

The Government welcomes the positive response to the consultation. We will proceed with the proposals set out within the consultation. The amendments will come into force from 1 September 2016.

We received a range of suggestions from respondents regarding how LAs' ability to identify CME could be improved. Some of these suggestions were outside scope of this consultation.

LAs were concerned about the lack of coordination of in-year admissions, which they felt could result in some children missing education if they fail to secure a school place. The Government announced its intention in the '*Education Excellence Everywhere*' White Paper to seek views on requiring local authorities to take greater responsibility for certain admissions functions, in particular, requiring them to co-ordinate in-year admissions. This will ensure parents have a single point of contact for applying for school places, speed up the in-year admissions process, and reduce the risk of children falling through the gaps. More information is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/educational-excellence-everywhere>.

We will, however, consider these responses when updating the '*Children Missing Education*' statutory guidance.

Collaboration between LAs and schools

Question 2: Do you agree that schools and LAs should collaborate when making 'reasonable enquiries' about the whereabouts of a pupil, before the pupil's name can be deleted from the register under regulation 8(1)(f) and 8(1)(h)?

	Total	Percent
Yes	113	94%
No	6	5%
Don't Know	1	1%

There were 120 responses to this question, with 94 providing comments. Almost all (94%) agreed that schools and LAs should collaborate when making 'reasonable enquiries' before removing a pupil from roll under sections 8(1)(f)(iii) and 8(1)(h)(iii) of the Regulations. LAs and schools commented that there was already an existing collaborative approach in making 'reasonable enquiries'. The consensus was that collaboration would encourage greater consistency when making enquiries and that this duty would allow schools and LAs to develop better relationships in relation to the tracking of children missing education.

Government response

The Government notes the positive response to the question, with nearly all respondents supporting this proposal. We will proceed with the proposed amendments relating to sections 8(1)(f)(iii) and 8(1)(h)(iii) of the Regulations, which will require 'reasonable enquiries' to be performed collaboratively between the school and LA.

Information sharing

Question 3a: Should schools only be required to report to their LAs pupils removed from their registers and pupils added to their registers at non-standard transition points (i.e. whenever a compulsory school-aged child leaves their school before completing that school's final year group)?

	Total	Percent
Yes	29	25%
No	85	74%
Don't Know	1	1%

There were 115 responses to this question, with 98 providing comments. 74% of respondents felt that schools should not only be required to report to their LAs at non-standard transition points but at standard transition points as well. Of the LAs that responded to this question, 80% felt that schools should share information about pupils leaving and joining at standard transition points too.

LAs stated that some children are at particular risk of going missing at standard transition points, after failing to arrive at their destination school. LAs said that information at standard transition points could help identify genuine CMEs, reducing the time spent tracking children who have safely arrived at their next school. 10% of LAs highlighted that this could help identify vacant school places, particularly at standard transitions, which can then be allocated to those on waiting lists.

Six respondents made comments concerning the effect the new duties could have on workload, capacity and resourcing of schools and LAs.

Question 3b: Are LAs likely to use the proposed discretion to seek information on pupils removed from their registers (and pupils added to their registers) at standard transition points?

	Total	Percent
Yes	73	66%
No	26	23%
Don't Know	12	11%

Responses from LAs only	Total	Percent
Yes	62	78%
No	8	10%
Don't Know	10	12%

There were 111 responses to this question, with 54 providing comments.

Of the 80 LAs that responded to this question, the majority (78%) said they were likely to use the proposed discretion to seek information at standard transition points. About a fifth of LAs said that they already requested this information from schools in their authority area.

Question 3c: If your answer to 3(b) is yes, how often is this likely to be (e.g. every year for all schools, every year for most schools, etc.)?

There were 82 responses to this question. Most of the LAs (69%) that responded said they would request this information every year for all schools. Many LAs commented that the timeliness of this information was crucial to identifying CME and felt that it should be given to the LA by schools as close to the start of the academic year as possible.

Question 3d: If answer to 3(b) is yes, what are the expected additional benefits of requesting information at standard transitions, over and above non-standard transitions?

There were 81 responses to this question. 47% of respondents specifically stated that having information about pupil movements between standard transition points would help identify the children that do not arrive at their next school, therefore reducing the risk of children going missing.

LAs emphasised that standard transition points for most schools occur over the summer break; a period when it is more difficult to determine the whereabouts of a child.

They also commented that capturing information at standard transition points would enable LAs to identify school places that could be freed up for those that need them.

One LA said that information at standard transition points could identify children who may be moving from schools to unregistered settings. The LA felt this measure would allow LAs to identify a cohort of pupils that otherwise may remain unknown to them. Some LAs felt that having information about pupils that have left or joined a school at a standard transition point would reduce workload in the long term as they should see a reduction in children whose whereabouts are unknown.

Government response

Although the majority of respondents felt that schools should be under a duty to report at non-standard transition points, the Government has intentionally sought not to impose such a duty on schools to avoid additional burdens. We have instead decided to introduce a discretionary power for LAs to request this information from schools.

It is also clear from the responses that most LAs plan to request information at standard transition points because they anticipate that a small number of children could fail to arrive at their destination school. We would encourage LAs to work in co-operation with schools in their authority areas to introduce an efficient system for gathering this information. We will review the use of this discretionary power and its impact before September 2019.

Statutory guidance and departmental advice

Question 4: Is there any practical advice related to the proposals in this consultation, their effect or implementation that you would like to see in statutory guidance or departmental advice?

There were 100 responses to this question. These included many suggestions for statutory guidance, including:

- setting out the responsibilities of schools and LAs in relation to CME including having a designated person responsible for CME in schools;
- strengthening statutory guidance, including introducing a definition for the phrase 'making reasonable enquiries collaboratively';
- timescales for schools sharing pupil information with LAs;
- accountability and compliance measures; and
- establishing national databases and data sharing agreements.

This list is illustrative of the most commonly cited suggestions, rather than exhaustive.

Government response

The Government welcomes the range of suggestions submitted and will consider ways to reflect these suggestions when updating the statutory guidance on *Children Missing Education* to be published in July 2016.

We note that accountability and compliance were a significant concern for many LAs, with numerous questions submitted about how to challenge non-compliance with these Regulations. There was also a request for the Department for Education regularly to update its LA CME contact list to support communications between CME officers across the country. We will in future update this list monthly instead of bi-annually.

Individuals or groups in particular circumstances

Question 5a: Are there individuals or groups with particular circumstances or characteristics, or type(s) of pupil for whom the impact of the proposals in this consultation will be relatively more significant?

There were 106 responses to this question. The responses identified a range of groups for whom the impact of the proposals in this consultation will be relatively more significant. This included Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children, transient and mobile groups, looked after children, foreign nationals studying in England, and vulnerable children at risk of forced marriage, female genital mutilation, child sexual exploitation, trafficking or radicalisation.

Government Response

We note that respondents felt that the impact of the proposals on these groups would be positive, leading to better use of information from schools to identify CME and an improved multi-agency approach to reduce the risk of harm. Responses to this question helped inform our Impact Assessment.

Equalities

Question 5b: How will the proposals in this consultation affect efforts under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity, or to foster good relations?

There were 86 responses to this question. 96% of respondents felt the proposed measures would help eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Overall, respondents felt that this would be achieved by the information-sharing duties relating to all children leaving or joining a school, regardless of the type of school or the child's background.

Most of the LA respondents stated that these measures would result in identifying children missing education, regardless of the child's circumstances. This means such children are able to have an equal opportunity to access suitable education and therefore have access to the same opportunities as others, reducing discrimination.

LAs said that these proposals would help in identifying vulnerable children so they do not fall through the net, enabling LAs to satisfy themselves that such children are safeguarded against harm, thereby protecting the rights of the most vulnerable. They also felt the proposals would improve inter-borough co-operation and foster good relations between schools, parents and local authorities.

Four LAs considered that the new duties would be helpful in challenging a minority of schools in cases where children might have been taken off the school roll unlawfully.

Government response

Respondents suggested that the information would enable them to identify children missing education more effectively and thereby address the risk of poor life outcomes because of the time spent out of education.

We are confident that LAs will be able to target their resources and support more effectively, to ensure all children, regardless of background, are safeguarded and have equal access to education. We believe this should help reduce discrimination and advance the equality of opportunity for the most vulnerable in society.

Implementation

Question 6: How will schools and LAs approach the implementation of these proposals? What are the challenges or benefits, if any?

There were 107 responses to this question. Over 60% of responding LAs acknowledged the need to take the lead and communicate to schools in their area about the new duties, offering training and support where necessary. A third of school respondents said that they already have the required pupil information in their Management Information Systems (MIS) and it would simply be a case of sharing it with their LA. Some LAs said that they already requested information about the removal of children from school rolls at non-standard transitions from maintained schools.

A benefit commonly identified by respondents was that the Regulations would help improve the identification and tracking of CME, since the proposals relate to all schools. LAs on the whole felt a consistent and standardised approach would ensure better safeguarding practices across all schools, fostering better relationships and communications with all schools in their area. Just under half of the respondents to this question felt a key challenge would be dealing with an increase in administrative work.

Question 7a: What existing processes, such as management information systems, could schools and LAs use for sharing information under the proposals in this consultation?

There were 106 responses to this question. About a third of LA respondents said that most maintained schools had MI systems in place, such as Capita SIMS, and that these systems can often link into LAs' systems. Responses illustrated the variety of MI systems being used. However it was not clear what MI systems, if any, were being used in independent schools. About a quarter of LAs said that as long as there were existing systems for reporting (which are currently used to report removal of children from the school roll under the existing five grounds) and an agreed protocol with schools, there should be little problem in implementation.

Question 7b: Will any changes be needed to adapt these processes and/or systems in 7(a) above to implement the proposals? If so, what would these changes be?

There were 90 responses to this question. 43 LAs commented that they would need to make changes to their existing systems, procedures and process, but 14 of them felt there were only minor changes required. Seven LAs stated they were unsure about what changes, if any, would be required. The main change identified would be establishing processes and systems to receive data from some independent schools.

Question 7d: What administrative work will be required by LAs to process the additional information received from schools?

There were 96 responses to this question. Around 15% of LAs pointed out that there would be an increase in administrative work resulting from the increase in volume of information being received from schools. They said that this burden would peak when implementing these

changes; however it should be manageable in the medium-term once efficiencies and benefits are realised.

Question 10a: Within schools, who would be responsible for understanding the amendments to the regulations and disseminating information about the changes in the regulations to staff?

There were 93 responses to this question. 90% said that it would ultimately be the responsibility of the head teacher to disseminate information about the changes, although they recognised the responsibility may be delegated to a member of the senior leadership team or the designated safeguarding lead.

The statistical breakdown of responses to Questions 7c, 7e, 8 a-c, 9 and 10b provided an estimate of the time taken to undertake a range of activities by LA and

school staff, and the time taken by parents in responding to requests for information (see Annex A).

Government response

Many respondents felt that the wider benefits of these proposals would include improving information sharing between schools and LAs when tracing CME. We will communicate to schools and LAs the changes to the regulations and strengthen the statutory guidance on '*Children Missing Education*' to provide clarity on issues such as compliance.

In terms of the adaption of management information systems, we are confident that most schools and LAs will have the necessary infrastructure and processes in place, with only some additional amendments and updates required to implement the changes effectively from September 2016. This is because all schools should currently be providing their LA with information about pupils removed from their register under the five grounds listed in the regulations. In addition, the consultation has provided information that suggests LAs already have robust management information systems in place to receive notifications from schools.

The statistical information provided in response to the questions on time taken to undertake administrative tasks has helped inform cost estimates set out in the Impact Assessment.

Other matters

Question 11: Please let us have your views on responding to this consultation (e.g. the number and type of questions, was it easy to find/understand/complete, etc.)

There were 75 responses to this question. Respondents generally felt that the consultation asked the right questions and it was easy to respond to. Some found the questions on the time taken to carry out administrative tasks difficult to answer as each case was unique and therefore the level of work required varied.

Annex A: Statistical breakdown of responses to the consultation

This annex provides a statistical breakdown to questions that did not require a free-text response.

Question 7c

How long (in minutes) is it expected to take for one member of LA staff to familiarise themselves with the amended regulations and disseminate information about the changes in the regulations to all staff?

There were 95 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	3	3%
11-20 mins	6	6%
21-30 mins	16	17%
31-40 mins	24	25%
40+ mins (please specify):	46	48%

Question 7e

How long (in minutes) is it expected that this administrative work would take for each child?

There were 89 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	22	25%
11-20 mins	22	25%
21-30 mins	18	20%
31-40 mins	10	11%
40+ mins (please specify):	17	19%

Question 8a

How long (in minutes) do schools expect it would take to carry out the following task: Report a deletion of a pupil's name from their register to their LA.

There were 78 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	43	55%
11-20 mins	15	19%
21-30 mins	14	18%
31-40 mins	1	1%
40+ mins (please specify):	5	6%

Question 8b

How long (in minutes) do schools expect it would take to carry out the following task: Report an addition of a pupil's name to their register to their LA.

There were 79 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	48	61%
11-20 mins	17	21%
21-30 mins	10	13%
31-40 mins	1	1%
40+ mins (please specify):	3	4%

Question 8c

How long (in minutes) do schools expect it would take to carry out the following task: Obtain from parents the necessary additional information required; this may cover:

- a pupil's onward destination and home address if they are being removed from their current school's register, including the name and address of their new school/institution.
- details of a pupil's previous school and home address when they are being added to a school's register.

There were 75 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	11	15%
11-20 mins	16	21%
21-30 mins	16	21%
31-40 mins	8	11%
40+ mins (please specify):	24	32%

Question 9

How much time (in minutes) will it take for parents to provide this additional information to schools?

There were 79 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	38	48%
11-20 mins	20	25%
21-30 mins	9	11%
31-40 mins	0	0%
40+ mins (please specify):	12	15%

Question 10b

How long (in minutes) is this task expected to take?

There were 74 responses to this question.

	Total	Percent
0-10 mins	6	8%
11-20 mins	6	8%
21-30 mins	17	23%
31-40 mins	13	18%
40+ mins (please specify):	32	43%

Annex B: List of organisations that responded to the consultation

The Department would like to thank all those who responded to this consultation, including the following organisations:

- Association of Directors of Children’s Services
- Association for Education Welfare Management
- Association of School and College Leaders
- Bedford Academy
- Bedford Borough Council
- Beech Academy
- Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
- Blackpool Council
- Bolton Council
- Bordon Infant School
- Bournemouth Borough Council
- Bradford Metropolitan District Council
- Bristol City Council
- British Humanist Association
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Catholic Education Service
- Changing Faces
- Cheshire East Council
- Cheshire West and Chester Council
- Children’s Society, The
- City of London Corporation
- Clifton College
- Clifton Primary School
- Crookhorn College
- Darlington Borough Council
- Derby City Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Devon County Council
- Directorate Children and Young People (Ministry of Defence)
- Doncaster Council
- Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council
- East Sussex County Council
- East Wickham Primary Academy
- Essex County Council
- Farringdon Community Academy
- Furness Education Consortium
- Gateshead Local Authority
- Gateway Nursery School
- Gloucestershire County Council
- Hackney Learning Trust
- Hampshire County Council
- Haringey Council
- Harrow Council
- Heathfield Primary School
- Hertfordshire County Council
- HE-Special
- Isle of Wight Local Authority Education Sub- group
- Islington Council
- Kent County Council
- Kingston Upon Thames

- Kirklees Council
- Lambeth Local Authority
- Lancashire County Council
- Leeds City Council
- Leicester City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Local Government Association
- London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
- London Borough of Bexley
- London Borough of Croydon
- London Borough of Ealing
- London Borough of Haringey
- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Lewisham Council
- London Borough of Newham
- London Borough of Sutton
- London Borough of Tower Hamlets
- Luton Borough Council
- Manchester City Council
- National Association of Headteachers
- National Children's Bureau
- Newcastle City Council
- North East Lincolnshire Local Authority
- North Lincolnshire Council
- North West CME Group
- North Yorkshire County Council
- Northumberland County Council
- Nottingham City Council
- NSPCC
- Oldham Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Peterborough City Council
- Pool Academy
- Portsmouth City Council
- Reading Borough Council
- Redbridge Council
- Richmond upon Thames
- Rochdale Borough Council
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Sandwell Council
- Sheffield City Council
- Shepton Beauchamp Primary School
- Slough Borough Council
- Somerset County Council
- South Gloucestershire Council
- Staffordshire County Council
- Suffolk County Council
- Surrey County Council
- Sutton and Merton Community Services
- TASHIS England
- Telford & Wrekin Council
- Thomas Russell Junior School
- Trafford Council
- Waltham Forest Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- Wigan Council
- Willenhall Community Primary School
- Wirral Council



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2016

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: DFE-00170-2016



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk