

Schools that work for everyone

**Report on the consultation conducted
September to December 2016**

March 2017



Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

Report produced by Ipsos MORI for the Department for Education.

Contents

1. Background and methodology	4
2. Families who are just about managing	8
Question 1: How can we better understand the impact of policy on a wider cohort of pupils whose life chances are profoundly affected by school but who may not qualify or apply for free school meals?	8
Question 2: How can we identify them?	8
3. Independent schools	12
Question 3: What contribution could the biggest and most successful independent schools make to the state school system?	13
Question 4: Are there other ways in which independent schools can support more good school places and help children of all backgrounds succeed?	13
Question 5: Are these the right expectations to apply to all independent schools to ensure they do more to improve state education locally?	15
Question 6: What threshold should we apply to capture those independent schools who have the capacity to sponsor or set up a new school or offer funded places, and to exempt those that do not?	17
Question 7: Is setting benchmarks the right way to implement these requirements?	18
Question 8: Should we consider legislation to allow the Charity Commission to revise its guidance, and to remove the benefits associated with charitable status from those independent schools which do not comply?	19
Question 9: Are there other changes necessary to secure the Government's objectives?	21
4. Universities	23
Question 10: How can the academic expertise of universities be brought to bear on our school system, to improve school-level attainment and in doing so widen access?	24
Question 11: Are there other ways in which universities could be asked to contribute to raising school level attainment?	24
Question 12: Is the Director for Fair Access (DFA) guidance the most effective way of delivering these new requirements?	26
Question 13: What is the best way to ensure that all universities sponsor schools as a condition of charging higher fees?	27
Question 14: Should we encourage universities to take specific factors into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment?	29
5. Selective schools	32

Question 15: How should we best support existing grammars to expand?	33
Question 16: What can we do to support the creation of either wholly or partially new selective schools?	33
Question 17: How can we support existing non-selective schools to become selective?	33
Question 18: Are these the right conditions to ensure that selective schools improve the quality of non-selective places?	34
Question 19: Are there other conditions that we should consider as requirements for new or expanding selective schools, and existing non-selective schools becoming selective?	34
Question 20: What is the right proportion of children from lower income households for new selective schools to admit?	36
Question 21: Are these sanctions the right ones to apply to schools that fail to meet the requirements?	38
Question 22: If not, what other sanctions might be effective in ensuring selective schools contribute to the number of good non-selective places locally?	38
Question 23: How can we best ensure that new and expanding selective schools and existing non-selective schools becoming selective are located in the areas that need good school places the most?	39
Question 24: How can we best ensure that the benefits of existing selective schools are brought to bear on local non-selective schools?	40
Question 25: Are there other things we should ask of selective schools to ensure they support non-selective education in their areas?	42
Question 26: Should the conditions we intend to apply to new or expanding selective schools also apply to existing selective schools?	42
6. Faith Schools	44
Question 27: Are these the right alternative requirements to replace the 50% rule?	44
Question 28: How else might we ensure that faith schools espouse and deliver a diverse, multi-faith offer to parents within a faith school environment?	46
Question 29: Are there other ways in which we can effectively monitor faith schools for integration and hold them to account for performance?	48
Question 30: Are there other sanctions we could apply to faith schools that do not meet this requirement?	48
List of organisations which responded to the consultation	50

1. Background and methodology

Background

In September 2016, the government published a set of proposals for creating an educational system that seeks to extend opportunity to everyone, not just the privileged few.

Building on policies implemented from 2010 to improve the quality of schools across England, the government's aim is to:

- expand the number of good school places available to all families, not just those who can afford to move into the catchment area of a good school, go private or pay for tuition to pass selective tests;
- give all schools with a strong track record, experience and valuable expertise the right incentives to expand their offer to even more pupils, driving up standards and giving parents greater control; and
- deliver a diverse school system that gives all children, whatever their background, the opportunity to help them achieve their potential.

The consultation 'Schools that work for everyone' was launched on 12 September 2016 to gather views from a wide range of people and organisations on a series of proposals designed to encourage high-performing institutions – independent schools, higher education institutions, selective schools and faith schools – to help improve the quality of school places in the state sector.

The consultation ran until 12 December 2016. The full length consultation included 34 questions, the majority of which were open ended. A shorter version of the consultation was also available containing 12 questions. Ipsos MORI was not involved in the design or running of the consultation.

In December 2016, Ipsos MORI was commissioned to provide an analysis of responses to the 30 open ended questions contained with the consultation using text analytics.

This document provides a summary overview of the analysis conducted by Ipsos MORI.

Participation

The consultation received 7,080 responses from individuals and organisations. A total of 6,914 were received through the online consultation form, a further 166 responses were submitted to the DfE email mailbox.

After careful review of the raw data, a total of 226 responses were removed from the dataset. These included:

- 26 duplicate responses (including where duplicate responses were submitted to both the long and short consultation versions).
- 200 blank responses (where no text was submitted to any open ended question)

The Department for Education received 2,054 ‘campaign’ responses led by the British Humanist Organisation. The additional volume of responses to this campaign was considered separately by the Department to the analysis conducted by Ipsos MORI, along with other identified campaigns where identical responses were submitted through central coordination. Using a combination of human and machine identification, to the best of our ability, a total of 16 potential campaigns were identified, accounting for around 80 responses.

After data cleaning, a total of 6,688 responses were accepted as valid responses, giving a total of 80,099 individual answers to 30 open ended questions.

A breakdown of the number of respondents can be found in the table below; a full list of the organisations who submitted a response can also be found in the appendix.

Respondent type	Number of responses
Pupil / student	332
Parent / grandparent	2,598
Member of public	268
School	489
Teacher / school employee	1,793
Governor / board member	453
Consultancy / research organisation / academic	29
Local Authority	48
Higher Education Institution	69
Faith group / charity	72
Representative body for schools/teachers	45
Representative body for Higher Education Institutions/staff	7
Academy sponsor	36
Campaign group	7
Member of a faith group	75
Employee of Higher Education Institution	111
Employee of Local Authority	72
Other	116
Not specified	68

Methodology

Given the large number of responses submitted to the consultation, Ipsos MORI was commissioned by DfE to provide an analysis of all open-ended responses to the questions included in the consultation document.

Due to the number and unstructured nature of the responses, a text analytics approach was adopted. Text analytics uses a combination of human coding and machine learning to replicate human decision making across large datasets in a time-efficient manner. This specific piece of analysis used two main analytical techniques:

- Keyword matching: using computers to identify combinations of phrases and keywords, chosen by human coders, into response themes.
- Probabilistic matching: using machine learning and natural language processing to classify data into categories, seeking to replicate the decision made during an initial round of manual coding.

By its very nature, the use of these analytical techniques is likely to result in some false positives and some false negatives. This is due to the machine under- or over-allocating comments to particular themes depending on how cleanly words associate with those different themes. As such, the outputs of the analysis are not comparable to a full manual coding of all consultation responses, and it is not appropriate to interpret the outputs using measures of accuracy such as confidence intervals.

However, a number of quality assurance procedures were put in place to help review data quality and mitigate errors – this included manual review of sample data for each theme coded, peer review by multiple colleagues per code frame, and a cyclical process of coding to build analysis iteratively.

The process of text analytics was applied to all valid responses received through the online consultation platform, and a small number of responses received through the DfE email mailbox that had followed the same structure as the online form. In addition, Ipsos MORI manually reviewed other mailbox responses and those from key stakeholders (as identified by DfE).

Notes on interpretation

When assessing insight generated by text analytics, the following note may be helpful. Text analytics allows us to identify and group common threads together, capture the broad weight of opinion, and consider the relative weight of the most common themes. The technique helps us to easily identify the breadth of opinion, rather than exact number of people who hold those views. As such, the results are intended to be illustrative rather than statistically reliable.

Consultation samples are not representative of public opinion, and often contain responses from a wide range of respondent types. In this case, the consultation received responses from individuals, such as parents and pupils, as well as representative bodies on behalf of their members. It is therefore not always possible, or desirable, to provide a precise indication of the proportion of respondents who hold a certain view. Moreover, in this case, the intention of the consultation was to explore how best to achieve the stated policy aims through seeking views on each proposal.

Therefore, the authors have used different analysis techniques to identify how important an idea is. This report provides some reference to weight of opinion for broad themes of analysis by providing references, where appropriate, to the number of times key overarching themes were identified. In addition, we also use phrases such as "a few" or "some" to reflect views which were mentioned infrequently and "many" or "most" when views are more frequently expressed. Any proportions used in our qualitative reporting (e.g. a "couple of" or "a few" participants), should always be considered indicative, rather than exact.

It should be further noted that the Schools that work for everyone consultation was designed to seek suggestions in relation to a defined set of proposals. Many respondents expressed broader concerns about some of the proposals, alongside suggestions for improvement. Many responses also expressed mixed views on the proposals, being supportive of some while opposed to others. It is therefore important to note that suggestions for improvement, or comments on design or delivery, do not always indicate support for the overarching policy, and that support or opposition to particular proposals cannot be taken as support or opposition to the policy as a whole.

2. Families who are just about managing

Overview

The consultation asked respondents to consider how best to understand the impact of government policy on pupils from families who are 'just about managing', and for suggestions as to how this cohort could be identified.

Respondents provided a wide range of suggestions for who should be consulted to improve understanding of this cohort – including parents, school staff, education experts and staff in the children's services sector. Some also suggested conducting further research with children and families.

The most frequently cited tools for identifying pupils from families who are 'just about managing' were income related data, eligibility data for government benefits, and household demographic data. Other suggestions included pupil attainment data, measures of deprivation, softer school-based measures, indicators of disposable income, and learner destination data.

Question 1: How can we better understand the impact of policy on a wider cohort of pupils whose life chances are profoundly affected by school but who may not qualify or apply for free school meals?

Question 2: How can we identify them?

There were 2,343 responses to question 1. Of these, four referenced another answer, and a further 145 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 2,205 valid responses.

There were 2,193 responses to question 2. Of these, 176 referenced an earlier answer and a further 126 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 1,891 valid responses.

Most respondents giving an answer were broadly supportive of the government's ambition set out in the consultation to better support disadvantaged pupils who do not qualify for free school meals (FSM). There was recognition across the board, including from national bodies that represent the teaching profession, that the criteria used for FSM and Pupil Premium initiatives are too narrow to successfully identify families and pupils who are 'just about managing'.

There was considerable overlap between the responses to questions 1 and 2. Overall, across both questions, the consultation received over 3,750 suggestions for how pupils

who are 'just about managing' could be better identified, and for how the impact of policy on this cohort could be better understood. A number of respondents, particularly stakeholders representing the teaching profession, urged caution that any form of identification will be difficult and complex, and that it could require a multi-dimensional approach. The suggestions given in response to the consultation could be broadly categorised into three areas: identification, consultation and research.

Identification

In total, over 2,150 different suggestions were given as to how best identify pupils from families who are 'just about managing'. In order of occurrence, these ideas could be broadly categorised into the following themes:

- Indicators of income were the most frequently mentioned method, for example through identifying household income, tax codes or National Insurance Contributions. Some respondents suggested that these data could be obtained through government records; others suggested that it may be more appropriate to use self-reported data.
- Eligibility for government benefits, including tax credits and Child Benefit records, both of which have financial thresholds. Some respondents suggested that it could still be important to consider FSM and Pupil Premium data, but to also consider those families who have recently become ineligible and thus just outside the criteria.
- Household demographics were the third most suggested method for identification, and were commonly cited as a means of putting other data into context. This included a wide range of measures such as number of children in the household, marital status, level of education, postcode, property type, employment status and ethnicity.
- Attainment data, including results from Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 and measures of progress against these. Some suggested that pupil progress data could be taken from informal records such as grades on school monitoring reports rather than solely from official exam results.
- Measures of deprivation, the most frequently mentioned of which was Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) data. This could be used to identify pockets of geographical areas with high social deprivation.
- Softer school-based indicators, such as school dinner money debts, lack of involvement in school activities that require a financial contribution, and condition of uniform or equipment, were all suggested as potential signs of a family struggling financially.
- Indicators of disposable income: a smaller number of respondents suggested using measures of relative wealth rather than income, for example taking expenditure, mortgage or rental costs and bills, measures such as fuel poverty, or use of food banks.

- Destination data: a small number of respondents stated that learner destination data such as Higher Education Access Tracker, or data on NEETs (those aged 16-24 not in education, employment or training) might also be helpful to identify areas where relatively few pupils go on to access further or higher education.

Consultation

Respondents also suggested consulting with parents, teachers and other professionals both as a means of identifying and understanding the impact of policy on pupils from families who are 'just about managing'. In total, across both questions, 1,142 suggestions were made relating to wider consultation. These included:

- Asking schools and school staff: most suggested this would involve discussion with head teachers and teachers; some also suggested that canteen staff and school health staff would be able to contribute. The suggestion to work more closely with schools was particularly prevalent among parents/grandparents and school employees. Furthermore, some suggested that schools could be asked not just to inform wider policy, but also to undertake identification of pupils at their discretion.
- Speaking to parents and families directly: for most respondents this suggestion was with a view to obtaining a detailed real life picture of the impact of policy; however, some also suggested that parents could self-identify as a family that is 'just about managing' rather than relying solely on third party data.
- Talking to wider children services staff: a smaller number of respondents suggested that the views of staff in social services, local health services and foster carers should also be taken in to account.
- Talking to educational experts, such as academics, representative bodies, and regulators – particularly in reference to better understanding the impact of policy on families who are 'just about managing'.

Research

Related to both consultation and identification, a large number of responses suggested that the government should conduct further research, both to help build a better understanding, but also as a method of identification. These suggestions included requests for more robust, longitudinal academic-led research which would track families and pupils through a number of different phases of their education (for example, from primary through to secondary education). The use of youth forums, or the commissioning of similar qualitative work with parents, pupils and staff was also suggested by some to help inform impact. Others also suggested that surveys could be administered to help collect some of the household data and softer outcomes outlined above to help identify eligible families and pupils.

Other comments

Not everyone provided a suggestion for how to better understand or identify pupils from families who are 'just about managing'. A number of other respondents expressed caution, and stated that they disagreed with the notion of identifying pupils. Within this, there was some concern about the potential stigma associated with identification, and the possible reluctance of families to identify with and accept additional support. Others cited concern with the challenges of creating an appropriate metric and the potential for additional burden on schools to either support in the administration or identification of the cohort.

Furthermore, a small number of respondents commented on the format of the consultation, and suggested ways in which it could be improved.

3. Independent schools

Overview

The consultation asked respondents to consider ways in which independent schools could make a contribution to the state school system, and the different mechanisms that could be used to help monitor this contribution.

The proposal of school sponsorship received less attention compared to other arrangements, of which the sharing of facilities and teaching resource was the most commonly cited method of support. In addition to these proposals, the consultation received a range of other suggestions for how independent schools can contribute to state schools, including many examples of where strong partnerships and bursaries are already in place.

Among those who broadly agreed that a threshold should be applied to identify independent schools which have the capacity to sponsor or fund new places, suggestions for the basis of the threshold included metrics to measure the financial capability, size, and quality of independent schools. However, there was mixed support for the use of benchmarks. While some thought benchmarks were a reasonable and pragmatic approach to implementing the expectations, the majority opposed their use due to concerns that it could be too challenging to ensure that benchmarks are robust, meaningful and flexible enough to be effective.

Among those who commented on the use of legislation, the majority agreed that legislation should be considered to remove the benefits associated with charitable status from those independent schools who do not comply with new expectations. However, others expressed a preference for no legislative change, and for maintaining the current guidance arrangements.

In addition to the specific questions asked in the consultation, a number of respondents used the forum of the consultation to make wider points such as to voice objection to independent schools per se, or to their charitable status.

Question 3: What contribution could the biggest and most successful independent schools make to the state school system?

Question 4: Are there other ways in which independent schools can support more good school places and help children of all backgrounds succeed?

Question 3 received a total of 3,044 responses. Of these, two referenced an earlier answer and a further 82 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 2,959 valid responses to this question.

Question 4 received a total of 4,543 responses. Of these, 131 referenced an earlier answer and a further 160 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 4,252 valid responses to this question.

There was considerable overlap between the responses to questions 3 and 4; however, a significant minority did not respond directly to the questions posed in the consultation. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

The consultation presented two possible ideas for how independent schools could make a contribution to the state school system: i) to sponsor academies or set up a new free school in the state sector; and ii) to offer a certain proportion of places as fully funded bursaries to those who are unable to pay fees. In addition to these, respondents suggested a range of others ways in which independent schools could make a contribution, including by: sharing facilities and resources; sharing teaching resource and support; better partnership working; support with extra-curricular enrichment; and further financial support.

Stakeholders from within the independent sector pointed to a number of examples where independent schools already have strong partnerships with local schools in place (this was also cited by a number of state schools) and/or offer bursaries. However, not all respondents agreed that under-performing schools would benefit from such arrangements.

Admissions support

Across both questions, a large number of respondents commented on proposals to increase the number of bursaries, the majority of whom were broadly positive about the opportunities they could present to those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Requests for contribution through bursaries or scholarships were most prevalent among parents/guardians, and school employees. Some cited a specific wish to increase the number of bursaries offered, and thus see an increase in the number of students

attending from lower-income families; however, it was largely unclear whether others were indicating a support for the status quo in the number of bursaries places currently offered, or an increase.

Those who expressed concerns about the proposal often voiced doubts about the independent sector per se and suggested the scheme would have a negative impact on state schools.

Furthermore, there was some uncertainty as to whether bursaries would secure any government funding. Although some suggested the re-introduction of the 'assisted places' scheme, others disagreed that government should subsidise or co-fund bursaries; and moreover, suggested that bursaries funded by independent schools should be offered as a requirement of charitable status. For example, as part of their published response, the Independent Schools Council (ISC) suggested a jointly-funded initiative (between independent schools and the government) to create up to 10,000 new free places at independent schools for students from lower income families.

Sponsorship

A small number of responses commented on the proposal of sponsorship, with mixed opinion. This was seen by some as a good opportunity for independent schools to share their expertise, and a welcome potential injection of resources into individual schools. Others were more hesitant. The most commonly cited concern was that, in their view, independent schools did not necessarily have the right expertise and were not well placed to lead schools that likely served different pupil cohorts, and with different levels of resource. Furthermore, some asked for assurance that sponsorship status would be given to schools based on merit, rather than assumed based solely on the type of school.

Other suggestions

In addition to the proposals outlined in the consultation, 1,752 responses provided further suggestions for how the independent sector could best support more good school places. The most commonly cited examples and ideas, in order of occurrence, included:

- Sharing of facilities: across both questions, responses suggested that independent schools could share facilities with state schools. This included sports facilities, science laboratories, libraries, music and performing arts facilities, sharing of transport such as mini-buses or coaches, and access to grounds. Some respondents stated that access should be provided free of charge, others suggested that independent school facilities could be used at discounted rates by state schools.
- Sharing of teaching resource, in terms of both pooled resource and collaborative working. This included suggestions such as joint teacher training and CPD, teacher exchange programmes, shared schemes of work, joint observations,

creating networks of expertise, and provision of expertise in STEM, minority subjects and the arts. However, some also raised concern that the independent and state school settings are very different, to the extent that shared teaching resources might have limited impact.

- Closer partnership working: in both directions, such as staff acting as governors, mentors of staff, part of Multi-Academy Trust boards, and sharing expertise in school management, behaviour, and parent engagement.
- Extra-curricular activities, to help enhance student development. This could include access to clubs, societies and activities such as Duke of Edinburgh, debating clubs, visiting speakers, support with university applications, interview skills, summer schools, music and drama productions, joint sports teams, and excursions. Further financial contributions, outside of formal sponsorship arrangements. For example, funding school trips, specialist teacher recruitment, or support in helping attract additional investment.

Question 5: Are these the right expectations to apply to all independent schools to ensure they do more to improve state education locally?

A total of 2,012 responses were received to this question. Of these responses, 143 referenced an earlier answer and a further 68 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,801 valid responses. Of these, a small number of submissions did not directly address the question of 'expectations'. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

The consultation document detailed five proposed expectations of independent schools that do not have the capacity and capability to take on full sponsorship, of which schools would be required to fulfil one or more of the following:

- Provide direct school-to-school support with state schools.
- Support teaching in minority subjects which state schools struggle to make viable.
- Ensure their senior leaders become directors of multi-academy trusts.
- Provide greater expertise and access to facilities.
- Provide local sixth-form scholarships to a proportion of pupils in year 11 at a local school.

These are considered in turn below. In addition to responses offering comments on the proposed requirements, several respondents requested that all requirements should be flexible and voluntary as actions taken by choice are likely to have more impact. Some of these respondents also raised concerns that there is huge diversity in the independent sector and, as such, many independent schools do not have the resource or capacity to support state schools.

Provide greater expertise and access to facilities

Compared to other questions in the consultation, a relatively small number of respondents commented directly on one or more of these expectations. The largest volume of these comments related to providing greater expertise and access to facilities. The majority of these respondents said that access to independent schools' facilities, where these were superior, would be beneficial. However, there were also a number of common concerns raised by a minority of respondents:

- It is not always the case that independent schools have superior facilities to state school, so such exchanges may not always be appropriate.
- There are significant challenges associated with sharing facilities – for example those relating to timetabling and transport – which may outweigh the benefits.
- Increased access to facilities at independent schools should not be used as an excuse to erode resources at state schools.

School-to-school support

The small number of respondents who offered an opinion on this proposal were generally in favour of direct school-to-school support. However, a number of comments expressed a need to ensure that this would deliver more than just tokenistic collaboration. It was suggested by some that schools should be matched based on an assessment of need, to ensure that the support is appropriate and mutually beneficial. It was also suggested that the impact of such partnerships should be monitored and evaluated to ensure that it is delivering the required outcomes to both parties.

Provision of sixth-form scholarships

The small group of respondents who commented on the provision of sixth-form scholarships offered mixed views. Those not in favour expressed concern about the negative impacts that this proposal could have on state schools, and potentially on the pupils that are identified as part of the scheme. However, some suggested that this impact could be mitigated if the state school were to lead on the identification of pupils.

Assisting with teaching minority subjects

Among the vast majority of the small number of respondents who addressed this proposal, support for independent schools assisting with the teaching of minority subjects was high. However, there was also concern amongst some that putting responsibility for minority subjects on independent schools would further threaten the viability of those subjects across the country.

Senior leaders becoming directors of multi-academy trusts

The majority of the small number of respondents who commented on the proposal that senior leaders of independent schools become directors of multi-academy trusts voiced some concerns. Many of these respondents said that leaders of independent schools were unlikely to have the knowledge or experience of the challenges faced by state schools to have a useful impact as directors of MATs.

Those who were broadly in support of the proposal said that it was most likely to be a success where the independent school leaders were able to offer specific financial or legal expertise that was lacking in the state school.

Question 6: What threshold should we apply to capture those independent schools who have the capacity to sponsor or set up a new school or offer funded places, and to exempt those that do not?

A total of 2,160 responses were received to this question. Of these responses, 93 referenced an earlier answer and a further 272 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,801 valid responses. However, a substantial minority of these submissions did not comment specifically on the concept of a threshold. Other comments are discussed further at the end of the chapter.

A small number of respondents specifically stated that, in their view, there should be no threshold and that all independent schools should be expected to sponsor or set up a new school, or offer funded places. In contrast, a very small number of respondents thought that it was not independent schools' role to support state schools in this way.

Respondents' suggestions for how the thresholds should be applied fell into three broad categories: based on financial ability; based on number of pupils; or based on academic results. Many respondents suggested that some combination of these three factors should be used.

Financial ability to support state schools

The most frequently suggested threshold was an independent school's financial ability to support state schools. It was recognised by these respondents that many independent schools operate on small margins and that it would be unviable to expect all to invest financially in the state sector. With this in mind, a number of respondents suggested that the threshold should be based on the amount of surplus income a school has each year, rather than on fees or income alone. A small number of respondents went further, and suggested independent schools should be required to expend a proportion of the surplus in supporting state schools each year. Other suggestions, mentioned by a small number

of respondents, included basing the threshold on the level of school fees, on the annual turnover or on the amount of financial benefit accrued through charitable status.

The size of the independent school

Another frequently suggested threshold was based on **the size of the independent school**. In the majority of cases, respondents cited the total number of pupils at the school would be an appropriate measure of capacity; however, a small number of respondents suggested that average class size could be used as an alternative measure instead.

The quality of the independent schools

The third most frequent suggestion was that the quality of the independent school should be used when setting thresholds. Respondents mentioned factors such as high quality teaching, exam results, progression to higher education, Oxbridge acceptances, and Independent School Inspectorate (ISI) rating, all of which could be used to feed into a schools' suitability to set up or sponsor a state school. However, it was reiterated by many of these respondents that independent schools operate under very different conditions to state schools and, as such, success on these factors would not necessarily mean the independent school had the necessary skills for the state sector.

Question 7: Is setting benchmarks the right way to implement these requirements?

A total of 1,535 responses were received to this question. Of these, 167 referenced an earlier answer and a further 283 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,085 valid responses.

Among those who gave a response, respondents were more likely to have used language that indicated broad opposition to the use of benchmarks, than those who used language that indicated broad support. However, there was some uncertainty among respondents about what the benchmarks would be; this uncertainty led to many responses which were caveated or expressed no clear preference either way.

Those who broadly agreed with the use of benchmarks generally implied that it was a reasonable and pragmatic approach. Those who opposed their use often suggested that any benchmarks set would, in their view, most likely be too crude and blunt to form a robust measure. There were also concerns among some that benchmarks could be very subjective and may be subject to manipulation by some schools.

However, there were a number of suggestions for how benchmarks should be implemented to mitigate these concerns. These respondents said that benchmarks need to be sufficiently robust, meaningful, evidence based, and flexible.

A large proportion of respondents suggested that independent schools should be required to provide evidence of where they fell in relation to the benchmarks in order to ensure that the benchmarks are applied consistently and fairly for all. However, some identified the potential bureaucracy and administration associated with this as a challenge.

Furthermore, a smaller number of respondents said that, in their view, benchmarks would likely be too rigid to account for the large variety of independent schools. It was suggested that the benchmarks would need to be flexible to account for the needs of local state schools, the specialisation of the independent school (e.g. if the independent school specialised in SEN education), and the characteristics of the local area (deprivation, ethnic mix etc.). Some respondents suggested that in order to account for this variation, benchmarks would need to be set on a school-by-school basis. Others suggested that a well-functioning appeals process would need to be available to independent schools who thought the benchmarks were not appropriate given their individual circumstances.

Question 8: Should we consider legislation to allow the Charity Commission to revise its guidance, and to remove the benefits associated with charitable status from those independent schools which do not comply?

A total of 1,986 responses were received to this question. Of these, 87 referenced an earlier answer and a further 81 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,818 valid responses. However, a number of these submissions did not comment specifically on the proposal, but instead commented on the wider role of independent schools. These comments are discussed further at the end of the chapter.

The vast majority of respondents used language that suggested broad agreement that legislation should be considered to allow the Charity Commission to remove the benefits associated with charitable status (from independent schools that do not comply with the expectations outlined in the consultation to support the state sector). However, it should be noted that the comments received demonstrated a mixed level of knowledge about the role of the Charity Commission, its current remit, and the current formal guidance to charities, including independent schools that are charities, on the public benefit that they must demonstrate.

Support for revising guidance

A large number of respondents cited broad support for removing the benefits associated with charitable status if independent schools fail to comply with expectations to support the state sector. Many respondents stated that, in their view, it would be appropriate to use legislation to force adherence to the guidance where schools did not comply. For

these respondents, it was important that independent schools were held fully to account for the benefit of receiving charitable status.

Another common reason for supporting legislation was in recognition of the respect that should be given to charitable status. Many respondents expressed that, in their view, independent schools should have to justify that they are using their charitable status to benefit the wider public – not just their own pupils, and especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Among these respondents, removing charitable status was therefore perceived to be appropriate in instances where this wider public benefit could not be proven by independent schools.

Preference for no legislative change

A smaller proportion of respondents used language that indicated a preference for no legislative change, and as such broad support for maintaining the current guidance arrangements. Among these were the Charity Commission, who in their submission to the consultation presented a number of challenges to the effective implementation and impact of the proposal.

Among other respondents who cited concern, reasons for disagreeing with the need for legislative change included:

- Concern that this policy should not be enforced upon independent schools, and that the best partnerships between schools are fostered (with both sides as mutually willing partners) rather than imposed.
- Wider acknowledgement of the work that independent schools already do to demonstrate public benefit, and outreach to pupils outside of their schools.
- Concern that some independent schools do not have the finances available to undertake deliver to these requirements.
- Caution that this should not be the role of independent schools, and that use of funds in this way may not be fair on parents who pay fees for independent schooling.

These concerns were raised by a wide variety of stakeholders including maintained schools, faith groups, representative bodies and members of the public, as well as some independent schools.

Other stakeholders, from both inside and outside of the independent sector, had mixed views. Whilst some felt that it was an appropriate measure against which to hold independent schools to account, others felt that there was already adequate provision in place for the Charity Commission to consider the public benefit of independent schools, and that a more flexible approach is required to cater for the wide range of contexts in which independent schools operate.

Opposition to charitable status per se

A similar proportion agreed with the notion of legislation to change the current guidance, but asked that the legislation goes further and removes charitable status for all independent schools. A common perception among this group of respondents was that independent schools are businesses whose mission is to serve a privileged minority of pupils, rather than offer a charitable service to the wider public. This was a re-occurring theme across all questions in this section.

Question 9: Are there other changes necessary to secure the Government's objectives?

A total of 1,671 responses were received to this question. Of these responses, 83 referenced an earlier answer and a further 124 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,464 valid responses.

It should be noted that, based on the responses given, a large number of respondents were unclear as to which specific government objectives were being referred to in the question. As such, many of the responses received to this question either re-stated previous answers, or gave suggestions for changes that are needed to improve education more widely, rather than focusing on independent schools.

Among the small number of responses that did directly address this question, the most commonly cited requests for change were:

- Calls to ensure that independent schools are effectively monitored and inspected to ensure compliance with any new expectations.
- More support for pupils with special educational needs, such as including a requirement for independent schools to be more responsible for better SEN provision in return for the benefits of charitable status.
- A reiteration of calls to increase the number of places independent schools offer the ablest students through scholarships and bursaries.

Other comments

Outside of the specific questions asked above, a large number of respondents from a wide range of organisations used the forum of the consultation to consistently express general objections to the existence of independent schools per se, and their charitable status. These objections were based on perceptions of the impact and contribution that independent schools have on the wider school sector and society in general.

Others regularly raised concern that not all independent schools necessarily have the relevant expertise and ability to support the state sector. This was seen by some to be particularly pertinent to areas such as sponsorship, shared teaching and school

governance, but of less concern to areas such as sharing facilities and access to extra-curricular activities or minority subjects.

4. Universities

Overview

The consultation asked respondents to consider how universities can help contribute to raising school-level attainment, the best mechanism through which university sponsorship should be overseen, and the factors that should be considered by universities when deciding how and where to support school attainment.

The consultation received a wide range of suggestions for how universities can best support school level attainment. This included support for students, support for teachers and support for schools in primary, secondary and further education. However, while the idea of school support was broadly welcomed, not all agreed that traditional, formal, academy sponsorship arrangements should be prioritised over other forms of school engagement.

The majority of responses disagreed that the guidance administered through the Director for Fair Access (DFA) was an effective mechanism for overseeing the proposed changes in policy. However, comments demonstrated some lack of knowledge about the DFA guidance among respondents. Both those who broadly supported or opposed using the DFA noted that there would need to be changes to the remit and scope of the DFA if this was to be a directive and prescriptive mechanism.

The consultation identified three broad suggestions for ensuring that universities sponsor schools as a condition of higher fees. A large number of respondents suggested that legislation would be required to guarantee that these requirements were followed. Some respondents said that universities should be required to provide evidence that they meet the requirements before being permitted to charge higher fees. For others, the best mechanisms would be the introduction of financial incentives, or clear guidance (in general) for universities to follow.

Respondents suggested a wide range of factors that universities should take into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment. Responses to the consultation identified level of school attainment, geography, and socio-demographic factors as the most important.

In addition to the specific questions asked in the consultation, some respondents raised concerns about higher education institutions being required to sponsor schools and support attainment in schools. These included some uncertainty about the extent to which universities' sponsorship will guarantee improvements in attainment, caution about the impact the policy would have on other methods of engagement, and opposition to tuition fees in general.

Question 10: How can the academic expertise of universities be brought to bear on our school system, to improve school-level attainment and in doing so widen access?

Question 11: Are there other ways in which universities could be asked to contribute to raising school level attainment?

There were 2,588 responses to question 10. Of these, 23 referenced an earlier answer and a further 112 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 2,453 valid responses.

There were 3,891 responses to question 11. Of these, 155 referenced an earlier answer and a further 199 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 3,537 valid responses.

There was considerable overlap between the responses to questions 10 and 11. However, a large number of these submissions did not respond directly to the question of how universities could best contribute to raising school attainment. Other comments relating more widely to the role of universities are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Stakeholders from the HE sector cited many examples of where universities have already been partnering with schools to help improve school-level attainment. Overall, across both questions, the consultation received over 2,600 suggestions for how academic expertise at universities could help improve school-level attainment. Suggestions could be categorised into three broad areas: support for pupils; support for schools; and support for teachers. These respondents said that universities had a role to play in supporting primary, secondary and further education, and often cited multiple types of support suggesting that it is important that universities make a contribution across a number of different fronts simultaneously. However, higher education institutions and their representative bodies were opposed to a prescriptive approach – for example school sponsorship – due to concerns that this would limit the number of schools that are supported, and the number of pupils reached, compared to the diverse approaches currently taken.

Support for pupils

The largest group of suggestions were those that gave examples and ideas for how universities could work directly with pupils. The most commonly occurring examples and ideas, in order of occurrence of mentions, included:

- Outreach work to raise awareness of higher education and to provide student enrichment. This included initiatives such as visits to the school from lecturers and

undergraduates, taster sessions, open days and summer schools, masterclasses, and extracurricular activities and clubs.

- Specific suggestions to increase pupil attainment. These included the provision of support and stretch activities for gifted and talented pupils, provision of mentors (and e-mentors) to give academic support, sharing of university resources and facilities to stretch gifted children, guest lectures, summer schools for sixth-formers who need additional support, twilight subject sessions and online learning resources to provide subject specific support.
- Mentoring schemes, coaching, work experience and careers advice to help students realise their potential.
- Financial support to students from lower income backgrounds to help make university more viable. This includes bursaries, scholarships and more flexible assessment criteria.

Support for schools

The second most commonly cited area of support related to the broader contribution universities make to the running of schools. In order of frequency, these included:

- Recognition of the contribution that university research, and more specifically 'action research' could play, such as research into teacher training, effective teaching methods, longitudinal research into cohorts, student mental health and students from disadvantaged backgrounds – to name but a few. Respondents suggested that findings from evidence-based best practice should be shared with, and applied in, schools more easily. Some respondents also suggested that it would be beneficial for universities to form long-term research partnership with groups of schools to provide the most collaborative research settings.
- Creation of more informal partnerships, often between universities and the schools in their local area. These could take a number of different forms, from co-leading on research projects to sharing teaching resource and facilities. Some respondents also suggested more formal twinning or feeder school arrangements.
- Better sharing of learning facilities – such as libraries, online journals, specialist equipment, science/language laboratories – and extra-curricular facilities such as in sports, music and the arts.
- A smaller group of respondents also suggested that universities could support schools by acting as trustees or governors, or supporting with the wider governance and management of the school. Some respondents said this could also take the form of sharing corporate governance expertise where schools are part of larger governance structures such as multi-academy trusts.

The consultation made specific reference to two further ways in which universities could support schools – either by sponsoring an academy or establishing a new school in the

state system. A relatively small number of respondents cited sponsorship of schools as a tool by which universities could make a positive impact on attainment levels.

A number of HE sector bodies noted that many universities already have some form of sponsorship relationship with schools, and that in many cases these could point to signs of improvement in levels of attainment. However, they also expressed wishes that an expansion of this initiative should be fully evidence-based, and recognition of the value in a 'continuum of sponsorship' which would represent greater flexibility and a broader definition of formal support through sponsorship.

Support for teachers

The third area in which universities could make a contribution was in direct support for teachers. Again, this could be broadly categorised into two forms of support:

- The most commonly cited area of support for teachers was help with career training, progression and development. This includes more formal qualifications such as initial teacher training, PGCE courses, and Master's Degrees in Education, through to training conferences, refresher courses and access to relevant lectures at the university.
- A smaller number of respondents said that universities were able to contribute to content for student qualifications (especially in post-16 education), support in developing curriculums and schemes of work, and more informal subject support through access to experts and relevant journals.

Question 12: Is the Director for Fair Access (DFA) guidance the most effective way of delivering these new requirements?

A total of 1,144 responses were received to this question. This is a relatively low number of responses compared to other questions, which given the nature of responses, may reflect a lack of knowledge about the DFA guidance among respondents. Of these responses, 65 referenced an earlier answer and a further 268 stated 'no answer' or said they were unable to comment. As a result, there were 811 valid responses.

A small number of respondents used language that suggested broad agreement with using the DFA guidance to deliver the new expectations. However, this should be viewed in light of the low level of knowledge about the DFA guidance among respondents. It should also be noted that the proportion agreeing was much higher among those responding on behalf of a higher education institution or representative body for higher education institutions.

Support for incorporating expectations into DFA guidance

Respondents who agreed that the DFA guidance would be the most effective approach often cited the efficacy of the current Widening Participation DFA guidance in driving improvements. Some respondents also said that incorporating the expectations into DFA guidance would reduce administrative burdens on universities. Stakeholders from the HE sector corroborated this view, suggesting that expectations to contribute to raising attainment should sit within, and build upon, existing processes.

Many of those who agreed, however, said that DFA guidance would be necessary but not sufficient on its own to ensure new expectations are met.

Some said that the current guidance would need tailoring to individual universities and to local needs. For example, where additional school places are not required, universities' efforts would be best focused on supporting existing schools rather than opening new schools. It was also suggested by some that the success of the DFA guidance so far has in part been due to the DFA's willingness to engage in constructive dialogue about these variations. In order for any new guidance to be successfully adopted, respondents said this should continue.

A smaller number of respondents suggested that, in order for the DFA guidance to be implemented effectively and efficiently, case-studies and best practice examples should be provided to universities. The impact and effectiveness of the guidance should also be monitored and evaluated to ensure it is having the desired impact.

Concern the expectations are outside the DFA's remit

Respondents who disagreed with incorporating the new expectations into the DFA guidance often said that the proposed expectations within the consultation document are not directly linked to fair access and are therefore outside the scope of the DFA's current remit. There was some concern that if the proposed expectations were to be incorporated into the DFA guidance, this would expand the DFA's scope to include all school children, rather than the current "under-represented and disadvantaged groups".

Question 13: What is the best way to ensure that all universities sponsor schools as a condition of charging higher fees?

There were 2,053 responses at this question. Of these, 39 referenced an earlier answer and a further 150 stated 'no answer' or said they were unable to comment; as a result, there were 1,864 valid responses.

Of those who directly addressed the question, suggestions could be categorised into three broad areas: legislation; a requirement to provide evidence; and financial incentives

(above and beyond increased fees). Other comments are considered further at the end of the chapter.

Legislation

A large number of the responses that addressed the question suggested that legislation would be the only way to ensure that all universities meet the proposed expectations. While not all favoured the introduction of legislation, some respondents were uncertain as to the legal status of DFA guidance. Most of those who perceived this not to be enshrined in legislation, felt that legislation would be the only effective way of ensuring it is met across the board.

If legislation were to be introduced, some respondents said it would be necessary to ensure that the demands placed on universities are fair and proportionate. This could be achieved by requiring a certain proportion of the additional fee income, or a certain proportion of staff time, to be spent on sponsorship activities. However, stakeholders from the HE sector requested that any legislation may need to be sufficiently flexible to allow for tailored model of sponsorship to the strengths of the universities and the needs of the schools involved.

There was some recognition that the introduction of legislation might not be welcomed by universities and so extensive consultation with them would be necessary before introducing such a measure.

Providing evidence

Some respondents said that universities should be required to provide evidence that they meet the expectations before being permitted to charge higher fees. There are two suggested forms that this evidence could take:

- Evidence of the actions the university has taken: universities could be asked to provide evidence of the activities they have undertaken to support the schools they sponsor.
- Evidence of the impact the university has had: universities could be asked to monitor and evaluate the impact their sponsorship has had on raising standards and attainment in the school's system.

It was suggested by some that this evidence could be reviewed by a body such as Ofsted or the Office for Fair Access before a decision on ability to charge higher fees was made.

A higher education representative body urged caution over the use of certain forms of evidence however. For example, if sponsored schools are expected to be 'good' or 'outstanding' as a condition of universities being able to implement higher fees, this could discourage universities from sponsoring failing schools.

Financial incentives

Some respondents suggested that the opportunity to charge higher fees is unlikely to prove sufficient for many universities who are not currently sponsoring schools to do so in a way that meets the proposed aims. These respondents suggested that ‘the carrot’ would be more effective than ‘the stick’ when ensuring that universities engage in meaningful – rather than just tokenistic – sponsorship of schools.

There was also some suggestion that, given the increase in the Resource Accounting and Budgeting charge associated with raising fees, it might be just as cost-effective for the Government to offer financial incentives for universities to sponsor schools on the condition that they meet certain performance criteria.

Question 14: Should we encourage universities to take specific factors into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment?

There were 1,495 responses at this question. Of these, 107 referenced an earlier answer and a further 112 stated ‘no answer’ or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,276 valid responses.

Of the valid responses, the vast majority agreed that universities should be encouraged to take specific factors into account. Among those who agreed, consideration was given the specific factors discussed below.

Level of attainment

The most frequently cited factor was the level of exam attainment in schools. There were some suggestions that schools with low attainment should be prioritised, while others thought that universities should work exclusively with these schools to maximise their impact and ensure that schools were not “cherry-picked”.

Geographical factors

A similar proportion stated that geographical factors that should be taken into account when deciding which schools should be supported. Views on this were mixed however. While there was a general feeling that universities should focus on schools in their local areas, there was concern that this would exclude schools in rural areas. Similarly, there was a division between those that said universities should spread their sponsorship across many schools, and those that said the benefits would be greater if universities each focus on a small number of schools.

Socio-demographic factors

A number of respondents asked that socio-demographic factors should be taken into account when universities decide where to support school attainment. Whilst there was some recognition that it was important that no schools were overlooked, a focus on those schools with high proportions of FSM pupils, low progression to higher education, and low income was suggested by some.

The expertise of the university

A similar proportion of respondents mentioned the importance of universities aligning the support they offer to their specific areas of expertise. However, some respondents also said that identifying areas in which universities can usefully support schools needed to be a two-way process, with the schools playing an important role in identifying the most appropriate and worthwhile areas. A number of respondents suggested that these areas of specialisation might not always be academic subjects. For example, they could include curriculum design, financial planning or mentoring pupils, if these were areas that the university could offer needed expertise or capacity.

The local economy

A small number of respondents cited the importance of taking the local economy into account when deciding how school attainment should be supported. In some cases, this might be by encouraging students to study subjects that are in short-supply. In others this could be by using their links with local industries to help schools engage with employers or to create opportunities for apprenticeships or vocational courses.

Other comments

Outside of the specific questions asked above, a significant number of respondents used the forum of the consultation to raise concerns about higher education institutions being required to sponsor schools and support attainment in schools.

A large number of respondents were concerned that university staff do not have the necessary skills to either set up or sponsor a schools in the state system. This view was particularly prevalent among respondents currently working in a school. These respondents accepted that universities can offer value in non-classroom based support such as career advice, support with facilities, and some advanced subject expertise, but were cautious about their knowledge of how best to teach primary or secondary aged school children. Moreover, some were also concerned that a higher education framework is not a suitable framework or path for all learners, and thus should not be assumed to be beneficial for all school contexts.

Some respondents from within the higher education sector were concerned that the policy of sponsoring a state school or establishing a new school should not be a condition of access to higher fees. Whilst they supported the value of sponsorship, they raised some caution that prioritisation of sponsorship, above other forms of engagement in the school sector, might have negative unintended consequences on those students who benefit from other school engagement activity.

Furthermore, a small number of respondents expressed opposition to tuition fees; however, it was not clear in many cases whether this opposition related to tuition fees in general or to the policies proposed in the consultation.

5. Selective schools

Overview

Respondents were asked to consider how the government could best support the expansion of selective schools to ensure they contribute to increased numbers of good and outstanding non-selective school places. This included consideration of conditions that might be attached to expansion of selective schools and the monitoring frameworks that could accompany expansion.

The consultation received a number of suggestions for how the Government could best support new or expanding selective schools. The most commonly cited included requests for increased funding to support the costs of selective schools expanding or any potential non-selective schools seeking to transition to selective status, and for processes which offer appropriate oversight to ensure that expansions take place in the right areas that are in need of additional good school places and where demand is high.

Of the proposals presented in the consultation document, respondents were most favourable towards the requirement for any new and expanding selective schools to take a proportion of pupils from lower income households. Moreover, some went further, suggesting that conditions should be in place to ensure that admissions processes are effective at capturing true ability, and that any new selective schools should be targeted in area of high social deprivation.

This appetite for greater access to selective schools from those from lower-income households, and for fairness in selection based on ability, was further demonstrated in the discussion on what proportion of pupils should be from lower-income households. Moreover, respondents suggested that the locations of any new or expanding selective schools should be informed by measures of deprivation, exam results, and the opinion of local stakeholders (including parents).

However, there was less consensus on whether sanctions would be an effective approach to encourage selective schools to play a significant contribution to improving standards in non-selective schools.

Respondents were also asked whether any new conditions asked of new and expanding selective schools should also apply to existing selective schools. Though a majority of respondents stated that it was important to have effective mechanisms to enforce these requirements, others expressed a preference for a more flexible and adaptive approach which did not enforce requirements on schools.

Outside of the specific questions asked above, a significant number of respondents used the forum of the consultation to raise concerns about selection within schools per se. This included objections to the expansion of selective schools, concern about the accessibility

and impact of selective schools, and requests for government resource to instead be focused on supporting all schools.

Question 15: How should we best support existing grammars to expand?

Question 16: What can we do to support the creation of either wholly or partially new selective schools?

Question 17: How can we support existing non-selective schools to become selective?

There were 3,086 responses to question 15. Of these, nine referenced an earlier answer and a further 68 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 3,009 valid responses.

There were 2,939 responses to question 16. Of these, 154 referenced an earlier answer and a further 83 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 2,702 valid responses.

There were 2,819 responses to question 17. Of these, 324 referenced an earlier answer and a further 114 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 2,381 valid responses.

There was considerable overlap between the responses to questions 15-17. However, a number of these submissions did not respond directly to the question of how this policy can be best facilitated. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

The suggestions received in response to these questions fall into six broad categories – some of which focus on how best to deliver the proposals detailed elsewhere in the consultation document, rather than specific support to schools. In order of occurrence, these were:

- **Funding:** this was most commonly cited in connection with the need to fund new buildings and facilities, but also to help subsidise transport and attract good quality teachers. Some also requested an improved process for receiving funds with minimal lag; others suggested a transition period to help bridge funding. Some respondents noted the £50million of additional funding a year to support the expansion of existing grammar schools, but also suggested that this might need to be higher in order to meet demand. The need for funding was most commonly cited in reference to supporting expansion and the creation of new selective schools.

- Evidencing need for places: a large number of participants suggested that new selective schools should be facilitated only where there is a local need and clear demand from parents – for example where there is particular pressure on the number of school places. Respondents expected the government to ensure that there was a clear business case for expansion in each case; some respondents further expressed a preference that new selective schools should be opened only in areas of social deprivation.
- Improved selection processes, to increase confidence that admission tests accurately capture real, rather than tutored, academic ability. Some respondents expressed concern that it is currently too easy for pupils from wealthy families to receive tutoring to help them pass entrance examinations. Others asked that admissions rules prescribe a minimum number of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.
- Consultation: a smaller group of respondents urged for greater involvement of parents and the wider local community in deciding how and where selective schools may be introduced; however, it was unclear how the government should best facilitate this.
- Help with teaching and recruitment: some respondents also urged further action to recruit and train teachers as they suggested this was necessary to support expansion.
- Amendments to catchment areas: others suggested that the current catchment area system needs to change. However, though some respondents requested expansion to existing catchment areas to widen access beyond potentially wealthy areas, those in favour of establishing selective schools in areas of deprivation suggested that the catchment areas may need to be restricted to ensure they benefit the immediate local area. Discussion of catchment areas was particularly relevant for new selective schools and existing non-selective schools wishing to become selective.

Question 18: Are these the right conditions to ensure that selective schools improve the quality of non-selective places?

Question 19: Are there other conditions that we should consider as requirements for new or expanding selective schools, and existing non-selective schools becoming selective?

There were 4,257 responses to question 18. Of these, 122 referenced an earlier answer and a further 134 stated ‘no answer’ or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 4,001 valid responses.

There were 4,227 responses to question 19. Of these, 122 referenced an earlier answer and a further 134 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were 3,641 valid responses.

There was considerable overlap between the responses to questions 18 and 19. However, a significant minority of these submissions did not respond directly to the questions posed about what appropriate conditions might be for new selective schools. Other comments are discussed further at the end of the chapter.

The consultation outlined five potential conditions which could be applied to new or expanding selective schools in order to increase the number of good and outstanding places in non-selective schools. These were to:

- Take a proportion of pupils from lower income households.
- Establish a new non-selective secondary school.
- Establish a primary feeder in an area with higher density of lower income households to widen access.
- Partner with an existing non-selective school within a multi-academy trust or sponsor a currently underperforming and non-selective academy.
- Ensure that there are opportunities to join the selective school at different ages.

Response to specific proposals outlined in the consultation

Of those who stated support for the proposals outlined in the consultation, the most commonly supported proposal was taking a proportion of pupils from lower income households. This was seen by many to present a reasonable opportunity for social mobility – reflecting the spontaneous mentions for a similar proposal at questions 15-17. However, some expressed a preference for selection to be based purely on ability, regardless of household income.

The second most commonly cited proposal was the suggestion to ensure that there are opportunities to join selective schools at different ages. Most respondents commenting on this proposal were largely unconvinced about how this would work in practice, especially at the age of 14, which sits outside a more traditional window in which pupils move schools. Some were concerned that it would be difficult for schools acting at capacity to cater for new pupils at his midpoint; others asked whether underperforming pupils from selective schools would lose their places as a result. Furthermore, a number also expressed concern that it may not be fair for non-selective schools to lose their most able students at 14 and 16.

Furthermore, concern about the proposal for any new or expanding selective schools to establish new schools centred around limited capacity among selective schools to oversee the launch/expansion of two schools at the same time.

A smaller number of respondents commented on the proposals to introduce feeder schools and closer partnership working, with mixed opinion. Though some expressed optimism that feeder schools in areas with lower-income households would raise aspirations among pupils and families, others perceived that this might restrict the extent to which selective schools could be truly open to all pupils based on ability, and potentially distort admissions. Some were also concerned about the impact on other local primaries, and on the local area – such as increases in the house prices of those in the catchment area of feeder primary schools.

Some respondents were able to point to a number of positive partnerships already in place between selective and non-selective schools, and emphasised the potential positive outcomes from shared working – for example, this could include shared teaching resources, curriculum planning, and support with university applications. Others, particularly school staff, were more sceptical about whether staff at selective schools have the right skills to support teachers in an underperforming academy – this is discussed further at the end of the chapter.

Other suggested conditions

In addition to the proposals outlined in the consultation, the consultation received over 900 suggestions for other conditions for any new or expanding selective schools. In order of occurrence, these included:

- Requests for improvements to the admissions tests to ensure that they are more tutor-proof and the best possible judge of natural ability. Some also asked for schools to be more transparent in the results to help measure the tests' effectiveness.
- An increased focus on equality of access for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Some respondents voiced concerns that the expansion of selective schools would disadvantage those with SEND. It was suggested there should be conditions to ensure that high achieving SEND pupils have equal access to selective schools.
- Aligned to requests to take a proportion of pupils from lower-income households, some respondents also suggested that new selective schools should be targeted in areas of social deprivation.
- Requests to remove other financial barriers to accessing selective schools, such as the cost of school uniform, transport and excursions.

Question 20: What is the right proportion of children from lower income households for new selective schools to admit?

A total of 5,274 responses were received to this question. Of these responses, 189 referenced an earlier answer and a further 215 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to

comment. As a result, there were 4,870 valid responses. Some of these submissions did not respond directly to the question. These comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Proportionate to number of lower income households in area

A large proportion of respondents said that the number of pupils from lower income households admitted to new selective schools should be proportionate to the number of pupils from lower income households in the school's catchment area. Some respondents suggested this approach would ensure a nationwide benchmark would not result in pupils from lower income households being under-represented in certain areas of the country.

Suggested proportions of pupils from lower income households

Of those respondents who gave a suggestion for the proportion of pupils who should be admitted from low-income households, the most frequently given response was that 100% of pupils admitted to new selective schools should be from lower income households. A smaller subset of respondents said that between 75-90% of pupils should be from lower income households. In many cases, these respondents were opposed to new selective schools in general, and said they would be supportive only if they were made available almost exclusively to lower income pupils.

A still smaller proportion said that around half of all pupils admitted to new selective schools should be from lower income households. A similar proportion said that a smaller proportion of pupils – between 10 and 40% – should be from lower income households. In the vast majority of cases, where proportions were given, these were not further justified by respondents.

No restriction on basis of income

A large proportion of respondents felt that there should be no set restriction on the proportion of pupils admitted on the basis of their household income. There was a wide variety of reasons for holding this opinion:

- Academic merit should be the only criterion: Some said that selection should be based on academic ability only, and that such requirements defeated the object of selective schools.
- Disadvantage is subjective: some shared concern that any attempt to measure disadvantage (including through income) would be subjective and therefore there should be no attempt to impose a restriction.
- Quotas could lead to inappropriate admissions: there was concern that setting a target quota or benchmark could lead to pupils from lower income households being either inappropriately admitted to selective schools (where they did not have

the academic ability) or being excluded (where they had the ability but the quota of lower income households was already fulfilled).

- Setting benchmarks is unviable: Some respondents suggested that setting benchmarks would not work in practice. Due to regional variation, for example, in an area with low proportions of lower income households, pupils might be expected to travel inappropriate distances in order to meet a selective school's quota of lower income pupils.

Finally, a number of stakeholders mentioned the importance of ensuring there is a proper process of preparation and testing in place in primary schools. It was their opinion that this could even the playing field and help overcome some of the barriers to pupils from lower income households attending selective schools, and would therefore reduce the need to set quotas. The current system in Northern Ireland was mentioned as an example of how this could be put in practice.

Question 21: Are these sanctions the right ones to apply to schools that fail to meet the requirements?

Question 22: If not, what other sanctions might be effective in ensuring selective schools contribute to the number of good non-selective places locally?

A total of 1,363 responses were received to question 21. Of these, 110 referenced an answer to an earlier question and 211 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,042 valid responses. However, for both these questions, a large number of responses did not directly answer the question. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Those who did offer an opinion on the suitability of the proposed sanctions outlined in the consultation document were more likely to oppose than support the proposal.

There were three main reasons given for opposing the sanctions:

- Sanctions would not be effective: There was some feeling among school employees, maintained school governing bodies and parents/grandparents that the punitive nature of sanctions would be ineffective, or potentially even counter-productive in getting the biggest contribution from selective schools. This concern led these respondents to suggest that sanctions should not be used.
- Instead, an investigative and supportive approach was suggested by some. This sentiment was most apparent among respondents who worked in the education sector.

- Sanctions would lead to risk-averse schools: some respondents said that, when schools are asked to innovate or take a new approach, failures are to be expected and putting sanctions in place could lead to risk-averse schools that take a narrow approach to education. As such, sanctions were perceived by some not to be an appropriate mechanism to improve education.
- Sanctions do not go far enough: conversely, a small number of respondents did not feel that the proposed sanctions were severe enough. Some were concerned that some schools may accept the sanctions rather than operate in a more inclusive way. Others felt that it may be too difficult to fully monitor delivery against requirements of selective schools, and thus be able to identify where sanctions need to be applied.

At question 22, respondents were then asked which other sanctions might be effective in ensuring selective schools contribute to the number of good non-selective places. There were 1,153 responses to this question. Of these, 166 referenced an answer to an earlier question and 213 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 774 valid responses.

The most frequently mentioned alternative sanction was to impose fines, or to cut funding to schools that did not meet the proposed requirements. It was suggested by some respondents that this money should be redirected to other, non-selective, schools in the area.

As discussed earlier, there was also strong support for less punitive measures. A relatively high number of respondents suggested the use of incentives for meeting the requirements, and additional support for those who do not meet the requirements. These respondents felt that positive measures were more likely to have an impact than sanctions.

A relatively high number of respondents suggested that selective schools should be required to collaborate with non-selective schools. Moreover, in a small number of cases, maintained schools, school employees and parents/grandparents suggested that budgets should be pooled and academic results should be reported in aggregate.

Finally, some maintained schools, employees of schools, local authorities and parents/grandparents suggested that Ofsted ratings of selective schools should be dependent on them meeting these requirements; with those that failed to meet them unable to receive an outstanding rating. Others suggested that an Ofsted inspection should be triggered by a failure to meet the requirements.

Question 23: How can we best ensure that new and expanding selective schools and existing non-selective schools

becoming selective are located in the areas that need good school places the most?

A total of 4,484 responses were received to this question. Of these 299 referenced an answer to an earlier question and 229 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 3,956 valid responses. However, some submissions did not respond directly to the question. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

The largest group of respondents suggested that existing data should be used to ensure that any new selective schools were in areas that needed good school places the most. Three forms of data were frequently mentioned:

- Deprivation data: some respondents suggested that new selective schools be located in areas with the highest socio-economic deprivation. In many cases it was suggested that this should be assessed by the proportion of free school meal pupils in the area.
- School performance: some respondents suggested that new selective schools be located in areas where existing schools have low exam results or low Ofsted ratings.
- Demand for school places: some respondents suggested that new selective schools only be opened where current schools are oversubscribed or where population projections suggest that additional secondary school places will be needed in the future.

Another frequent suggestion was that various stakeholders – particularly schools, local authorities and parents – should be consulted to ascertain where selective schools should be located. It was seen to be important that good school places should be available within an appropriate distance from all pupils. A number of respondents mentioned the importance of achieving this in northern England and in rural areas.

Finally, a substantial proportion of respondents commented that it might not be possible to ensure that new and expanding schools were located in the areas that need good school places.

Question 24: How can we best ensure that the benefits of existing selective schools are brought to bear on local non-selective schools?

A total of 2,035 responses were received to this question. Of these, 114 referenced an answer to an earlier question and 10 stated 'no answer' or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,819 valid responses.

Respondents' suggestions for ensuring the benefits of existing selective schools could be shared with non-selective schools fell into four main themes: collaboration; funding; teaching staff; and facilities.

- Collaboration between schools: of the themes mentioned, the most frequent was the suggestion that selective schools should partner with local non-selective schools to foster collaboration, rather than competition, between schools. It was suggested that this collaboration should include sharing of expertise, and training and curriculum planning, as well as collaboration involving the pupils, such as mentoring and pupil exchanges. Some respondents suggested these partnerships should be formalised by the formation of Multi Academy Trusts.

As well as partnerships with non-selective secondary schools, respondents suggested that selective schools should work with primary schools to identify gifted and talented pupils at an early age, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds who would otherwise be less likely to achieve entry to the selective-school.

- Collaboration between teaching staff: another frequently mentioned suggestion was that teaching staff should work across both selective and non-selective schools in the local area, either with the teaching of minority subjects, or via exchange or 'sabbatical' arrangements.
- Additional funding: it was suggested that funding would be needed to enable strong partnerships between schools, for example, to enable staff to be released to teach at another local school or to conduct outreach programmes with primary schools.
- Sharing facilities: finally, where selective schools have specialised facilities that are unavailable at the non-selective school, respondents suggested that these be shared. There were, however, some concerns about the practical feasibility of such arrangements due to difficulties with transport and timetabling.

In many cases, where respondents suggested ways in which benefits could be shared between schools, they emphasised that both non-selective and selective schools could benefit from collaboration. For example, respondents highlighted that non-selective schools often have expertise dealing with mental health, behavioural and pastoral issues that selective schools could learn from. By taking an approach to collaboration which emphasises the mutual benefits, respondents suggested that partnerships are likely to be more constructive, resilient and harmonious.

There were also frequent comments that selective schools were not necessarily in a position to support non-selective schools, purely by virtue of being selective. Similarly, many successful non-selective schools had much to offer both selective and non-

selective schools alike. Some respondents therefore suggested that the focus should be around successful schools – whether selective or non-selective – supporting underperforming schools to improve.

Question 25: Are there other things we should ask of selective schools to ensure they support non-selective education in their areas?

Just 1,522 responses were received to this question – significantly lower than for the previous question. Of these responses, 142 referenced an answer to an earlier question and 103 stated ‘no answer’ or felt unable to comment. As a result, there were 1,277 valid responses. However, a number of these submissions did not respond directly to the question. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Among those respondents who answered the question, suggestions followed similar themes to those raised at question 24. As previously, the most frequently suggested approach was to encourage collaboration among non-selective and selective schools. Suggestions included sharing of expertise, training and curriculum planning, as well as collaboration involving the pupils, such as outreach programmes, mentoring, teaching of minority subjects, and pupil exchanges.

The next most frequently mentioned theme concerned widening access to selective schools to more pupils from lower income households. In some cases, respondents suggested that selective schools should take a specific proportion of pupils from lower income households (as discussed at question 20). Some respondents went further, and suggested that selective schools should be proactively involved in outreach to these groups of pupils by collaborating with primary schools to identify academically able pupils from all backgrounds.

Finally, a relatively small number of respondents raised the importance of ensuring that selective schools provide appropriate provision for those with special educational needs and disabilities, or behavioural problems. There was some concern that these pupils might have limited opportunities to attend selective schools, regardless of their academic potential. As such, there was a suggestion that selective schools should be required to accept a certain proportion of these pupils to ensure they have equal opportunities.

Question 26: Should the conditions we intend to apply to new or expanding selective schools also apply to existing selective schools?

There were 1,270 responses to question 26. Of these, 113 referenced an earlier answer and a further 145 stated ‘no answer’ or felt unable to comment; as a result, there were

1,112 valid responses. However, a number of these submissions did not respond directly to the question. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Among those who directly answered the question, respondents were more likely to use language that suggested support rather than language that suggested opposition to applying any new conditions to existing selective schools.

Support

The most commonly cited reasons for support were fairness and consistency. Those in support requested that all selective schools be asked to fulfil the same requirements, and that they all be judged against the same criteria. Some stated that it would be particularly important to apply consistency across all locations, given that not all areas have an existing selective school. A smaller number expressed a preference for consistency across all selective schools, even though they disagreed with the initial conditions.

Opposition

Opposition to the proposal to apply new conditions to existing selective schools was for a number of different reasons. This included concern that it would be unfair to ask existing selective schools to retrospectively meet these conditions, and that doing so may risk current models for success which should not be tampered with. Others asked that conditions should not be forced upon schools as requirements; instead, partnerships between selective schools and non-selective schools should be encouraged and fostered based on mutual benefit to both parties. A smaller number of respondents were concerned about the potential amount of bureaucracy involved.

Other comments

Outside of the specific questions asked above, a significant number of respondents used the forum of the consultation to raise concerns about selection itself, and selective schools – many of whom did not give further detail.

Some disagreed with selection schools per se, and cited a preference that selective schools should not be expanded or should be closed. Specific objections to the expansion of selective schools centred around perceived concern with the accessibility of selective schools, the impact on other surrounding schools and children who are not able to attend, and requests for government resource to instead be focused on supporting non-selective schools.

Others were concerned that selective schools may not necessarily be better placed to support attainment in non-selective schools. Many of these respondents suggested that, in their view, non-selective schools may have as much, if not more, to offer selective schools than vice versa.

6. Faith Schools

Overview

The consultation asked respondents to consider a number of alternatives to the current policy of allowing new free schools to admit a maximum of 50% of their pupils on the basis of faith when oversubscribed. Respondents were also asked how else faith schools could provide a more diverse offer to parents, and how this could be monitored.

Respondents had mixed views as to whether the requirements stated in the consultation provided effective alternatives, some of which were widely misunderstood (such as the proposal to establish mixed-faith multi-academy trusts). There was additional concern for how these would work in practice, though the appointment of an independent director was seen as the least intrusive.

In addition to the proposals highlighted in the consultation, respondents suggested a number of other requirements and sanctions that could be considered to ensure faith schools deliver a diverse multi-faith offer. These included independent inspections and monitoring, new admissions policies, and enforcing government policies such as the mixed-faith curriculum.

In addition to the specific questions asked in the consultation, some respondents used the forum of the consultation to express opposition to faith schools per se. The most common such requests were to close all faith schools or reduce the number of faith schools.

Question 27: Are these the right alternative requirements to replace the 50% rule?

The consultation outlined four alternative requirements to replace the current policy which limits new free schools to admitting a maximum of 50% of their pupils on the basis of faith when oversubscribed:

- Prove that there is demand for school places from parents of other faiths (local consultations & signatures).
- Establish twinning arrangements with other schools not of their faith.
- Consider setting up mixed-faith multi-academy trusts, including becoming a sponsor for underperforming non-faith schools.
- Consider placing an independent member or director who is of a different faith or no faith at all on the governing body of new faith free schools.

There were 4,670 responses to question 27. Of these, 13 referenced an earlier answer and a further 125 stated 'no answer' or were unable to comment; as a result, there were

4,532 valid responses. However, a number of these submissions did not respond directly to the questions posed in the consultation. Other comments are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Prove that there is demand for school places from parents of other faiths

The consultation received most responses in relation to the requirement to prove demand for school places from parents of other faiths, or no faith, through signatures and local consultations. This was of particular interest to parents and guardians. Some respondents indicated that this could be a suitable approach to be integrated with other requirements like twinning and having an independent director/governors. However, some also shared a level of concern as to whether this would be popular, or appealing, to faith schools and if they would actually adopt this as a standalone requirement. Some were also concerned that the administration of this requirement could potentially be quite time consuming. Others expressed concern that this policy would not do enough to guarantee diversity, for example schools that meet this requirement may not cover a multi-faith curriculum and policies.

Some stakeholders asked for further clarity as to how this new requirement would align with other requirements that are already in place to prove local demand when establishing a new school.

Establish twinning arrangements

A smaller number of respondents commented on twinning arrangements, with mixed opinion. Respondents who used language that broadly suggested agreement with the proposal commented that it would help with pupils' exposure to other faiths and teachings; it could also potentially increase ethnic integration. Those who used language that broadly suggested disagreement raised concern that it could be a costly and highly resourceful initiative, and that it would need to involve the same level of commitment from both schools in order to make it work. Some of those who broadly disagreed with the requirement, questioned whether taxpayer money should be used to fund the twinning arrangements.

Mixed-faith multi-academy trusts

In response to the mixed-faith, multi-academy trusts, few respondents understood the distinction between mixed-faith academies/schools and mixed-faith, Multi-Academy Trusts. Respondents who misunderstood the distinction between mixed-faith academies and mixed-faith Multi-Academy Trusts instead expressed broad support for mixed-faith schooling. This is discussed further at the end of the chapter.

Those who did make the distinction, expressed mixed opinion about how well the proposal would work. Some shared concerns that governance could be difficult as one

faith school would likely have majority control. Others requested that mixed-faith Multi-Academy Trusts should be required to include a non-faith school within the trust, and that efforts are made to ensure that underperforming schools are not excluded.

Some stakeholders from representative faith-groups suggested that there is a lack of evidenced examples of mixed-faith Multi-Academy Trusts working, and cited previous examples with mixed results relating to faith. They further noted that, in their view, previous examples have provided some positive impact on pupils' skills, attitudes and perceptions; however, other examples had found it challenging to find suitable partners and had delivered limited impact on pupils' knowledge and understanding.

Independent member/director

A small number of respondents expressed that the introduction of an independent governor/board or even teachers to single faith schools has the potential to be a positive step for increasing diversity. Those who welcomed the suggestion felt that it would be a less intrusive move in changing the faith schools structure. Others suggested that there may be some barriers to implementation. For example, it would need more than one 'neutral' governor/teacher per faith school. It also meant that faith schools need to allow the independent personal into their school and take some element of control.

Some respondents also noted that the new independent governors/teachers would need a lot of support from the local authority, the government or other governors in order to be fully accepted and integrated into the single faith schools, and that it may take a long time for them to make the right impact on the curriculum.

Question 28: How else might we ensure that faith schools espouse and deliver a diverse, multi-faith offer to parents within a faith school environment?

There were 4,520 responses to question 28. Of these, 173 referenced to an earlier answer and a further 284 stated 'no answer' or were unable to comment; as a result, there were 4,063 valid responses. However, a large number of submissions did not respond directly to the questions posed directly in the consultation. Other comments are considered at the end of the chapter.

The consultation received a number of suggestions for alternative requirements to deliver a diverse multi-faith offer to parents. These could be broadly categorised into four broad areas: multi-faith, universal curriculum; independent inspections & monitoring; new admission process; and enforcement of government policies.

Multi-faith, universal curriculum

A large number of respondents suggested a more universal, multi-faith curriculum and teaching syllabus could be required, stating that this would provide reassurance that pupils will be exposed to different faiths at school. This was especially seen to be the case if there was oversight by regulatory bodies to monitor whether this was being taught.

Some commented that this was particularly important for Religious Education, where they argued a statutory curriculum should be in place across all state funded schools to ensure that it is taught in a balanced way they promoted critical thinking, which could lead to pupils having more respect and tolerance to others from different religious backgrounds.

Independent inspections & monitoring

Another common theme was the suggestion that an independent inspection process could be implemented. Some respondents expressed that Ofsted should adopt additional monitoring policies for faith schools to ensure they are including a more diverse curriculum and teaching syllabus and that it's not purely controlled by a single religious institution.

Admission policies

A further theme was to ensure that admissions policies for faith schools were clear and fair, and potentially more diverse. Some respondents suggested that this could be to include a more diverse, flexible range of criteria such as the needs of the community and pupil capabilities to widen consideration beyond faith; others suggested that it was important for third parties to help oversee the process.

Some respondents proposed that faith schools should potentially look at opening up their admissions to pupils who come from different household incomes (especially lower household incomes) as to increase diversity and give children more opportunities to interact with children from different backgrounds.

Enforce government policies

Several respondents commented on how the government should be more involved in supporting a more diverse, multi-faith approach to faith schools. Again, citing policies such as implementation of mixed-faith curriculum and syllabus, independent and effective monitoring and regulation, these respondents asked that the government take a more hands-on approach to ensuring that these tools are put in place. Some also suggested that local authorities could also play a role in effective monitoring of policy implementation.

Question 29: Are there other ways in which we can effectively monitor faith schools for integration and hold them to account for performance?

Question 30: Are there other sanctions we could apply to faith schools that do not meet this requirement?

Question 29 received 2,054 responses. Of these, 116 referenced to an earlier answer and a further 137 stated 'no answer' or were unable to comment; as a result, there were 1,801 valid responses.

Question 30 received 1,768 responses. Of these, 122 referenced to an earlier answer and a further 141 stated 'no answer' or were unable to comment; as a result, there were 1,505 valid responses. Furthermore, a number of all these submissions responded directly to options for effective monitoring and sanctions. Other comments are discussed further at the end of the chapter.

There was considerable overlap in response to these two questions. In line with responses to earlier questions, responses to these questions could be broadly categorised into four themes: independent inspections and monitoring; community alignment and involvement in monitoring; multi-faith, universal curriculum; and funding agreements and controls.

Independent inspections & monitoring

Across both questions, the most common response was for the implementation of an independent, mixed-faith inspection and monitoring approach that is more robust than the current system. Again, as noted previously, some also suggested that Ofsted could have additional responsibilities when inspecting faith schools. For example, this could include a re-focus of Leadership and Management inspections on community cohesion; feedback from pupils, parents and independent community representatives in relation to community cohesion and diversity; and additional time to consider school faith and inclusivity policies.

Some stated that more could be done to publish school data and the outcomes of inspections. This would raise awareness of diversity and help hold schools to account.

Community alignment & involvement in monitoring

A large number of respondents stated that more could be done to deliver closer partnership between schools and the local community – for example involving the community in discussions about appropriate catchment areas for a school.

Mixed-faith, universal curriculum

As mentioned above, a mixed-faith universal curriculum was again cited as a potential tool in monitoring diversity or applying sanctions. Some suggested this could extend in to specific requirements for inclusive assemblies of all religions.

Funding agreements & controls

A further suggestion among a smaller group of respondents was to align funding agreements to diversity. For example, some suggested that state funds could be restricted or reduced for faith schools if they do not look to become more diverse (social and religious diversity) with their admissions, community involvement, inspections and curriculums. In place of state funding, these respondents suggested that more funding could be provided privately from pupils and religious institutions if faith schools to not adhere to these new requirements.

Other comments

Outside of the specific questions asked above, some respondents used the forum of the consultation to raise opposition to faith schools and doubts about their contribution to the education system. Not all respondents provided further justification or clarification; however, specific objections to the existence of faith schools per se included a perceived concern that they could lead to divisions within the wider community, and that they do not contribute enough to multi-culturalism. Though some stated a preference for faith schools to be abolished, others within this group asked that they should not receive public sector funding.

However, some respondents communicated the merits of a mixed-faith schooling more widely. A number of respondents, mainly parents and guardians, stated that this is an effective approach to promote diversity, suggesting that mixed-faith schooling would improve the awareness and skills of pupils to understand and respect all faiths. Others also questioned whether there was a need to change the 50% rule. Stakeholders representing faith groups stated that faith schools are already welcoming and accommodate the local community as much as possible.

List of organisations which responded to the consultation

38 Degrees
3Di Associates
4 Elms Primary
Abbot's Hill School
Achievement for All
Achieving for Children
Al Ameen School
Alastair Clunie
Alconbury Primary School
Alderman Peel High School
Aldro School
All Saints' Academy Cheltenham
All Saints Primary School
All Saints, Hapton and St Andrew's
Federation
Alliance for Inclusive Education (ALLFIE)
Alsager School
Alternatives in Education
Altrincham Grammar School for Girls
Anglia Ruskin University
Ansford Academy
Anthony Hofler
Apex Primary School
Archway Chair of Governors
Arizona Christian School Tuition
Organization
Arnold Lodge School
Arts Council England
Association of Colleges
Association of Christian Teachers
Association of Directors of Children's
Services
Association of Educational Psychologists
Association of Muslim Schools UK
Association of School and College Leaders
(ASCL)
Association of Secondary Headteachers in
Essex
Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Ateres High School
Athersley North Primary School
Auriol Junior School
Baker Dearing Educational Trust
Balcarras
Banbury Constituency Labour Party
Barnabas in Schools
Barnard Castle School
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Barnswood Park
Bath Spa University
The British Association of Teachers of the
Deaf
BEBCMAT
Bedmond
Belfield Community School
Bellerive FCJ Catholic College
Bellerive FCJ Liverpool
Bentleywood high school
Bethersden
Bilton School
Bircham Dyson Bell
Birkbeck University of London
Birmingham City University
Birmingham Education Partnership
Bishop Douglass School
Bishop Fox's
Bishop Grosseteste University
Bishop Vesey's Grammar School
Bishop Wordsworth's School
Blackburn Chemicals Ltd
Blessed Thomas Holford Catholic College
Board of Deputies of British Jews
Bohunt Education Trust
Bolton School
Bournemouth School
Bournemouth University
Bowdon C or E Primary School
Boxgrove Primary School
Brent Council
Brent Schools Partnership
Brightside
Brine Leas school
British Humanist Association
British School of Alexandria
Brockhill Park Performing Arts College
Brooke Weston Trust
Brundall Primary
Brunel University London
Brushwood Junior School

Bruton School for Girls
 Buckinghamshire County Council
 Bucks Minority Education Concern
 Burlington Junior School
 Burlington Junior School
 Burnage Academy for Boys
 Burpham Primary School
 Bury CE High School
 Byron Court Primary School
 Cabot Learning Federation
 Cabot Learning Federation
 Cambridge Centre for Sixth form studies
 Cambridge University
 Cambridgeshire Secondary Heads
 CAMEL100 LIMITED
 Campaign for Real Education
 Canterbury Diocesan Board of Education
 Cardinal Hume Catholic School
 (Trinity Catholic MAT)
 Carnegie School of Education,
 Leeds Beckett University
 Carre's Grammar School
 CASE Europe
 Casterton College Rutland
 Catherine Dilnot
 Catholic Diocese of Northampton
 Catholic Education Service
 Catholic Independent Schools' Conference
 Catholic School
 Cawston Church of England Primary
 Academy
 CCHS
 Centre for Social Justice
 Chair of Gloucestershire Association of
 Secondary Heads
 Charities' Property Association
 Charity Commission for England and Wales
 Charity Tax Group
 Chellaston Academy
 Chelmsford County High School for Girls
 Chelmondiston CEVC Primary School
 Chelmsford County High School for Girls
 Cheltenham College
 Cheltenham Design Foundation
 Chesham Grammar School
 Cheshire East Council
 Cheshunt School
 Chislehurst School for Girls
 Chris Hodgkins
 Christ Church Academy
 Christian Concern
 Christian Schools Trust
 Christine Hutchinson
 Christ's College Finchley
 Christ's Hospital
 Chulmleigh Academy Trust
 Church of the Flying Spaghetti Monster
 Churston Ferrers Grammar School
 Cirencester Deer Park School
 City of Leicester NUT
 City of London Corp
 City of London Freeman's School
 Clacton County High School
 Claires Court Schools Ltd
 Clarendon Primary School
 Cllr Evelyn Carpenter
 Coast Academies
 Cobham Hall
 Codicote School
 Colchester County High School for Girls
 Collingwood College
 Compass School Southwark
 Comprehensive Future
 Confederation of British Industry
 Conservatoires UK
 Consilium Academies
 Coombe Girls' School
 CORE Education Trust
 Cornwall Council
 Costello School
 Cottenham Academy Trust
 Cottenham Village College
 Council for Higher Education in Art & Design
 (CHEAD)
 Court Moor School
 Coventry National Union of Teachers
 Coventry University
 Cranbrook School
 Creative Education Trust
 Crocels Community Media Group
 CSPTSA
 Cuddington Community Primary School
 Cumbria Association of Secondary Head
 Teachers
 CVMS
 Danes Educational Trust

Darenth Community Primary School
 Dartford Grammar School
 David Cutts
 David Nieper Ltd. and David Nieper
 Education Trust
 De La Salle School and Language College
 de Stafford School
 Independent State School Partnership Forum
 Department of Educational Studies,
 Goldsmiths
 Derbyshire County Council
 Derek and Eira Bowden
 Devizes School
 Devon County Council
 Devonport High School for Boys
 Diocese of Chelmsford Board of Education
 Diocese of Chichester
 Diocese of Norwich Education and
 Academies Trust
 Diocese of Westminster Education Service
 Division of Educational and Child Psychology
 Djanogly Learning Trust
 Dulwich College Preparatory School Trust
 Ltd
 Dunraven School
 Durham Johnston Comprehensive School
 Durham University
 Durrington High School
 Durrington Multi Academy Trust
 E-ACT
 East Berkshire College
 East Riding of Yorkshire NUT
 East Riding Voices in friendship (ERVIP)
 East Riding Voices in Partnership
 East Sheen Primary School
 East Sussex County Council
 Edgbaston High School
 Edge Hill University
 Edgewood Primary School
 Education and Children's Services Group of
 Prospect
 Education Datalab
 Education for Engineering (E4E)
 Education Policy Institute
 Education Services, Diocese of Hexham and
 Newcastle
 Elsley Primary School
 Elthorne Park High School
 Elveden C of E Primary Academy
 Epsom Primary and Nursery School
 Essex County Council
 Essex Primary Headteachers' Association
 Ewell Grove School
 Ex - Ringwood Comprehensive School
 Excellent Education for Everyone
 Fairisle Junior School, Southampton
 Family Matters
 Farlington School
 Farnham Heath End School

 Felsted School
 Field Studies Council
 Five Acres Primary School, Ambrosden
 Flowery Field Primary School
 Focus Learning Trust
 Folio Education Trust
 Forced Home Education
 Freedom and Autonomy for Schools National
 Association
 (FASNA)
 Frimley Church of England Junior School
 Fryent Primary School
 Fullbrook School
 Furze Platt Senior School
 George Abbot School, Guildford
 Gillotts School
 Girls Day School Trust
 Governing body Marist school West Byfleet
 GL Assessment
 Glascote Academy
 Gloria Brown
 Gloucestershire Comprehensive Heads
 Gloucestershire Schools Forum
 Godolphin and Latymer School
 Goldsmiths University
 Gordano School
 Gosforth Federated Academies Ltd
 Governing body of Woodhey High School
 Governor of Etz Chaim Jewish Primary
 school
 Grammar School Heads' Association
 Great Totham Primary School
 Greater London Authority - London Assembly
 Labour Group
 Greater Manchester Humanists
 GuildHE
 Haberdashers' Adams' Federation Trust

Haberdashers' Aske's Federation	Individual
Hammersmith and Fulham Council	Institute of Mathematics
Hampshire County Council	Institute of Physics
Hampstead School	IntoUniversity
Harper Adams University	ISC
Harris Westminster Sixth Form	ISCG Information for School and College
Harrow School	Governors
Hartismere	Iver Heath Infant School and Nursery
Harvey Road Primary School	James Coombs
Haybridge High School	Jewish Community Council
Hazel Grove Primary	Kaizen School
Head of Barnswood Park	Katharine Lady Berkeley's School
Headington School	Keele University
Headteachers' Roundtable	Keevil Church of England Academy
Hedon Primary School	Kelvin Hall
Helen Hopkins	Kendrick School
Helston Community College	Kenningtons Primary Academy
Henley in Arden School	Kent Catholic School Partnership
Henrietta Barnett School	Kent County Council
Hereford Sixth Form College	Kent Education Network
Hertfordshire Association of Secondary	Kenyngton Manor Primary School
Headteachers (HASSH)	Kesgrave High School
Herts and Essex High school	Kilburn Park Primary School
High Ham Primary	King Edward VI community school
High School for Girls, Gloucester	King Edward VI Grammar School,
Highams Park Academy Trust	Chelmsford
Hinchley Wood School	King Edward VI School
Holos Education	King Edward VII School, Sheffield
Holsworthy Community College	King Edward VII Science & Sport College
Holy Family Catholic Primary	King Ethelbert School
Hope House School	King's College School Wimbledon
Horndon-on-the-Hill C of E Primary School	Kingsacre Primary School
Horsforth School	Kingsnorth CEP
Hoyland Common Academy Trust	Kirkburton Middle School
Human Scale Education	Knole Academy
Huntspill federation	KULB collaboration
Icknield Walk First School	La Retraite RC Girls' School
Icoco foundation	Lady Eleanor Holles School
Ifield Community College	Lammas School
ihec ltd	Lancaster Girls' Grammar School
IMCGB	Lancaster University
Imperial College London	Langstone Junior School
Impetus-PEF	LB Waltham
Incorporated Society of Musicians	LBC Student Voice
Independent Parental Special Education	Leeds Beckett University
Advice (IPSEA)	Leeds City Council
Independent Researcher and Author	Leehurst Swan
Independent Schools Council	Legatum Institute

Leicester City Council
 Leicester Diocesan Board of Education
 Leicestershire County Council
 Liberal Democrat County Group
 Lightman Consulting
 Lingsfield C of E Infant School
 Lincoln Minster School
 Lincolnshire County Council
 Linda Rundle Associates Ltd
 Linton Village
 Linton Village College
 Little Gaddesden School
 LittleGaddesden Church of England
 Voluntary Aided Primary School
 Liverpool John Moores University
 LKMco
 Local Equal Excellent
 Local Government Association
 London Borough of Bexley
 London Borough of Hackney
 London Borough of Haringey
 London Borough of Hounslow
 London Borough of Tower Hamlets
 LBTH Educational Psychology Service
 London Diocesan Board for Schools
 London Football Journeys
 London Inter Authority
 London Mathematical Society
 London NE and Eastern Region Chairs of
 Headteacher Associations and
 Professional Officers
 London School for Islamic (N/A)
 London School of Economics and Political
 Science
 London South Bank University
 Long Ditton Infant and Nursery School
 Loughborough University
 LTE group
 Ludlow & Marches Humanist Group
 Maidenhill School
 Maidstone Borough Council
 Manchester City Council
 Mangotsfield CE VC Primary School
 governors
 Manningtree High School
 Manor High School
 March and Chatteris Heads' cluster
 Marjorie McClure special school
 Markazul Uloom
 Martin and Michelle Gardner
 Martins Wood Primary School
 Maryburgh FC
 Max Fishel
 Mayfield and Five Ashes Primary Schools
 McGuinness
 MediaTaylor
 Melksham oak community school
 Member of Parliament for Bath
 Mencap
 Merchant Taylors' School, Northwood
 Middlesbrough Borough Council
 Middlesex University
 Midsomer Norton Primary School
 Mike Henderson, the Chairman of Governors
 at
 Cranmore School
 Mile Cross Primary School
 MillionPlus, The Association for Modern
 Universities
 Mission Grove Primary School
 Morton CE Primary School
 Mount Grace
 Mrs MJ Breen
 Mundeford Community Infants School
 Mulberry School for girls
 Mytchett Primary School
 NAHT Darlington Branch
 NASUWT
 National Association for Jewish Orthodox
 Schools
 National Association for Primary Education
 National Association of Head Teachers
 National Association of Independent Schools
 and
 Non-Maintained Schools (NASS)
 National Association of Secondary Moderns
 National Association of Virtual School Heads
 (NAVSH)
 National Children's Bureau
 National Deaf Children's Society
 National Governors' Association
 National Grammar Schools Association
 (NGSA)
 National Network of Parent Carer Forums
 (NNPCF)
 National Secular Society (NSS)
 Neroche

Netley Primary School
New College Durham Academies Trust
New Hall School
New Schools Network
Newcastle Law Centre
Newcastle School for Boys
Newcastle University
Newcastle upon Tyne Royal Grammar School
Newman University
Newport Community Primary Academy
Newton Abbot Academy Trust
Newton Flotman Primary School
NFER
NITAVA
Noam Primary School
Norfolk County Council
Norfolk Humanists
North Bromsgrove High School
North East Humanists
North Tyneside
North Yorkshire County Council
Northamptonshire County Council
Northern Saints Church of England VA Primary
Northumbria University
Northwich
Notre Dame High, Norwich
Notre Dame High School Governing Body
Nottingham City Council
Nottingham Trent University
NSS
Nurture Group Netowrk
NUT
Oakthorpe Primary
Old Town Infant School & Nursery
Oldham Council
Oldham Council
Orchard Fields community School, Banbury, Governing Body
Ottershaw CofE Infant and Junior Schools
Ovalhouse
Oxford Gov
Oxfordshire Community Churches
Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire Governors' Association
Oxted School
Partnership for Jewish Schools

ParentFederation.UK
Parkside Community College
Parkside Federation Academies MAT
Parkstone Grammar School
Parmiter's School
Parrot
Pate's Grammar School
PDET - Loddington CE Primary School
PEEC Family Centre
Peel Park Primary School
Perfect English
Personal consultation response
Peter and Eve Hitchens
Pitsford School
Pittville School
Place2Be
Plantsbrook School
Politea
Pontefract Academies Trust
Porter
Portsmouth City Council
Portsmouth Parent Voice
Preston Manor School
Priory Sothsea
PS Gibb email
PTA UK
QEGS Blackburn
Queen Elizabeth Grammar School
Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Horncastle
Queen Elizabeth's High School
Queens Park Community School
Quintet Consulting
Ralph Allen School
Rather Nott
Ravensbourne
Reach 2 and Reach South
Reading Borough Council
Reading University
Reckleford Infant and Nursery School
Redcastle Family School
Redgate School
Redhill Academy Trust
Reform
Represent
Repton School
Rescue our Schools
Rhubarb Farm

Richard Challoner School
 Richard Zipfel
 Ripon Grammar School
 Riverbrisse Primary School
 Riverside Primary Academy
 RNIB
 Robert Carre Trust
 Rodown Trust
 Rogers M
 Roman Catholic Diocese of East Anglia
 Romeo and Juliet party
 Rosh Pinah primary school
 Rowdown Inspire to Aspire Foundation
 Roxeth Primary School
 Royal Academy of Music
 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
 Royal College of Music
 Royal Grammar School, High Wycombe
 Royal Holloway, University of London
 Royal Society
 Royal Society of Biology
 Royal Society of Chemistry
 Rt Hon Charles Clarke and Professor Linda Woodhead
 Rugby High School
 Rushey Mead Educational Trust
 Russell Group
 Rutland and District Schools' Federation
 Rydens Enterprise School and Sixth Form College
 Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School
 Saffron Academy Trust and CTSN
 Saint Gabriel's College
 Saint Martin's Catholic Academy
 Saint Olave's Grammar School
 Saltburn Learning Campus
 Salterlee Primary School
 Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
 Sarum Hall School
 SASH
 Scalby School
 School Improvement Liverpool Ltd
 School of Education, Communication and Society,
 King's College London
 SCHOOLS NorthEast
 Schoolworks Academy Trust
 Scottish Council of Independent Schools - SCIS
 SEC
 SEEC
 Seven Oaks
 Seven Sisters Primary School
 Sheffield Hallam University
 Shenfield High School
 Shenley Brook End School
 Shoeburyness high school
 Sholing Infant School
 Shoreham Village School
 Sibford School
 Sidmouth College
 Silverstone UTC
 Simon Balle All through school
 Simon de Senlis Primary School
 Sir Henry Floyd Grammar School/Insignis Academy Trust
 Sir John Lawes Academies Trust
 Sir John Lawes School
 Sir Thomas Rich's School
 Sir William
 Sixth form college
 Skerne Park Academy
 Skinners' School
 Slough Borough Council
 Social Finance UK
 Socialist Educational Association
 Somerset County Council
 SOS SEN
 SOUNDWORK Community Project
 South Craven School
 South Craven School
 South Lakes Federation
 South Shields SEA
 Southampton City Council
 Southend High School for Boys
 Southwark Council
 Southwark Diocesan Board of Education
 Special Ed
 Sphere Federation
 Springwell Learning Community
 Square Pegs Charity
 SSE - Governor Services
 St Albans Girls' School
 St Albans primary school
 St Albans School

St Andrew's (Woking) School Trust
 St Andrew's School
 St Anthony's Catholic Primary School
 St Anthony's Catholic Primary School
 Watford
 St Augustine's RC High School
 St Bernadette
 St Catherine's
 St Clement Danes School
 St Edmund Campion
 St Edmund Campion Catholic Primary
 School
 St Gabriel's School
 St Georges
 St George's, University of London
 St Hugh's Buckden Cambridgeshire
 St Ivo
 St James' Catholic High School
 St James' CE Junior School
 St James Primary School, Elstead
 St John Payne Catholic School
 St John Payne Catholic School
 St John the Baptist Catholic MAT
 St Lawrence Primary School, Effingham
 St Margaret Clitherow RC Primary School
 St Mark's Catholic School
 St Martin's Catholic Primary School
 Governors
 St Martins
 St Martin's C of E Voluntary Aided Schools
 St Martin's East Woodhay VA Primary
 School
 St Mary Redcliffe Church, Bristol. UK.
 St Mary's Catholic Primary School Bognor
 Regis
 ST Marys Primary school Shenfield
 St Mary's Roman Catholic Parish Leyland
 St Michaels Catholic High School
 St Paul's C.E Primary School Stockport
 St Paul's CofE Primary School
 St Peter's School, York
 St Polycarp's Catholic Primary School
 St Richards catholic college, Bexhill
 St Thomas More Secondary, Eltham
 St. Anne's RC primary
 St. Anselm's College
 St. Dunstan's Catholic Primary school
 St. Nicholas R.C. High School, Northwich,
 Cheshire
 St. Pauls catholic college
 St. Lukes Parish, Peterborough
 Staffordshire County Council
 Staffordshire University
 Stamford Green Primary School
 Stanton
 Stockport MBC
 Stone King LLP
 Stowmarket High School
 Stratford Girls' Grammar School
 Stratford-Upon-Avon School
 Suffolk Association of Secondary Head
 teachers
 Suffolk Secondary Heads
 Summerhill School
 Sunbury Manor School
 Surrey County Council
 Surrey Secondary Heads' Phase Council
 Sutton Coldfield Grammar School for Girls
 Sutton Trust
 Swakeleys School for Girls
 Swindon Borough Council
 Synergy Trust
 Talking Walking
 Tatsfield Primary School
 Teach First
 Teaching Schools Council
 Ted Cattle
 Ted Cattle CBE, The iCoCo Foundation
 Ted Wragg MAT, Diocese of Exeter
 Education Division,
 Acorn MAT
 Teesside University
 Telford and Wrekin Council
 Testing Faith
 The Angmering School
 The Association of Orthodox Jewish Schools
 and
 Organisations Ltd
 The
 Athelstan
 Trust
 The Bishops' CofE and RC Primary School
 The Boswells School
 The Brent Schools Partnership
 The Brent Teaching School Alliance Partners
 The Bridge Group
 The British School of Alexandria

The Castle Partnership Trust
 The Challenge
 The Chilton Group
 The Christian Institute
 The Church of England Education Office
 The Communication Trust
 The Compton
 The Compton School
 The Crypt School
 The Dartmoor Federation
 The Edge Foundation
 The Elliot Foundation Academies Trust
 The Elmgreen School
 The Fair Education Alliance
 The Fallibroome Academy
 The Faulkner Family
 The FitzWimarc School
 The Geographical Association
 The Godolphin and Latymer School
 The Green Party of England and Wales.
 The Haberdashers' Company
 The Hall School
 The Harpur Trust
 The Hawthorns School
 The Henrietta Barnett School
 The Hereford Academy
 The Hertfordshire and Essex High School
 The Howard of Effingham School
 The Howard Partnership Trust
 The Independent Schools Association
 The Interlink Foundation
 The Joseph Rowntree Foundation
 The Kent Catholic Schools' Partnership
 The King David High School
 The King's School, Witney
 The Leys and St Faith's Schools Foundation
 The Methodist Church in Britain
 The Mirfield Free Grammar and Sixth Form
 Multi-Academy Trust
 The More House Foundation
 The National Autistic Society
 The National Education Opportunities
 Network (NEON)
 The National Foundation for Educational
 Research (NFER)
 The National Secular Society
 The Olympus Academy Trust
 The Open University
 The Reddings Primary School
 The Royal Borough of Kensington and
 Chelsea
 The Royal College of Speech and
 Language Therapists
 The Schools of King Edward VI in
 Birmingham
 The Sigma Trust
 The Southfield Grange Trust
 The SpringBoard Bursary Foundation
 The Swinton High School
 The Three Rivers Learning Trust
 The Tiffin Girls' School
 The UCL Academy
 The University of Bath
 The University of Leeds
 The University of Liverpool
 The University of Manchester
 The Village School
 The Warwick School
 The Worcester Christian Education Trust. -
 The River School
 The Worshipful Company of Merchant
 Taylors
 Thirsk School and Sixth Form College
 Thomas
 Thomas Keble School
 Thomas Knyvett College
 Thomas Tallis School
 Thorpe Hall School
 Tiffin School
 Tilian Partnership
 Tinline
 TISCA
 Tomlinscote School and Sixth Form College
 Torquay Girls' Grammar School
 Trent Academies Group
 Trill
 Tring School
 Trinity School
 Trumps Green Infant School
 Truro School
 Trust in Learning (Academies)
 TUC
 Twyford Multi Academy Trust
 UCAS
 UCL (University College London)
 UCL Institute of Education

Unison
 United Syangogue
 United Westminster Schools
 United Westminster Schools and The Grey Coat
 Hospital Foundation
 Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)
 Universities UK
 University Alliance
 University and College Union
 University of Bedfordshire
 University of Birmingham
 University of Brighton
 University of Buckingham
 University of Cambridge
 University of Derby
 University of East Anglia
 University of East London
 University of East London
 University of Essex
 University of Exeter
 University of Hertfordshire
 University of Kent
 University of Leicester
 University of Manchester
 University of Nottingham
 University of Oxford
 University of Plymouth
 University of Portsmouth
 University of Reading
 University of Sheffield
 University of Southampton
 University of Sunderland
 University of Sussex
 University of the West of England, Bristol
 University of Warwick
 University of Winchester
 University of York
 University of York
 Uphill Primary School
 Uppingham School
 Urmston Grammar
 Various
 Voice
 Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
 Wallace Fields Junior School
 Wallingford Schools Academy Trust
 Waltham Forest Council
 Walthamstow School for Girls
 Wandsworth Borough Council
 Wandsworth SCITT
 Warner G
 Watford Area Humanists
 Watford Grammar School for Boys
 Watford Grammar School for Girls
 Wellcome Trust
 West Education Ltd
 Westcliff High School for Boys
 Westminster North Conservatives
 Westwood Primary School
 Weydon
 Weydon school
 Which
 Whitburn Church of England Academy
 Whitecross Hereford, High School and Specialist Sports College
 Whitecross High School Hereford
 Whitwick Schools Governors
 Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council
 William Ellis School
 William Scott
 Wilson's School
 Windsor Academy Trust
 Winton Primary School
 Wirral Grammar School for Girls
 Woking High School Governing Body
 Wolverhampton Grammar School
 Wonersh and Shamley Green CofE Primary School
 Woodkirk Academy
 Woodseats primary school
 Worcester Diocesan Board of Education
 Wycombe DEnvironment Centre
 Wycombe High School
 Wymondham College
 Xavier catholic Education Trust
 Yavneh College Academy Trust
 Young Enterprise
 Young Minds

© Crown copyright 2017

This 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/publications