



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH



Consultation on the Proposal to Amalgamate
Squirrels Heath Infant and
Squirrels Heath Junior Schools
into a Single Primary School
from 1 September 2025

<u>Section</u>	<u>Heading</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1	Introduction	3
Section 2	Consultation Process	3
Section 3	Consultation Response	4
Section 4	Conclusion and Next steps	20
Section 5	Survey Demographics	21
Appendix 1	Consultation Stakeholder List	25

Section 1: Introduction

The London Borough of Havering's view is that 'all-through primary schools (infant and junior school aged children in one primary school), deliver better continuity of learning as the model for primary phase education in Havering. Therefore, we will aim to move towards this model of a single primary either through amalgamation or federation instead of separate Infant and Junior Schools where it is practical to do so if an opportunity arises.

As the Head Teacher of Squirrels Heath Infant School is relocating at the end of the summer term, this provides a natural opportunity to review the organisation of the school and to consider the needs of current and future pupils. Whatever the decision regarding the future of the school, the certainty is that there will be change in the school, which is inevitable when there is a change in leadership.

As the Head Teacher of Squirrels Heath Infant School is relocating, the Local Authority has decided to consult on a proposal to amalgamate Squirrels Heath Infant and Junior Schools into a single primary school (age 4 -11) from September 2025.

The Local Authority is aware of concerns regarding school reorganisation; as local communities see a school as being at the heart of the community and sometimes any proposed change may often be contentious. Taking this into account, the Local Authority will have regard to existing local arrangements and seek to avoid leaving existing schools without links on which they have previously depended, whilst ensuring that its vision for every child to reach their potential by having a good start and reaches the highest possible standard in their education.

Section 2: Consultation Process

The consultation process covered by this report ran from 24 February 2025 to 24 March 2025. The objective was to inform and gather views regarding the proposal from key stakeholders, particularly parents/carers of pupils and staff at both Squirrels Heath Infant School and Squirrels Heath Junior School, the school's governing bodies and other schools within the borough.

An electronic copy information booklet about the consultation proposal, process and a feedback questionnaire was made available as part of the online consultation feedback, published via Citizen Space, the Local Authorities dedicated consultation system. Emails informing key stakeholders which included the link to the online consultation were circulated to as many stakeholders as possible including all the borough schools, special schools, ward members, MPs, Church Diocesan representatives, all early years provision and unions; all were encouraged to respond online via the Havering Citizen Space or by sending an email to the school on any specific questions on the proposal. *Appendix 1* contains a full list of the stakeholders who were emailed, notifying them of this consultation.

A public notice of the consultation exercise together with the consultation document was also posted on both Squirrels Heath Infant School and Squirrels Heath Junior School websites throughout the consultation period.

Section 3: Consultation Response

This section of the report summarises the responses received from the consultation questionnaire. The questionnaire provided an opportunity for consultees to respond to specific questions regarding the proposal as well as allowing for general comments.

In total, **83** responses were received electronically. The categories of the respondents according to the role they defined on the questionnaire are shown below;

Questions 1: Are You?

Option	Total	Percent
A parent/carer of a pupil at Squirrels Heath Infant School	35	42.17%
A parent/carer of a pupil at Squirrels Heath Junior School	11	13.25%
A parent/carer of a pupil at another School	2	2.41%
Teacher/other staff at Squirrels Heath Infant School	16	19.28%
Teacher/other staff at Squirrels Heath Junior School	2	2.41%
Teacher/other staff in another school	3	3.61%
Governor at Squirrels Heath Infant School	1	1.20%
Governor at Squirrels Heath Junior School	1	1.20%
Governor at another school	5	6.02%
Local resident	1	1.20%
Other	6	7.23%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Question 2: Do you support our proposal to amalgamate Squirrels Heath Infant School and Squirrels Heath Junior School, resulting in a single primary school being established?

83 responses were received in respect of the proposed Amalgamation, of this:

- 69.88% were in favour of the proposal (58 respondents)
- 30.12% were not in favour of the proposal (25 respondents)

The table below shows the responses for and against received for each category of respondent.

Respondent	No	Yes
A parent/carer of a pupil at Squirrels Heath Infant School	12	23
A parent/carer of a pupil at Squirrels Heath Junior School	3	8
Teacher/other staff at Squirrels Heath Infant School	9	7
Teacher/other staff at Squirrels Heath Junior School		2
Governor at Squirrels Heath Infant School		1
Governor at Squirrels Heath Junior School		1
A parent/carer of a pupil at another School		2
Teacher/other staff in another school		3
Governor at another school	1	4
Local resident		1
Other		6

Please state why you support/do not support the proposal:

There were **61** responses to this part of the question.

Respondents were invited to comment or raise questions for or against the amalgamation proposal.

Some of the comments received in support of the proposal cited the following reasons:

Good for the community. Consistency for the children and parents.
Financially more viable - improved economies of scale Increased flexibility and better use of estate Provides improved continuity in education for pupils- easier to plan for progression
I think it is a good idea for both schools to be 'singing from the same hymn sheet' for the benefits of all staff, parents, governors, but most importantly - the children. I think it is an excellent and exciting opportunity for the future of the school. It allows consistency for everyone.

I have always felt it disjointed having the two schools be totally separate. I have two children, one who has moved all the way through both schools and is now in secondary, and the second who is currently in year 5. I think merging the schools would be very positive and logical. Indeed, the separation between the two has been my main issue over the years with the schools - they have always felt totally separate and, dare I say it, at odds with one another. Strangely competitive against each other, with quite different approaches. They do not communicate at all which has made it very difficult as a parent, particularly when I had one child in the infants and one in the juniors (school photograph day for example. I have never had a single photograph of my two children together, because they have always used different companies and had their photograph days on different dates).

As a parent who had a child at the infant school and a child at the junior school a combined approach may help with transitions to older years and be logically more straight forward.

It would be a more cohesive environment with more opportunities for meeting the needs of more/less able students within the curriculum

I won't have to reapply to send my children to junior school. There will be no transitional worries, and no upset of "leaving school".

I support Primary model, but caveat this with a concern about any potential loss of teacher jobs, which the NASUWT would not support. I expect that the school and Havering Education Department will fully consult on any proposed restructure.

Consistency of leadership through the school year groups. Consistency of learning objectives and goals throughout the childrens' schooling, same ethos and administration through from Reception to Year 6

More consistency for pupils across the two key stages. Parents able to 'know' the school better rather than having different arrangements across the two key stages - especially if they have children in both schools. Certainty of admission to the KS2 phase without application removes another uncertainty and task for families. More opportunities for staff development. The benefits for pupils, parents and staff must be the main focus.

Consistency throughout primary education and will make transitions from year to year easier.

Really worried that after many many years of working hard in the infants that we may be pushed out of our jobs or under valued. I enjoy my job so much and do feel very stressed.

The infant school allows the younger children to be children and develop their learning through play. As they move into year 1 and then year 2 they can build their confidence in an environment where they are not overwhelmed or intimidated by the older students.

As a member of staff in the infant school, it feels although we have been given no choice but to be 'taken over' by the junior school. There is no control regarding recruitment of a headteacher.

A positive benefit for the children, staff, parents and the community as a whole with continuous provision and learning from Reception to Year 6.

Issues, comments and questions received against the proposal are as shown in the table below with the Local Authority's / School response to the issues / concerns:

Questions and Comments	Local Authority / School response
Because it works as it is	The amalgamation will merge the strengths of both schools to improve outcomes for children and staff in areas like curriculum, assessment, consistency, and a unified vision, if approved.
<p>There has been a clear divide between the schools since Mrs Shipton started. Despite conversations around collaboration and doing things jointly, this has never happened. The huge staff turnover at the junior school concerns me as it suggests that staff are unhappy working at the junior school. Having worked in Havering for a number of years, along with being a governor, I know that when schools amalgamate it is always the school that is taken over that loses out. The last two amalgamations in Havering were not successful for the school taken over and this is my main concern. The proposal states that you recommend that the Governing Board reconstitute so that there is Infant representation, but a recommendation means nothing.</p> <p>I would like to know how a fair process will be adhered to if redundancies/restructures take place. If a staff member from each school went for one job, how will SHJS ensure that infant staff have a fair crack at the whip at getting the post. Having read up on amalgamations in this borough and other LA's, I think that unless you bring in a fresh Head Teacher, you are basically sending the staff of the school being taken over into a fight to keep their jobs and cause stress and uncertainty for them</p>	<p>We understand the concerns regarding the perception of a takeover by the junior school. The Local Authority is committed to ensuring that the new Governing Body includes representation from both schools to provide a balanced governance structure. This integration will be facilitated through a formalised process that prioritises the inclusion of experienced governors who understand the unique needs and strengths of the infant school.</p> <p>We understand the concerns that staff may have regarding the amalgamation process, especially given past experiences at other schools. Our priority is to ensure that this transition is as smooth as possible for all staff members. We are committed to fostering a positive working environment and providing ample support and resources to address any challenges that may arise. Open communication and engagement with staff will be key to navigating this process successfully.</p>
I am a SEN TA and know all of the children that I can be called upon to help. We have built really good relationships I am concerned that the children, particularly the non verbal ones are going to be scared of being in a larger school with many staff and children that they don't know.	<p>There will be no physical change to the school premises with pupils remaining in their respective infant and junior areas.</p> <p>Key Stage 1 pupils will continue to be taught in the Infants building under the supervision of key stage 1 staff and Key</p>

<p>We have pupils that are “runners” I am concerned that they will have access to both buildings,</p>	<p>stage 2 pupils will continue to be taught in the junior building under the supervision of key stage 2 staff</p>
<p>Special Needs Education is very important, the merge would potentially impact on the quality of teaching and care offered to children.</p> <p>Funds should be improved for education across the spectrum, to offer more opportunities to young children to thrive in their own education potential.</p>	<p>There is no change in the revenue funding in terms of High Needs funding or SEN budget. So no implications of this amalgamation proposal on SEN budgets. The support and continuity will be much smoother in a single school. It is expected that there will be a stronger, more consistent and seamless transition as pupils move through the school and this is one the main benefits for pupils with SEND as there will be an early oversight by either one or two SENCOs in a single school. Staff terms, condition of employment remains the same so they will continue in their roles in the new school.</p> <p>The SEND, 1:1 support and services which currently exists in the two schools will continue in the primary school as it is the right of the children to have it. Havering prides itself as an inclusive borough and that is the borough wide ethos and so it is expected that all schools support an inclusive culture within their school. So as it is a strong practice within the infant school, it is likewise in the junior school. And we expect to see the same in the primary school if the proposal is approved</p>
<p>As a former parent of both schools and now member of staff in the infant school I find it works well as separate schools.</p> <p>I have no faith in the head teacher of the junior school and from a parents perspective if the proposal went ahead it should have a totally new head and not the existing one. We as parents were totally let down by the junior school during lock down and children suffered due to this. Yet the SLT of the infants went above and over beyond to accommodate the children as well as the staff.</p>	<p>The LA acknowledges staff insecurity due to the proposed change but there is no direct impact on teaching, class support and ancillary staff as a result of this amalgamation. It is worth pointing out that the size of the school, number of pupils and classes will remain the same and currently there is very clear understanding of the number of teachers, support staff, administrative staff that are required for the two schools to operate separately. The school size will</p>

<p>Have been know to the school for over 21 years I think they work well as separate school and fear for job if it was to be amalgamated</p>	<p>remain the same if they amalgamate to be a primary, therefore, the staffing requirements wouldn't be different.</p>
<p>Whilst I support the overall premise of the proposal I do have concerns in the reduction of funding over time. Even accounting for economies of scale a 70% (and potentially more reduction) seems like it a way too high of a reduction for an already underfunded school. How has this figure been derived and what evidence is placed behind it? Such a large reduction makes this whole exercise seem solely like a money saving endeavour rather than actually considered to be for the good of the school and its pupils.</p>	<p>School budgets are dependent on a number of factors, of which pupil numbers and characteristics are the key drivers in respect of the funding calculation.</p> <p>As part of the amalgamation, the factor that is affected is the Lump Sum. Presently the Infant and Junior School, each receive a lump sum to support the costs for the structure for each school.</p> <p>Should the amalgamation proceed, then the Primary school will receive protection in respect of the lump sum for a three year period as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 2025/26 financial year the newly amalgamated school would receive 100% of the two lump sums. • In the 2026/27 financial year the school would receive 85% of the two lump sums. • In the 2027/28 financial year the school would receive 70% of the two lump sums. • In the 2028/29 financial year the school would receive one lump sum. <p>The lump sum in the formula acknowledges the cost of the structure that is required to operate as separate Infant and Junior, e.g. Headteacher, deputy Headteacher, etc. The amalgamation of the two schools would lead to one larger budget across a single school and lead to cost savings in certain areas, whereby the structure will be aligned to a</p>

	primary school leadership model, rather than two separate schools.
<p>I understand the need and uniformity of the proposal.</p> <p>I would like understand if the funding is based on number of pupils and this number is unlikely to decrease- how this warrants a 30% reduction in funding over time?</p> <p>I would assume the same or more level of staffing requirement is needed (less one headteacher) to ensure the quality of school life as is maintained and further developed.</p> <p>What justification is there for the tapered reduction to be so drastic overtime? Why is it not being reduced in 5% increments?</p> <p>Benefits are clearly outlined, I would like to understand what downsides have been considered with this proposal and how the risks are being mitigated against.</p>	<p>School budgets are dependent on a number of factors, of which pupil numbers and characteristics are the key drivers in respect of the funding calculation.</p> <p>As part of the amalgamation, the factor that is affected is the Lump Sum. Presently the Infant and Junior School, each receive a lump sum to support the costs for the structure for each school.</p> <p>Should the amalgamation proceed, then the Primary school will receive protection in respect of the lump sum for a three year period as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 2025/26 financial year the newly amalgamated school would receive 100% of the two lump sums. • In the 2026/27 financial year the school would receive 85% of the two lump sums. • In the 2027/28 financial year the school would receive 70% of the two lump sums. • In the 2028/29 financial year the school would receive one lump sum. <p>The lump sum in the formula acknowledges the cost of the structure that is required to operate as separate Infant and Junior, e.g. Headteacher, deputy Headteacher, etc. The amalgamation of the two schools would lead to one larger budget across a single school and lead to cost savings in certain areas, whereby the structure will be aligned to a</p>

	primary school leadership model, rather than two separate schools.
<p>I do not support the amalgamation. I believe that it may hinder the ability to cater to the distinct developmental needs of younger children(4-7) , which require a nurturing , play based environment that focuses on emotional and social development. The infant school creates a more close community for the children, which helps them in early years. Also the teachers in infant schools are specialised in early years education with a tailored learning to support each stage of development. Combining both phases in one school could dilute the specialised attention and resources needed for each age group, potentially resulting in a less tailored educational experience.</p> <p>I am happy with my decision to take my daughter to this school in reception , I based my decision especially because it was an infant school, and she is very happy here. Would not any changes to affect her.</p>	<p>Children will still follow the Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 curriculum. Teachers would remain in their respective posts which would not dilute the specialised attention and resources needed for each age group.</p> <p>The amalgamation is an opportunity for the whole staff to work together collaboratively to create a joint ethos and for the staff to take the best out of both schools and work on a strong vision that would enable a greater consistency for all pupils.</p>
<p>I believe that this is would lead poor standards in the school. As with overcrowding and shortage of facilities. Also children would lose individuality and be overwhelmed with, such a big change.</p> <p>The school is important to the real community of the area.</p> <p>Also,I would have to think about the impact on my children. Also if I would continue to let my children attend the school</p> <p>If this proposal was to be rubber stamped.</p>	<p>There are no plans to close any parts of the building or increase the number of pupils. Therefore there would not be any overcrowding or shortage of facilities.</p>
<p>I like having the separate schools. There is a step up element from when my child attended infants to juniors which I think is good. Infants has a really nice starter to the life of education feel and juniors is hyper focused on learning, reading and lots of homework!</p> <p>If this was to work I fully support Mrs Shipton being the headteacher for the amalgamated school, she's an asset to the junior school and think she can make a significant impact in making this transition work.</p>	<p>Children will still follow the Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 curriculum.</p>

I don't think this would benefit the children, who's benefit primes. Unless moving houses, each parent will register their children anyway to Juniors, and from the Juniors' school point of view, this would be a downgrade, as they have made significant progress as far as we understood when visiting the school. Currently only Infant needs to upgrade and this cannot be done by merging a better school, who worked on their progress really hard. Also, on a budget perspective, this is not good, as it will decrease the overall budget.

Don't think it's a good idea, to decrease one school's efforts on making progress on its only expenditure, to upgrade another school who didn't get their own upgrade using their own resources.

School budgets are dependent on a number of factors, of which pupil numbers and characteristics are the key drivers in respect of the funding calculation.

As part of the amalgamation, the factor that is affected is the Lump Sum. Presently the Infant and Junior School, each receive a lump sum to support the costs for the structure for each school.

Should the amalgamation proceed, then the Primary school will receive protection in respect of the lump sum for a three year period as follows:

- In the 2025/26 financial year the newly amalgamated school would receive 100% of the two lump sums.
- In the 2026/27 financial year the school would receive 85% of the two lump sums.
- In the 2027/28 financial year the school would receive 70% of the two lump sums.
- In the 2028/29 financial year the school would receive one lump sum.

The lump sum in the formula acknowledges the cost of the structure that is required to operate as separate Infant and Junior, e.g. Headteacher, deputy Headteacher, etc. The amalgamation of the two schools would lead to one larger budget across a single school and lead to cost savings in certain areas, whereby the structure will be aligned to a primary school leadership model, rather than two separate schools.

<p>The culture and ethos of the two schools are very different. We work in a very different way with older and younger children. Their needs are different and require different approaches. It is very clear from interactions with the Junior school that the head teacher works very differently and so as it has been suggested that the junior head take over - without applications for the job or consultation, the infant staff will be put at an immediate disadvantage. This would mean that we would need to change the way to work in order to accommodate the head rather than in a way that best supports the children.</p> <p>The post of head teacher should be one in which applications are open for and interviews had.</p>	<p>The amalgamation will involve staff through a structured approach that encourages participation and input from all levels. Regular staff meetings will be organised to gather and integrate ideas, ensuring that the new ethos is a product of collective effort rather than imposition. Additionally, working groups comprising representatives from both schools will be established to address specific aspects of the transition, ensuring that practices and values from both settings are respected and incorporated into the new framework.</p> <p>The junior school is being expanded and not closed and therefore the Headteacher's post is not affected by this change.</p>
<p>Worried about what my job role will become. Will we be expected to work with older children? I think we have a nice set up in the infants the head is very personable to staff and parents and that may get lost with one head running a primary school. The head has time for her staff not sure that would be possible with a primary school. We may lose the small community feel.</p> <p>It will still be separate because of the way the building/hall and the playgrounds are configured. Will there still be 2 entrances?</p>	<p>In the short term, there will be minimal changes in personnel to ensure continuity for students. Efforts will be made to maintain familiar staff members for the infants. However, we can't predict what the turnover of staff will be.</p> <p>There won't be any change to the playgrounds – they'll remain separate for infant and junior pupils. This arrangement is similar in primary schools. The primary school would have one main entrance and one Reception area.</p>
<p>I worry that the incredible ethos of the infant school (play based learning, encouraging the children to develop and grow themselves through play, nurturing education) will be lost when the junior school takes over (a lot more academically focussed and not so much about nurturing the child). I am a Primary school teacher as well and it is a delight to have my children in the infants.</p> <p>I think the council want to amalgamate because it's good for them financially- they only need to employ one headteacher as opposed to two and they get the best of it all. I worry for the</p>	<p>In the short term, there will be minimal changes in personnel to ensure continuity for students. Efforts will be made to maintain familiar staff members for the infants. However, we can't predict what the turnover of staff will be.</p> <p>Teachers currently in the Infants school will continue to teach infant classes in the primary school. They won't be forced to teach Key Stage 2 if they do not want to. However</p>

<p>staff at both schools- you say that there will be more opportunities for teachers to teach in different year groups but if a teacher has chosen to teach in an infant or junior school it is because they want to teach in those year groups, not in the opposite. As a teacher, your proposal makes no sense to me in terms of enticing teachers to different year groups.</p>	<p>there will be development opportunities in the primary school for those who want to upskill themselves to be able to teach both key stages.</p>
<p>Really worried that after many many years of working hard in the infants that we may be pushed out of our jobs or under valued. I enjoy my job so much and do feel very stressed.</p> <p>I would really appreciate firm guidance of what to expect in September and if my role would be changing.</p>	<p>The Local Authority is committed to ensuring job security for all staff during the amalgamation process. We recognise the concerns regarding potential redundancies and understand the importance of stability for both temporary and supply staff. There will be comprehensive assessments and consultations to ensure that staff are informed and reassured about their future roles. Measures will be taken to integrate staff from both schools into the new structure, aiming for minimal disruption and maintaining the continuity of employment. The goal is to retain as much of the existing workforce as possible, leveraging their expertise and familiarity with the schools' environments.</p> <p>In the short term, there will be minimal changes in personnel to ensure continuity for students. Efforts will be made to maintain familiar staff members for the infants. However, we can't predict what the turnover of staff will be.</p>
<p>The infant school is already unable to fund shortfalls on school trips when some parents do not pay.</p> <p>They are constantly fund raising.</p> <p>The situation will be even worse with proposed funding cuts if this goes ahead.</p> <p>The children will lose out.</p>	<p>School budgets are dependent on a number of factors, of which pupil numbers and characteristics are the key drivers in respect of the funding calculation.</p> <p>As part of the amalgamation, the factor that is affected is the Lump Sum. Presently the Infant and Junior School, each receive a lump sum to support the costs for the structure for each school.</p>

	<p>Should the amalgamation proceed, then the Primary school will receive protection in respect of the lump sum for a three year period as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 2025/26 financial year the newly amalgamated school would receive 100% of the two lump sums. • In the 2026/27 financial year the school would receive 85% of the two lump sums. • In the 2027/28 financial year the school would receive 70% of the two lump sums. • In the 2028/29 financial year the school would receive one lump sum. <p>The lump sum in the formula acknowledges the cost of the structure that is required to operate as separate Infant and Junior, e.g. Headteacher, deputy Headteacher, etc. The amalgamation of the two schools would lead to one larger budget across a single school and lead to cost savings in certain areas, whereby the structure will be aligned to a primary school leadership model, rather than two separate schools.</p>
<p>Personal feel that having 2 different heads is better for the schools</p> <p>2 separate heads is netter.. they have different aims at them stages</p>	<p>By amalgamating the Infant and Junior schools into a single entity, the overall budget can be managed more efficiently. The consolidation will lead to a reduction in duplicated administrative and operational costs, as the structure will be aligned to a primary school leadership model rather than two separate schools. For example, the cost of having separate headteachers and deputy headteachers can be reduced, allowing more funds to be allocated directly to educational resources and student support.</p> <p>A larger, unified budget can be distributed to areas where it is most needed. This can include better facilities, more</p>

	educational materials, and enhanced extracurricular activities. The amalgamation allows for a more strategic approach to resource allocation, ensuring that all students, from early years to older children, benefit from improved learning environments.
<p>My hesitation is that we were advised how much more effective the schools are as separate provisions when we looked around. I am concerned that for the infants, the focus on early years will be lost, with the focus being on the vision for the whole school. It's likely that the older children's need will become the focus.</p> <p>As above. This is already a big school. The fact that it will be merging means it's even bigger. Losing that focus potentially on Early Years. I viewed both schools before choosing and both schools said that they prefer being separate as they can work better with the age groups/area of expertise. Concerns that this will be lost otherwise.</p>	<p>A combined school structure can enhance collaboration among staff, leading to a more cohesive educational strategy. Teachers and administrators can work together more effectively to address the needs of all students, drawing on a wider pool of expertise and resources. This collaborative environment can help preserve the strengths of the current separate schools while integrating them into a unified model that benefits everyone.</p>
<p>The infant school allows the younger children to be children and develop their learning through play. As they move into year 1 and then year 2 they can build their confidence in an environment where they are not overwhelmed or intimidated by the older students.</p>	<p>While there are concerns about the potential loss of focus on early years, it is important to consider the benefits of continuity and progression within a single school structure. The amalgamation can provide a seamless transition for students as they progress from infancy through junior stages, fostering a sense of stability and confidence. This unified approach can maintain the distinct needs of each age group while ensuring that the overarching educational vision remains consistent.</p>
<p>As a member of staff in the infant school, it feels although we have been given no choice but to be 'taken over' by the junior school. There is no control regarding recruitment of a headteacher.</p> <p>Although it's important that the children have continuity, it feels like this move is 'being done'</p>	<p>We understand the concerns that staff may have regarding the amalgamation process, especially given past experiences at other schools. Our priority is to ensure that this transition is as smooth as possible for all staff members. We are committed to fostering a positive working environment and providing ample support and resources to address any</p>

<p>to the infant school with no say for staff. I am fearful of a 'takeover' where the lovely things about the infant school will be lost.</p>	<p>challenges that may arise. Open communication and engagement with staff will be key to navigating this process successfully.</p>
<p>I'm concerned that the longer wrap around care in the infants school - starting breakfast club at 7.30 and extending after school club to 6pm would be cut to mirror the shorter length in the junior school (junior is 7.45 start for breakfast club and 5.45 finish for after school club)</p> <p>Many parents including me rely on the longer length hours currently in the infant schools</p>	<p>This is something that the Governing Body of the primary school will need to look at. If demand is for longer hours then the provision would need to be for longer hours.</p>

Question 3: Do you have any other comments in respect of this proposal?

32 responses were submitted in respect of this question as detailed below:

No
I would like to know how a fair process will be adhered to if redundancies/restructures take place. If a staff member from each school went for one job, how will SHJS ensure that infant staff have a fair crack at the whip at getting the post. Having read up on amalgamations in this borough and other LA's, I think that unless you bring in a fresh Head Teacher, you are basically sending the staff of the school being taken over into a fight to keep their jobs and cause stress and uncertainty for them
We have pupils that are "runners" I am concerned that they will have access to both buildings,
Funds should be improved for education across the spectrum, to offer more opportunities to young children to thrive in their own education potential.
As a member of staff in the infants, I'm hoping that ALL staff will be treated on an even playing field.
Is better how it is
I believe the governing body should be made up of both infant and junior representatives for balance.
I would like assurance that there really will be a collaborative ethos and not a Year 6 top done approach.
What will happen regarding staff roles after the initial merger?"
Combined school must ensure that after-school clubs (that both run separately) can accommodate all pupils that require spaces.
Benefits are clearly outlined, I would like to understand what downsides have been considered with this proposal and how the risks are being mitigated against.
I am happy with my decision to take my daughter to this school in reception , I based my decision especially because it was an infant school, and she is very happy here. Would not any changes to affect her.
I have concerns the Junior staff will be treated more favourably if the Junior Head Teacher is automatically made head of the primary school.
In my opinion as long as the transition is smooth and not disruptive to pupils or staff then becoming a primary school could in theory work well.
"The new school set up should come with a new Headteacher. One that understands and has worked with EYFS as well as KS1.
As above - I'm concerned that the length of of wraparound care would default to the shorter length of the junior school.
My daughter went to both schools (my son is currently in the Junior School). My daughter was in year 6 when the country went into lockdown - her school year was disregarded half way through with no thought or consideration for the children's feelings or wellbeing. Mrs Shipton managed the year group terribly, resulting in many children feeling excluded and without any support or adequate remote schooling. My daughter felt that the school had washed their hands of the Year 6s and didn't care. She feels that the school weren't bothered about helping the children cope through the difficult covid times. Promises were made and not kept and the children felt forgotten.
My son hates the school and is not challenged or celebrated - he is in the top percentage of achievers in the school but feels ignored and bored. All of my attempts to speak about this with Mrs Shipton and

teachers are dismissed - and my son can't wait to leave and go to a school where his abilities will be recognised and met.
Please advertise for a new Headteacher to manage the new Primary School, it should be someone that actually likes children and has their best interests at heart."
As a local resident, to see the opportunities for more efficient use of Council resources and the two schools operating more economically as one is another key benefit.
No
No I think it a brilliant idea as I think it ridiculous tht we have reapply for year 3 whne ur child already there or be lot wiser for other parents too
Don't think it's a good idea, to decrease one school's efforts on making progress on its only expenditure, to upgrade another school who didn't get their own upgrade using their own resources.
The post of head teacher should be one in which applications are open for and interviews had.
I believe it would be a great change not only for staff but for the children. I think it would better support children in transitioning into ks2 having familiar faces more accessible.
It will still be separate because of the way the building/hall and the playgrounds are configured. Will there still be 2 entrances?
I do find it a little strange that the Junior head just becomes head of the new primary school - they are very different roles in my view and I have seen other amalgamations where the infants very much get neglected compared to the juniors.
We need assurance on the funding support
In agreement with the proposal. Only concern is senior leadership team in the Infants. They have such a wealth of knowledge and know pupils inside out and my concern would be that this may be lost if their jobs were at risk.
I think the council want to amalgamate because it's good for them financially- they only need to employ one headteacher as opposed to two and they get the best of it all. I worry for the staff at both schools- you say that there will be more opportunities for teachers to teach in different year groups but if a teacher has chosen to teach in an infant or junior school it is because they want to teach in those year groups, not in the opposite. As a teacher, your proposal makes no sense to me in terms of enticing teachers to different year groups.

Section 4: Conclusion and Next steps

In Summary, the issues raised will be addressed and there is no compelling evidence for the Squirrels Heath Infant School and Squirrels Heath Junior School not to proceed to the next stage of the process which is to publish a statutory notice which will run for a period of 4 weeks. This notice would provide an opportunity for comments or objections to be made.

Squirrels Heath Infant School and Squirrels Heath Junior Schools are both LA Maintained schools, therefore the final decision as to whether this proposal is approved for implementation will be made by the Local Authority after considering the responses to the statutory notice.

Thank you to all parents, staff, residents and families who have responded and taken time to submit the feedback questionnaire.

Section 5: Survey Demographics

As part of our approach in ensuring a best assessment of the impact of our proposed activity and that we are hearing from a wide cross-section of our stakeholder, the consultation questionnaire included additional questions to capture this information.

This information is as follows:

Question 4: I am happy to answer equalities questions

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	68	81.93%
No	15	18.07%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Question 5: How are old you?

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	0	0.00%
25-34	10	12.05%
35-44	34	40.96%
45-54	14	16.87%
55-64	8	9.64%
65-74	1	1.20%
75-84	0	0.00%
85+	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	0	0.00%
Not Answered	16	19.28%

Question 6: How would you describe your gender identity?

Option	Total	Percent
Male	6	7.23%
Female	60	72.29%
Non-binary	0	0.00%
Another description	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	1	1.20%
Not Answered	16	19.28%

Question 7: Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?

Option	Total	Percent
Bisexual	1	1.20%
Gay or Lesbian	2	2.41%
Straight or Heterosexual	60	72.29%
Another description	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	4	4.82%
Not Answered	16	19.28%

Question 8: What is your marital or civil partnership status?

Option	Total	Percent
Single	10	12.05%
Married	44	53.01%
Civil Partnership	0	0.00%
Co-habiting	6	7.23%
Widowed	1	1.20%
Another description	1	1.20%
Prefer not to say	3	3.61%
Not Answered	18	21.69%

Question 9: Ethnic origin is not about nationality, place of birth or citizenship. It is about the group to which you perceive you belong.

Asian/Asian British

Option	Total	Percent
Asian/Asian British - Indian	4	4.82%
Asian/Asian British - Pakistani	2	2.41%
Asian/Asian British - Bangladeshi	2	2.41%
Asian/Asian British - Chinese	0	0.00%
Asian/Asian British - Other Asian background	1	1.20%
Not Answered	74	89.16%

Black/Black British

Option	Total	Percent
Black/Black British - African	1	1.20%
Black/Black British - Caribbean	1	1.20%
Black/Black British - Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	0	0.00%
Not Answered	81	97.59%

Mixed/multiple groups

Option	Total	Percent
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Black Caribbean	2	2.41%
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Black African	1	1.20%
Mixed/multiple groups - White and Asian	2	2.41%
Mixed/multiple groups - Other mixed background	0	0.00%
Not Answered	78	93.98%

Other ethnic group

Option	Total	Percent
Other ethnic group - Arab	0	0.00%
Any other ethnic group	1	1.20%
Not Answered	82	98.80%

Prefer not to say

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	2	2.41%
No	81	97.59%

White

Option	Total	Percent
White - British	42	50.60%
White - Irish	1	1.20%
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0.00%
White - European	4	4.82%
Other - White background	3	3.61%
Not Answered	33	39.76%

Question 10: Faith, Religion or Belief

Option	Total	Percent
Buddhist	0	0.00%
Christian	30	36.14%
Hindu	0	0.00%
Jewish	0	0.00%
Muslim	6	7.23%
No Religion	23	27.71%
Sikh	3	3.61%
Other religion	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	4	4.82%
Not Answered	17	20.48%

Question 11: Do you consider yourself to have a disability, impairment or health condition?

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	7	8.43%
No	56	67.47%
Prefer not to say	4	4.82%
Not Answered	16	19.28%

Impairment?

Option	Total	Percent
Sensory - e.g. mild deafness; partially sighted; blindness	3	3.61%
Physical - e.g. wheelchair user	2	2.41%
Mental Illness - e.g. bi-polar disorder; schizophrenia; depression	0	0.00%
Development or Educational - e.g. autistic spectrum disorders (ASD); dyslexia and dyspraxia, neurodiversity	4	4.82%
Learning Disability / Condition - e.g. Down's syndrome; Cerebral palsy	1	1.20%
Long-term Illness / Health Condition - e.g. cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, stroke	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Not Answered	76	91.57%

Appendix 1: Consultation Stakeholder List

Consultees
The governing body of Squirrels Heath Infant School
The governing body of Squirrels Heath Junior School
Parents/carers of pupils at Squirrels Heath Infant School
Parents/carers of pupils at Squirrels Heath Junior School
Teachers and other staff at Squirrels Heath Infant School
Teachers and other staff at Squirrels Heath Junior School
The governing bodies of all maintained schools in the borough
Teachers and staff of all maintained primary, secondary, special schools and academies in the Borough.
Early Years Providers in the borough
Voluntary organisations and Community groups who work with children with SEND
Representatives of trade unions of any staff at schools who may be affected by the proposal.
All Havering Councillors
MPs whose constituencies include the schools that are the subject of the proposal or whose constituents are likely to be affected by the proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julia Lopez • Andrew Rosindell • Margaret Mullane
Neighbouring local authorities where there may be significant cross-border movement of pupils. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Borough of Barking and Dagenham • London Borough of Newham • London Borough of Redbridge • Essex County Council • Thurrock Council