

# **A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath**

## **Appendix**

# Review of Secondary Schools in Bath

## Questionnaire Summary Results

This page shows the summary of the responses that have been received.

### 1

**Do you agree with the Council's overall plan/strategy for Bath which is to:**

- Reduce the number of schools from seven to six to remove surplus places and reflect the current and future need in Bath.
- Reduce the number of single sex places and provide more co-educational places to meet parental demand.
- Provide sufficient Church school places to meet the level of demand.
- Maintain one single sex girls school and one single sex boys school to provide choice for parents (Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield).
- Create the right size schools which are educationally and financially viable.
- Have one new co-educational school located in the north of the city and one new co-educational school in the south of the city.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Count</b>
Yes	72% (302)
No	28% (116)

### 2

**Do you agree with the proposal to close Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's schools and to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a PAN of 160 in the north of the City and a linked proposal to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a PAN of 160 in the south of City.**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Count</b>
Yes	66% (275)
No	34% (143)

### Either 2a

A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current Oldfield site.

Please see attached.

### Or 2b

A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St Mark's site.

Note: The current St Mark's site could be the location for a new school only if it was a Church of England school proposed by the Anglican Diocese.

Please see attached.

### a

Parent/carer involved with:

<b>Option</b>	<b>Count</b>
Culverhay	4% (14)
Oldfield	12% (44)
St Mark's	11% (40)
Other (including Primary and Special)	72% (255)

**b**

Pupil at:

**Option**

Culverhay

Oldfield

St Mark's

Other (including Primary and Special)

**Count**

6% (3)

19% (9)

10% (5)

65% (31)

**c**

Member of staff at:

This question has been answered 41 times.

**d**

Governor at:

This question has been answered 33 times.

**e**

Member of the community near:

This question has been answered 109 times.

**f**

Other (please specify and state school(s) name)

This question has been answered 35 times.

**Name**

This question has been answered 418 times.

**Postcode**

This question has been answered 418 times.

2a	<b>A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current Oldfield site. Comments:</b>
•	No. there should be a school on the St Marks site in the north east of Bath.
•	The Oldfield site for a school would still attract pupils from South Glos. Children in Batheaston/Bathford/Bathampton/Swainswick would find it difficult to travel that far across town.
•	This sounds like the better option. However, there is quite a lot of snobbery in Bath about the area where Culverhay is and I wonder if people will actually choose to use a school based there?
•	This would be my preferred option
•	I would support this option, if Oldfield Girls school remains open, either as a girls school or a co-ed school, either under control of the LA or as an Academy. The priority is to provide a secondary school in the north western area, serving local children, where travel times and cost do not dictate that parents will have to drive their children to school.
•	A new co-educational school on the Oldfield site would attract more families from Bath and therefore reduce the options available to cross-border residents in the rural areas of South Glos.
•	This is the correct option, assuming the only options are the St Marks or Oldfields current sites, as there should be fewer church school places.
•	Saving Oldfield school is the main priority!!!! K
•	Why do they have to be new schools, keep the same name, keep the same uniform and add a few toilets/changing rooms?
•	Adapt Oldfield to co-ed, rather than close and start new school. What a complete waste of money that would be! Save the school, keep the teaching staff and headteacher. New school at Culverhay would be a good idea.
•	This would be the best option as Oldfield takes in pupils from Weston Village and surrounding villages. Oldfield also has an outstanding OFSTED report, so why close such a good school. Not all parents want their child to attend a faith school.
•	This is the option we would favour of the two, but either option would substantially improve the situation.
•	It is clear that the current school on the Oldfield site serves the children of Bristol. There isn't the desire to attend from the children of Bath.
•	Oldfield site as non denominational important
•	If the schools are to change way not build on the Oldfield and st marks sites? There are a lot of schools located in and around by culverhay school.
•	I think the consultation here has just proved slightly biased... It should say there are ways of how a new school to the North West of the City could be provided. We (the Consultation team) suggest..... Suggest what you have put is not that legally correct, and could be subject to judicial review
•	Not single sex
•	There is no need for a new school on either site.
•	Put a new school anywhere you like but not at the Oldfield site.
•	I support this option as Culverhay is well located to serve Southdown, Twerton, Rush Hill and parts of the more central areas and has ample space for redevelopment. A new school at the Oldfield site is a preferable alternative to a new building on the St Mark's site. The current St Mark's site is too small to accommodate a modern school and has no room for expansion.
•	Not the Culverhay site.
•	Definitely no

•	The other locations seem better.
•	No I would strongly object to Oldfield being amalgamated. It would dilute and alter the constructive community that it has striven to create
•	Culverhay and Oldfield both need updating and modernising but should remain single sex.
•	Yes, Oldfield is in a good location set in lovely grounds.
•	I would prefer option (a) as I feel this would give the best deal to children in Bath.
•	Should these plans go ahead I would prefer the 'a' option as the journey too and from school for the current girls at Oldfield MUST be considered.
•	Option 'a' would be preferable to me if it meant my daughter would be able to continue her schooling at the Oldfield site. It would be less disruption for her at a crucial time, as she would looking at starting her G.C.S.E. courses, and disruption at this time could reduce her ability to obtain a good grade.
•	Either BUT if option 'a' I would only like this if one of the schools is a Church School. NB. If Culverhay had been a CofE school of good standard I would ahve chosen this for my children instead of Ralph Allen.
•	I believe option 'a' above would be the best way forward.
•	Oldfield Park site not very central.
•	oldfield site but single sex
•	No. For those of us living in the north of the city this would defeat the purpose of having a good co-ed neighbourhood school. The edge of Weston is definately not accessible for those living around Lansdown, Fairfield Park and Larkhall. Even though the headmistress at Oldfield Park talks of their high marks and why the school shouldn't be closed down, there is not doubt that this is not a true Bath school, with so many pupils from Bristol. Better to put it to good use as a college.
•	There is no need for a new school on the Oldfield site as there is a perfectly good one there already. Closing St Marks would leave the North East corner of Bath without a nearby state secondary school.
•	I would agree to a new school bing build on the Oldfield site, however I do not agree with closing of the Schools.
•	A new school on the Cuvlerhay site is what I wish for as it the school within a mile from my home. The other new school I don't really mind what site it's on.
•	Option A - Wider scope to develop sport facilities (essential with Government targets of 80% 2hrs curriculum plus 1 hour extra curricular per week).
•	Neither option chosen. Why & at what cost? How much has this consultation period already cost. No doubt the legal proceeding will also be expensive and that is before you start any building, improvement or reorganisation. How much does it cost to send all these forms out to every household. You are already wasting mone NOW!!
•	In future years this may be required but the pupils currently attending these school should see their time out before any changes are made & future intake could chose knowing what lies ahead for them.
•	Why put Oldfield with two of the boy's schools who are so under achieving.
•	This options makes sense in respect of re-building capabilities, St Marks has very limited area in which to provide as many on-site facilities, eg sports pitches, as Oldfield.
•	neither as oldfield should stay as it is. If it does go though oldfield site as my daughter will still beable to get to school on a bus from the area we live in as i have the understanding she will still have a place in a bath school.
•	I agree this seems the most sensible solution. Both sites have enough space to expand in future.

•	Oldfield site is currently a Major Existing Developed Site in the Green Belt - planning policy allows for limited infilling and/or redevelopment for educational use as long as it does not have greater impact on openness than current development. This would need to be taken into account in developing a new school.
•	Conditional on the school(s) being co-educational and secular, I agree with the proposals.
•	This would be our preferred option as we want a non-denominational, co-ed school for our child.
•	A new school on the Oldfield site, replacing like for like in regard size & single sex, as most BSF schemes would be ideal. You should do nothing that changes the fantastic ethos & standards that Oldfield achieves.
•	I would favour option A. Both sites are big with good facilities.
•	We feel 'a' would be the best and most convenient plan as Oldfield is on a big site with room for expansion as is Culverhay.
•	'a' would be my choice as they are easily accessible and I do not believe we need a church school.
•	I just hope and pray that if this does happen, then one of the new school's will be built on the Oldfield site because my daughter travels from Bristol, and I do not want her travel time to be any longer than what it is now. It would be ridiculous for our daughter to have to travel right into Bath.
•	Culverhay re-development seems good idea, good location etc.
•	this would be preferable as oldfield school would be far more convenient
•	I agree with this proposal
•	Don't know which site in the north is better, other than away from South Glos to stop our money being spent on kids from other authorities.
•	I support 2a PROVIDED that the new school on the Oldfield site can be a Church of England school.
•	Only if Culverhay received significant funding to be able to serve the community eg Academy status Would favour this option
•	This may be the best choice to ease traffic from the other side of Bath.
•	No preference
•	The oldfield site is too far out for many families.
•	I don't want this exercise to go ahead but if it does I feel Oldfield would be the better site as it is easy to get to, has lots of space and is relatively flat.
•	Would it be possible to have one of these schools as a Church of England school?
•	I do not agree with the opening of a new school on the current Oldfield site as the mapping tool used in the consultation amply demonstrates that the two main catchment areas are south of Bath and outside the BANES areas. It is difficult to imagine that demand from South Glos/Bristol will decrease whereas those parents wanting a co-ed school to the south of Bath will have one on the Culverhay site.
•	If a school north of the river is not going to be re-opened, I think it should be Oldfield as it takes many students from outside Bath, and many children in the catchment area of Bath, do not go there.
•	Given the location of St Mark's and the additional permissions, this would seem the best option. However, faith schools have been shown to perform very well and provide a more supportive environment. Could not the CofE have a stake in new developments to balance that of the RC?
•	This would be my preference. I am the mother of two primary school-aged boys and would welcome a co-ed school on the Oldfield site which would be within walking distance of our home in Newbridge. At present, my children have no senior school that is part of our

	community - their closest school is Beechen Cliff, which is a 45 minute walk or expensive bus ride away.
•	This is the only viable option for a variety of reasons including the lack of coed places in the south of the city and also the fact that the Culverhay site serving the more disadvantaged ward in the city. Not having a school on the Culverhay School site would caused further issues for the most disadvantaged ward within the city.
•	One in north of city, one in south.
•	This is the only proposal we support as a non religious co-ed school on the Oldfield site will have strong support and ties with the surrounding community which the current Oldfield School does not achieve.
•	Because of my location I would hope that this option would be achieved.
•	Don't believe this would solve the percieved problems.
•	Yes. This would be my preferred choice as Oldfield is within easy walking distance of our home.
•	Oldfield is a large site with amazing facilities. The LA has forced Newbridge Primary to have an intake of 90 pupils in 2010, this must indicate a local increase on population. It would therefore make sense to retain the nearest secondary school and make it co-ed.
•	No because there will be no school on the north east of Bath
•	Irrelevant now that Oldfield has taken itself out of the equation with its tactical survival of Academy status application.
•	I do not agree with this proposal because of the impact on traffic in the city and the inconvenience to the public.
•	No. Oldfield does not meet the needs of children from the community in Bath - hence the overwhelming majority of pupils from outside our community.
•	This will mean a long distance for children to travel across Bath when congestion is already great at rush hour
•	This would be my preferred option due to the proximity of the Oldfield site to our home. The reliance on gaining the approval of the CoE for the St Marks site is also a concern.
•	This is preferable.
•	Reading what has been announced in the news recently, it looks like Oldfield has taken themselves out of the consultation by going to Academy status. Even though this is underhand of the headmistress, I can't say I blame her, considering the outstanding results of this school. As we our geographically placed in Larkhall. It would mean a car journey to send our children . There is no direct bus link to either of Culverhay or the Oldfield site. t
•	Definitely oldfiels site there is nothing on our site and children have to cross town in cars and buses, it will lesson the traffic.
•	this will be deemed redundant if Oldfield becomes an academy and there is no longer a co-ed school in the North to send our children to
•	This is the only option within these proposals that allows for viable schools
•	I think the consultation meeting on 25/5/10 highlighted how passionate the parents are within Newbridge/Weston and Larkhall areas about having secondary schools within their community. There was no support for Culverhay at the meeting from either parents at Culverhay or Primary Schools within that area so this indicated that this school isn't the most popular school.
•	Preferred choice out of two but local community really wants to keep Oldfield for area and make co-ed.
•	Yes, Oldfield is already a successful school and should converted to a coed school. The fact that it is so popular with families from outside BANES is a good thing: they can continue to fill any remaining places after every child in the area has been allocated a place, keeping

	surplus places to a minimum.
•	I would much prefer the option described as 2A for travel purposes. I also think the Oldfield site is a better choice than St Marks, which is sloping and in an area which is not particularly accessible for transport.
•	I agree with this statement as I live in Weston and would be served by the conversion of the Oldfield site. This would serve several feeder primary schools, reduce congestion in Bath city centre and provides a large, attractive school site.
•	My own personal preference is that Oldfield School is retained or closed and re-opened as a co-educational school and that the Council commits investment to achieve that outcome.
•	What about a church school in the north of the city? The south has St. Gregory's, st. Mark's should remain in the south.
•	Oldfield is a MUST for Newbridge / Weston children. Culverhay needs modernising.
•	<a href="http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/bath_review/answerQuestionnaire?qid=1053987">http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/bath_review/answerQuestionnaire?qid=1053987</a>
•	Oldfield School would be a great location for a new school as currently the majority of students are from outside the Bath area (i.e. Bristol). Boys in Bath NEED a school north of the City.
•	The Oldfield site is key to most families in this area. It is pleasant and convenient for a population which is miles from most of the other options. But it takes far too many pupils from nearby Bristol boroughs and I do not understand why this is allowed to happen?
•	Oldfield is set in a wonderful position. Being on the edge of town it eliminates traffic congestion. The peaceful surroundings, I am sure, aid education, in creating a tranquil and airy feeling. Also it is on a direct bus route. Therefore keeping traffic and pollution down as less parents need to use cars to get their daughters to the school. I believe cars would be required to get to St Marks.
•	This option would require all pupils from Larkhall to travel across the city - this will cause traffic mayhem. There is no direct bus service from Larkhall to Weston, and services from Lambridge to Ralph Allen are already overcrowded.
•	Oldfield would be more appropriate as they have better (especially sports) facilities so less money would have to be spent on improvements
•	If this question is still relevant (ie Oldfield have not actually had improval to become an academy) then i agree with this statement fully. With these schools being Co-ed. Please also see my notes above.
•	This questionnaire is pre-supposing that a co-ed school in the north and the south is the way forward.
•	As far as I'm concerned this is not an option as children in the north of the city will not have access to these schools without awkward commuting. This is too much to ask for 11-year-old children. Haven't you noticed that Bath has a transport problem? At the moment First-Bus are planning to cut services to Larkhall. As for walking to school, forget about it, it's really not a safe option without enforced 20 mile hour speed limits and the closure of commuter rat runs in the north of the city.
•	My understanding is that Oldfield are going out of ths system anyway
•	Both schools should remain and be co-ed with admissions policies which prioritise the children of Bath and the immediate surroundings (ie discourage those currently attending Oldfield from Bristol - a situation which discourages Bath children from attending there).
•	I do NOT agree with this proposal.
•	This is no good for children on the north eastern side of Bath - many of whom opt for wiltshire to get the "best quality" education.
•	1.If a school is to be shut, the bulk of poorer kids come from around the Twerton area, and so could access a school on the Oldfield site far more easily than one on at St. Marks. Giving as



	many as possible of those with least educational opportunities at home the best choices of schools should be a priority, so Oldfield is better for more.
•	Considering the size of local mixed primary schools including Weston All Saints and Newbridge this seems the most logical proposal.
•	This is my preferred option although I am partly influenced by selfish motives. The school would remain local to us. Having said this, there would be no money raised directly from the sale of the ST Marks sight although I understand the church could choose to invest in either of the other two schools.
•	I agree with this one there should be atleast one church of england secondry school.
•	i am in favour of this option providing oldfield will be a co-educational, and available to children in bath over south gloustershire/bristol. mainly as the school is in the bath city boundary.
•	This would be our preferred option.
•	As Oldfield have refused to cooperate in this procedure I find this idea wholly unacceptable. Oldfield does not want to or has any aspirations to serve the community of Bath let alone the north side of the city nor does it wish to be co-ed. So that means my child who is a boy will not be served by this decision and would have a 2 bus journey to get to the other schools , which is ridiculous since he can walk to school now.
•	Not quite - Oldfield must be a co-ed site even if it to become an academy.
•	Please see above comment.
•	Not in favour of this option. Oldfield is on the edge of the city while St-Marks is halfway between Weston and Bathford.
•	This is our preferred option as otherwise for those in Newbridge/Weston area otheriwse our children would be reequred to travel across town to either Culverhay or St Marks.
•	As above, given our location this would be our preference

<b>2b</b>	<b>A new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St. Mark's site. Comments:</b>
•	St Marks is a good local school and should be retained and enhanced to improve results and reputation. Retaining a school on the St. Marks site is my personal priority. Out of the two options 2 b is my preference but the option of 2 schools in the north should be considered
•	I would strongly support a new Anglican school on the St Marks site.
•	Parents who would choose St Marks today are not doing so because of the threat of closure; this distorts the figures (both intake and achievement levels) because many of the more able pupils or those with more proactive parents are sending them to schools known not to be under threat. St Marks has made incredible progress in recent years, has strong links in the community and has delivered outstanding performance for the education and development of my own children.
•	Yes. St Mark's may be small but it works. It has a special atmosphere.
•	I do not agree that the new school should be a religious school of any kind. See also my answer to Q2.
•	I would want 2b a church school on the st marks site and one on the current Culverhey site. It is important to keep a school on the st marks site for those families around that site and the surrounding places like Batheaston.
•	I would support a proposal for a Church of England school either on the current St Marks site or a new school north of the river. This would continue to meet the need for sufficient church school places.
•	This option would leave anyone in the Newbridge/Weston area with little or no local provision. Children would find it much harder to get in Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield and St Marks and Culverhay are a long way to travel and do not have the same outstanding results which Oldfield has.
•	Whilst I disagree with the closure of any of these sites for the reasons listed above, I also very strongly support the maintenance of a school on the St Mark's site. I am a local resident with 2 primary age boys who are actively engaged with St Mark's and its pupils already. Larkhall and the surrounding area is a very strong community and the school plays an active part in this.
•	The dusty old Church is desperate to appear relevant by maintaining a hold on our schools and on children's minds. We cannot permit this to continue. The Church must be separated from all state schools.
•	In order to meet the criteria to provide Church of England school spaces, this option is the only possible one.
•	There should be fewer church school places so this option should not be adopted.
•	Education should not have to bow to religion, if we had a large Muslim population would the St Marks site be used for their school.
•	No. See previous comments about the outdated view that church schools are needed/wanted.
•	I think option 2b would be a bad idea.
•	The St Mark's site would be a more convenient site for our location. It may be difficult for children to travel from the Fairfield Park/Larkhall part of Bath to the Oldfield site without using a car.
•	The consultation meeting at St Marks on May 12th showed the support of the community for a co-educational Faith based school that respected non-religious members of the community (such as my family). I would like to thank the Chair and

	speakers at the meeting for the informative way in which they conducted the debate. It should also be noted how the St Marks staff and local Heads contributed so positively to the debate and how apparent it was that they put the interests of students first.
•	There is a great need for a co-educational school to serve both the immediate locality, and the wider community. Primary schools in the locality would provide children. A new school on the same site could provide a first class education for those areas of Bath that have, up until now, been neglected. As a parent, I find the lack of co-educational schools very frustrating. We are a co-ed society..Let's have a great new school for this side of Bath-a legacy for future students.
•	Will this mean renovation or demolish and total new build? and if so how long will this take?
•	I am of the opinion that the new 'north' school should be on the St Marks site since it would be closer to a large residential area and is already co-ed and therefore should not require high expenditure for the implementation of this plan. Further having now attended one of the consultation meeting I am more convinced than before that Oldfield should be the school to be closed.
•	I take it that St Mark's has now moved to North of the City As there are only max 500 characters in 3 below Q 3St Marks is really by itself geographically (5 stars)and is in a highly residential area (5 stars). We need to be local and support local schools. Minimise the school run taking pupils way across the City centre and return at night. Suggest cross Town from B'easton to C'hay would take 30 mins one way,ie i hours car emissions, pm journey same 2hrs emmissions at 30mph 9kg /day/car.
•	One new school either side of the City would be fair.
•	Not single sex
•	This would be a cynical way for the Council to make money by selling off the valuable and attractive Oldfield school grounds. I suspect this is why the scheme has been suggested.
•	Culverhay's 'design' is appalling,there is no cohesion. The blocks are too spread out; classrooms are too small and too old; there are no redeeming features and the layout is a maze for bullying, so do with it as you please. Bulldozing it is the only realistic option.
•	Not the Culverhay site.
•	Morally opposed to shurch schools, but the locations of St Marks and Culverhay would seem to give a better spread of secondary schools across Bath. Is there any other site possible in the St Marks area?
•	This would be preferable, but I m not convinced that it would achieve what is proposed
•	New schools on the Culverhay site and the St Mark's site are more likely to benefit children from the Bath area, which is surely the object of the exercise!
•	In light of the above, St Mark's is not a suitable site.
•	I would choose (b). I think it is important to keep one school on the East side of Bath (St Mark's site)(would avoid traffic moving through Bath City Centre) as most schools already on West side. As a CofE school is needed anyway, it is not an issue that it had to be CofE on that site. If Oldfield used, pupils would have to cross Bath City Centre to get to it every day.
•	Neither see over.
•	Is this likely to happen. If not then there will be no CofE faith school (whre is parent

	choice then?). It is my understanding the St Mark's site was inaccessible during poor weather/snow and forced to close. Is this a good option. NO.
•	Do think there will still be a need for a Church of England Secondary School ie 'b' St Mark's site.
•	Would oppose school at St Mark's site as Bath doesn't need any more schools with faith based Admissions. Perhaps somewhere more central than Larkhall would be better for Northside?
•	The St Mark's site is much better for good geographical spread of schools. It is needed to keep kids from that area battling through London Rd traffic, much better to keep them at school up near Larkhall. Sell the Oldfield girls site - it must be worth a fortune.
•	Option b.
•	st marks
•	Yes. Ideal solution for those of us who would like a CofE co-ed neighbourhood secondary school.
•	Leave St Mark's alone!
•	It would be incomprehensible to close a highly successful school and keep an undersubscribed school open.
•	I would go for (b), there is much more need for a secondary school in north (east) of town.
•	A school is needed either on the St Marks site or Oldfield site as there a numerous schools near Culverhay.
•	a - is the preferred option as there are too many faith schools in Bath already!
•	Idea B - I believe as these 2 are in better positions across the City of Bath. Transport concerns me, traffic is already bad in Bath, therefore it would be better if children are able to walk to the new schools.
•	However, this option makes sense in respect of location, St Marks is located within a more densely populated area, with Oldfield being on the outskirts of town, and attracting more children from other LA Areas. We already have alot of buildings on the edge of town and a school in this location would increase traffic as more people would need to travel to this school rather than walk/cycle.
•	The st Mark's site is not suitable for a new modern school as this is in the middle of a residential area on a steep hill.
•	St. Mark's site is too small to sensibly accommodate the scale of school envisaged for the north of the city whilst allowing for full and adequate playing pitch/open space provision. In addition it is very inaccessible for students coming from outside B&NES - students will continue to attend from South Glos for at least 5 years after the new school is developed.
•	I oppose this option as it would mean maintaining a church school.
•	Prefer option b. If option a is chosen there would be a shortage of schools on the north and east sides of Bath.
•	Agree to a new school on the existing Culverhay school site & St Mark's school sites.
•	As to Oldfield or St Mark's. I hope the decision will look to available spare facilities and access as well as 'faith' school provision. Though personally I would like to see a CofE linked senior school.
•	'a' seems much more viable regarding location and building age and size.
•	Oldfield site has more space than St Marks & would seem rational choice. There would have to be a linked in transport policy (?? lanes etc).

•	Definitely option 2b - St Marks should be the site of a new Church school
•	Its a shame that religion has to be involved in education at all.
•	I support the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site
•	If the Oldfield site cannot be made a Church of England school, then I support 2b.
•	We support the proposal for a C of E school at St Marks
•	I support the Authority's proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site
•	I would thoroughly support the St Mark's site being used for a Church of England school as being complimentary to St Gregory's.
•	Would favour St Gregs taking on co-demoninational status if not new school on the St Marks site
•	I would support the provision of sufficient church school places in the city by supporting the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Marks site
•	I support the provision of sufficient church school places in the city by supporting the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Marks site.
•	I agree with this.
•	I favour this proposal. Why not take the financial contribution the Cof E would make?
•	As shown by the report St Marks is very much a school for Bath children with the majority coming from the local area.It standards year by year are improving, has had a great Ofsted report which shows how well it is performing despite the above average intake of children receiving Free School Meals or with SEN's. With time and support St Marks will become an excellant school.
•	We support the provision of sufficient Church school places in Bath and specifically a Church of England school on the St Mark's site.
•	2b
•	2b - to satisfy the need for a faith school, a CofE school on the St Marks site would make the most sense.
•	No preference
•	I support the location of future secondary schools on the St Mark's and Culverhay sites.
•	Would like it to be st marks site but not necessarily a c of e school.
•	I would prefer 2b, a new school on the current Culverhay site and a new school on the current St Mark's site, in order to support the provision of sufficient Church of England school places.
•	We opt for option 2b. We would like that Church of England secondary school be retained on the current St Mark's site. We think that the children of this generation (and any generation) require a moral compass and spiritual guidance as part of a holistic approach to education. li is therefore very important for us as parents that our children grow up with Christian principles and with Faith in God.
•	I agree with 2b as Oldfield School does not serve many students from the Bath area. It is apparently an 'Outstanding' school and yet only 27 parents and students form Bath have chosen it as their first choice. As a Bath residence and Council Tax Payer I believe that we should concern ourselves primarily with the education of BANES students NOT those from other authorities.
•	I agree that a new school should be located on the St.Mark's site but there are a number of major concerns (see below)
•	St Marks site is easily accessible by walking and cycling for many families and would be the better option.

•	The St Marks site is not big enough, not flat enough and is too difficult to get too being in a crowded residential area. there is already a lack of sports fields and to make it bigger would reduce facilities further.
•	I think the new schools should be located at Culberhay site and St Mark's site. There is already another girls school in Bath and what we need is another co-educational school. Also, we need a school on this side of town, which serves the east as well as the north. Though I am not religious, I am not bothered about the school being Church of England. I would prefer Church of England co-ed over secular girls school any day.
•	I would support this proposal (2b)
•	I favour this if t is the only way
•	Yes - best split
•	I support this proposal. The mapping information shows a strong existing cluster of pupils within the local Larkhall area. If these pupils were expected to travel to either Ralph Allen or Oldfield then the areas current transport difficulties would only increase.
•	I think St Mark's should be the location for a new school. I agree that it should be a church of England school, otherwise there will not be a C of E school in Bath
•	I support this proposal above 2a, to ensure sufficient Church school places are provided in the city
•	The option that best provides access and amenity, I have no preference to site - perhaps a totally new site might be better.
•	2b would be perfect. A church of England secondary school on the St mark's site. The only faith school available for secondary children in Bath is a Catholic school. This year 154 places out of 160 have been taken by Catholics - many from outside Bath. We need more faith schools!
•	This is the Diocesan Board of Education's preferred option. The Board is strongly committed to schools serving local communities and believes schools on the Culverhay and St Mark's sites are best placed to serve local residents and enrich the offering to young people in B&NES through the existing and developing strengths of local community interface.
•	I support this option. I think it should be a church of England school and a small school.
•	I think this would be fairer and make more sense as it would provide a new co-ed school for both sides of the city and would support the provision of a new co-ed Christian school. Also Oldfield and Culverhay would be too close together geographically.
•	I think that the decision not to keep a small school is obviously finance based as they are inevitably more expensive to run. I believe that St Mark's would be able to translate the skills acquired through small classes to larger ones and therefore believe that the best option for children would be to have a C of E secondary school on the current site of St Mark's.
•	It is important that a school remains on the St Mark's site, offering a local school for children this side of the river. Traffic getting across Bath, in the morning particularly, is extremely heavy and there is insufficient public transport to allow many children easy access to a school further away. Keeping a school in Larkhall would offer an alternative to long days for children, encourage local children to walk to school and provide an excellent feeder school for local primary schools.
•	Why is a new school on the Culverhay site guaranteed?If this is the only choice

	offered by Banes I would opt for 2b. However, the Culverhay site being safe regardless was not made at all clear in our meeting at St Marks.
•	support proposal for a C of E school on St. Marks site.
•	I support the proposal for a Church of England school on the St Mark's site
•	We favour either a new school on the St Marks site or that St Marks be left as it is. If Oldfield does get Academy status for a girls school and you decide to build a new school at Culverhay your proposal would mean that there would not be a single state school place for any Bath boy who lives North of the river this would clearly be a preposterous situation.
•	I can walk to this site. To get to Oldfield I would have to get 2 buses and leave an hour earlier each day!!!!
•	I agree with option 2b and that St Marks would be a church of England school. I understand that if this proposal goes ahead that St Marks will be improved in size so it can accommodate 160 admissions and that it will also be rebranded. I have been happy with all the proposals I have been informed about regarding a school staying on this site.
•	I believe this option makes the most sense.
•	I would prefer for the St Mark's school to remain an option and for the necessary resources to be deployed to ensure it attains the high standards reached in other secondary schools in Bath. This would attract parents in the local community to choose St Mark's as a preferred choice.
•	Last point under further comments. Read a - f first. Moved to this section as lack of space provided g. Before any decisions are made I would strongly recommend that the councillors who will make this decision (not just the officers) actually go and talk to parents of children at Newbridge and Weston All Saints Primary Schools who will be affected by this to gauge how strongly the community in this area of Bath feels about this extremely important decision.
•	This would not be suitable on a number of counts 1) Church of England school make preferential choice of those who are baptised and attend Church of England churches, this would reduce our choice of co-ed schools to Culverhay 2) both school require travelling for my son - he would not be travelling by public transport so would mean a car journey 3) Neither would place my son in his community.
•	I hope that Church of England will be in partnership with local communities to enable this to happen on the St Marks site.. I hope this stay in control of the church of England and not be in partnership with St Greogory.As I feel it is a strange mix and would add further confusion to parents in the area.
•	I agree with 2b.
•	Do not believe that a new church school is needed or wanted.
•	This would be my preferred option. Children should be able to go to school where they live and we should be making it possible for as many children to have a good school within walking distance as we can.thus cutting down on all the extra "school run" traffic current policy encourages.
•	No. It would be impractical for my children to travel across the city to St Marks and it would not be walking distance either to Culverhay.
•	It seems to make no sense to maintain St. Mark's which is not a popular school and is also a C of E school. This would seem to limit choice even further to parents in the north of the city.
•	St marks should stay as a small school see first comment.
•	A new school on the current St Mark's site makes most sense when the catchment

	<p>areas of both St Marks and Oldfield Schools are examined in detail. With the majority of pupils at Oldfield coming from outside of B&amp;NES it seems odd that Oldfield would be chosen and parents in Larkhall couldn't send their children to a local school! Let's concentrate on B&amp;NES residents first!</p>
•	<p>St Marks could have a sixth form as no sixth form exists in North Bath. Existing buildings can be increased by adding extra floors below or above. Children should not waste 2 hours a day commuting to Brislington. Examine St Mark's educational provision and religious emphasis. Parents can be put off schools that over-emphasise religion in the curriculum and the building. It could do with change to make it more educational and less crematorial.</p>
•	<p>I agree with this proposal - if it needs to be a Church School then I think that's a great thing for Bath anyway.</p>
•	<p>Yes. St Mark's is situated at the heart of a community where there is already a successful primary school. Its geographical location neatly balances that of St Gregory's across the City. Partnership with the Diocese of Bath &amp; Wells is the way to ensure that the wishes of those who want an Anglican secondary school are met. The financial contribution from the Diocese will ease the pressure (albeit slightly!) on the capital outlay.</p>
•	<p>Communities in the North of Bath need a secondary school within close reach. St Mark's is in the right spot.</p>
•	<p>This will mean a long distance for children to travel across Bath when congestion is already great at rush hour</p>
•	<p>I prefer option 2b.</p>
•	<p>of course I would prefer The st Marks school to stay, if it were to close it would greatly effect the local community , shops , and as i have already mentioned, impact heavily on the traffic.. We are athiests and wonder, if St Marks could take a more open direction with religion, to make it more attractive to non church goers. this and the proposed consultations is probably why the schools in the North are so oversubscribed.</p>
•	<p>No we need school on our area for the same reason.</p>
•	<p>"b and the provision on a Church of England school on the site.</p>
•	<p>We are not Church of England! The CHOICE is now reduced once again</p>
•	<p>The St Marks site is not capable of enlarging and has very poor facilities with little options for expansion. As someone who has more than a keen interest in sport and young peoples health I believe the current facilities at St Marks are totally inadequate. There is nowhere near enough 'outdoor space' for a thriving secondary school and the 'artificial pitch' (as someone who works on artificial pitches) is no better than a car park.</p>
•	<p>I have concerns over the families that do not practice religion as they will be disadvantaged in the admissions process and therefore Weston/Newbridge children will be disadvantaged by having limited choices made available to them. The 3 primary schools within this are are extremely well respected and successful please do not let these children down by splitting up the community.</p>
•	<p>I support option 2b and understand that the Bath &amp; Wells Diocese has made a clear decision to fully support the retention of an Anglican co-educational secondary school on the St Mark's site. My family are not churchgoers, but we are totally happy with this option and will be delighted to send our sons to an Anglican school on this site, believing that the principles taught are very much in line with our own family ethos.</p>



•	No. St Marks is already a coed school which is failing to attract enough pupils. It is in an inaccessible area of the city for many children.
•	I believe it is essential to have a school in the north-east of the city to give people in this area the option of attending a school which does not involve crossing the city.
•	By keeping St.Mark's, it would provide an Anglican school in the north, to compliment Catholic St. Gregory's in the south. We have been informed that they would like to enter into a 'hard' federation together, which would be an exciting development for St.Mark's. Allowing the sharing of resources, including a sixth-form, it would surely go a long way towards providing the council with a way of retaining St.Mark's in a far more educationally & financially viable way, than maybe it does currently.
•	I support this option. There is also an advantage that the school would be supported by the Anglican Diocese not only by the site being owned by the Diocese, but also a financial contribution to its funding. St. Marks is very much part of the community in Larkhall, students are very involved in lots of community projects. All the schools are set in the heart of this community and if the secondary school was lost it would leave a very big hole in the fabric of this community.
•	I object to this option that will result in the closure of Oldfield School.
•	It is my understanding that the Anglican Diocese has approved this option. It would be my first choice as the Oldfield site is even more remote than St Mark's.
•	I think Bath needs a church of England school. So would vote for the 2b option.
•	This option is the most preferable as both these schools serve the local community and should remain and St. Marks, together with St. Gregory's in the south will provide sufficient church schools for the city of Bath.
•	I support this option.
•	Oldfield school is virtually in Bristol, so it is difficult to get there from this part of the city and neither Culverhay nor Oldfield would constitute a local school for anyone on this side of Bath
•	NB We must NOT let the church meddle with our children's education! They are at school to be informed, not disinformed!
•	Don't agree with either. Close one single sex school, reopen other as co-ed. If council/LEA continue to ignore this obvious proposal, I'd be forced to opt for 2b as we must have a school on the St Marks site. An improved school would attract greater numbers. Recent discussions with St Gregory's re the development of a 6th form would help refresh St Marks' profile in exactly the way set out in your vision for education, resulting in many more admissions from the surrounding areas.
•	I am not in favour of a CofE option and the St Mark's site is too small to achieve a modern education service provision.
•	The same transport issues arise in reverse as 2a, and as stated having the only school in the north of Bath as a Church of England school raises issues of choice for parents who may not want their children educated in a religious environment. Even as a regular church goer I personally would prefer to separate education and beliefs so I can understand that for those of different or no faith this could be a big problem.
•	The complications of the Church involvement may slow down the process, but as it is already a co-ed school, it already has facilities for mixed pupils
•	This I agree with
•	i think this is the right choice as there needs to be a school on these sites and the magority of children attending are from the local area NOT BRISTOL

•	I support the option. I feel St Mark's school is in a better position to serve pupils in the north of Bath it would be a lot easier for pupils to travel to and from.
•	I strongly support the need for a Christian based school in Bath and this was one of the reasons my son chose to go to St Mark's school.
•	I feel strongly that St Marks should remain as a Church of England school
•	Unfortunately you don't say whether definitely a school is going to be in Larkhall. So I can only agree with this if a school is in Larkhall. However I do agree that it should be suitable for children up to 18, that is a sixth form college as well at St Mark's.
•	I would like to retain a Church of England school on St Mark's site. Our family chose the school specifically because of our faith. The C of E ethos is distinctive & appeals to those without a faith as well, who recognise the benefits that a Christian approach confers. I want to retain the choice to have a C of E secondary school in Bath, and St. Mark's is the best site for that. It has recently been judged 'Outstanding' in its SIAS inspection.
•	Only if the Anglicans want it
•	I support 2b and that the Larkhall School be a Church of England school proposed by the Anglican Diocese.
•	Absolutely. As a practising Christian I think the city needs a Church of England school. There are a lot of primary/junior CofE schools and if you remove St Marks school, then there will be no feeder school for them that continues with the Christian ethos
•	I would like to retain a CofE school on St Mark's site. My family chose the school specifically because of our faith. The CofE ethos is distinctive and appeals to those without a faith as well, who recognise the benefits that a Christian approach confers. I want to retain the choice to have a CofE secondary school in Bath, and St Marks is the best site for that. It has recently been judged and 'outstanding' school in its SIAS inspection.
•	I would agree with this option
•	My preference because I live in Larkhall. i.e. self-interest.
•	St Mark's is very much a community school and the village of Larkhall would greatly miss having a school on the St Mark's site. Building the school on the St Mark's site would help ensure that demand for church school places is met.
•	This is the ideal solution. St Marks is a good school and outstanding faith school and part of the Larkhall community. It is the only C of E school in Bath. The site is attractive and has huge potential for development.
•	And what about parents who are strongly in favour of secular schools???? It's outrageous to expect non-religious families to put up with a 'like it or lump it' local education decision.
•	This makes more sense to me - both St Marks and Culverhay, based on their results, are performing well and that could be addressed by replacing it with a new school and system. But Oldfield is successful and should not be closed down - it's working well.
•	As with 2a, both schools should remain and be co-ed. Both are excellent schools serving their communities and delivering good quality, rounded education for children with the broadest ranges of needs. Closing Oldfield deprives that community of a local school.
•	This I feel is the best option as if St Marks closed there would be no school close enough to serve the community. I also support the idea of St Marks getting together with St Gregory's and using it as a sixth form collage.

•	What is wrong with current St Marks build ? What would need to be done to existing buildings to admit 160 per year ?
•	1.If a school is to be shut it makes much more sense to keep one on the Oldfield site. It has far more land than the St Marks site, including playing fields. In these times of childhood obesity and mental health problems for kids, for the Council to even be considering shutting a school with playing fields and quite deliberately opening one without playing fields is absolutely disgraceful. 2. We don't want a religious based education for our children.
•	I feel in the current social climate, religious schools do not serve to encourage children to be accepting of various cultural and social differences. After experiencing the narrow minded selection criteria for our most local primary school (St Mary's) I am disgusted that discrimination due to religious belief is allowed to continue within education.
•	In light of recent events we do not know if keeping a school on the Culverhay site and the St Mark's site is still an option. If only one site can be used for the new school, we support the St Mark's site.
•	If the council insisted on following this proposal I would have to support option b as St Marks is my familys local school. However, I feel incensed that the council has caused the 3 schools concerned to be battling each other for survival, particularly St Marks and Culverhay who offer so much to their children and communities.
•	This would be the most appropriate option, given that Oldfield takes most of it's pupils from outside BANES
•	This is the preferred option.
•	Education and religion should not be compulsory!
•	With the choices given this would be the option I would prefer.
•	The choices seem to change daily, the current proposal for a 'hard' federation appears to have a lot going for it. The chance for St Marks to pool resources with St Gregory's, financial, pastoral and educational would, I feel, benefit both communities. The children would gain opportunities not currently available, new resources and curriculum areas could be pursued. The prospect for children from both schools to move seamlessly to a new sixth form facility also seems both logical and sensible
•	I disagree with this choice.
•	This would be preferred.
•	I would prefer this option as we live in Larkhall. I would see it as an opportunity to improve local secondary provision. I like the idea of a local Church of England secondary school.
•	St Mark's School has been the only school to have shown in this consultation a commitment to the children of it's community. Whilst I disagree with the methods that the Headteacher has approached her position in this consultation, I do believe that St Mark's is a vital lifeline in the communities of Larkhall and Fairfield Park and that to loose a school in this area would be a devastating loss to the community.
•	This option would leave the Newbridge area and a large part of south west bath with no nearby secondary school.
•	We would prefer a new school on the current St mark's site.
•	This would be our strong preference.
•	I would support the provision of a Church of England secondary school
•	I would support a new CofE school at St Mark's if its admission criteria do not give preference to Church members. I am concerned that local children who are not

	church members may be denied a place if the school becomes oversubscribed. For example, non-churchgoing children who live less than half a mile from St Mark's can be in Category 8 under St Mark's current admissions criteria; this would be unacceptable if St Mark's becomes the only coed secondary school in the north of the city.
•	I would support this option as I feel a Church of England school would provide the option of a christian school and associated ethos which as a parent I feel should be an part of the overall provision and choice for families.
•	Since St. marks and St. Gregory's wish to hard federate this seems to be the best option as this will leave the north side of the city with a school serving its community and a south side one.
•	St Marks had been graded as 'Good' and as 'Outstanding' as a Church school. It has the support of the Church of England and is a very viable option. Why should the ST Mark's site only be considered if a new Church School is decided upon? This smacks of monetary considerations rather than educational ones. Suppose all want a church school, and the St Marks site is not big enough for the demand? Not very equal opportunity here.
•	I support having a Church of England school on the St Marks site. Larkhall is a very particular location: church, shops, businesses, housing, Transition, New Oriel Hall, Larkhall Festival. It is unique in having a vibrant and active community. We want a secondary presence but it must be a revitalised presence. We will work so that parents are confident that they become willing to send their children to the secondary school.
•	This option is preferable. My children can walk to the school whereas moving the school would require at least 200 children being required to commute in the city increasing traffic congestion. Public bus transport is NOT an option as it is too expensive and increases the risks my children would be required to face through daily commuting. The loss of children growing up and schooling in their home area and community due to a closure of St Marks is not acceptable.
•	I support the proposal 2b
•	This is a excellent idea keeps everyone happy as long as the schools can remain open while all maintenance is being done
•	I would be happy for a new school on the St Marks site to retain Church of England status. To me that's a real positive and incentive to send my children there.
•	This is the option that I favour strongly. This would best serve the needs of the community and would preserve the contribution of the church in secondary education. There all sorts of benefits of church involvement at this sort of level. It keeps the Christian voice in the mix at a time when there is a growing need for cultural, religious and historical sensitivities.
•	Keep a school on the current St Marks site
•	Please see above comment.
•	I would like to have a new coeducational school on the St. Marks site in Larkhall.
•	This would seem to be the best idea. I would like to keep a church school. The only other church school is St Gregorys and that is always full.
•	Parental choice should be a strong consideration and maintaining a Church of England faith school in the city should be a priority
•	This is my preferred option.
•	We support this option. The school is halfway between where BANES pupils live bringing them together.

•	If a new school is to be built we would prefer a C of E school to be built on the ST. Marks site.
•	If St Marks is the chosen site, and is a C of E school, then that leaves those looking to send their children to a co-educational, non religious school no option. Again not enough information on if the church will propose the school or not.
•	We would be concerned with our only close option being a faith school and may decide that single sex was preferable to faith, though it would mean sending our two children (boy and girl) to two different schools.
•	One of the schools needs to be CofE
•	Better
•	Yes support new CofE school
•	Yes but not keen on church aspect
•	Yes - St Marks

**A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath**  
**A summary of on-time responses via E-Consult**

Parent responses	353
Pupil responses	48
Staff responses	41
Governor responses	33
Member of community near schools	109
Other: Grandparents; ex-pupils, parents of ex-pupils, residents outside of BANES	35
<b>Total</b>	<b>619</b>

Note: Total replies are 421 on e-consult (619 including drafts which have been counted). Some responses may have ticked more than one box which accounts for the differences in totals.

Q1. Do you agree with the Council's overall plan/strategy for Bath?

<b>Total Replies</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
418	302	72	116	28

<b>YES by Post Code</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>
BA1	168	55
BA2	90	30
BA3 and BA5	10	3
BS*	23	8
SN*	9	3
Other	2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>302</b>	

<b>NO by Post Code</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
BA1	73	59
BS	14	11
Other	37	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	

<b>NO Parent at</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Culverhay	1	.3
Oldfield	38	11
St Mark's	10	3
Other including Primary	60	17.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>31.8</b>

<b>YES Parent at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>
Culverhay	13	3.8
Oldfield	4	1.2
St Mark's	30	8.7
Other including Primary	187	54.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>68.2</b>

Parents ticking 'Other including Primary': majority from St Gregory's, Newbridge, St Saviours Infant and Juniors

<b>Member of Staff at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	8	
Oldfield		2
St Mark's	17	3
Other including Primary	15	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>

<b>Governor at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	5	
Oldfield		
St Mark's	2	
Other including Primary	26	4
Total	33	4

<b>Member of Community near</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	10	1
Oldfield	24	6
St Mark's	28	12
Other including Primary	22	12

**Other 'yes':** 30 made up primary age parents, grandparents, ex-pupils and people with an interest in education and in particular a church education.

**Other 'no'** to Q1: 7



Q2. Do you agree with the proposal to close Culverhay, Oldfield and St Mark's schools and to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the north of the City and a linked proposal to open one new 11-18 co-educational school with a planned admission number of 160 in the south of the City?

<b>Total Replies</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
418	275	66	143	34

<b>YES by Post Code</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>
BA1	148	51
BA2	89	31
BS30	6	2
BS31	3	1
SN*	9	3
Other	35	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>290</b>	

<b>NO by Post Code</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
BA1	93	62
BA2	15	10
BS15	11	7
BS30	8	5
Other	24	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	

<b>YES Parent at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>
Culverhay	13	3.8
Oldfield	2	.6
St Mark's	27	7.9
Other including Primary	172	50.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>62.4</b>

<b>No Parent at</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
Culverhay	1	.3
Oldfield	40	11.7
St Mark's	13	3.8
Other including Primary	75	21.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>37.6</b>

Parents ticking 'Other including Primary': majority from St Gregory's, Newbridge, St Saviours Infant and Juniors, Newbridge and WASPS

<b>Member of Staff at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	8	
Oldfield		2
St Mark's	12	6
Other including Primary	10	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>

<b>Governor at</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	5	
Oldfield		
St Mark's	1	
Other including Primary	30	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>8</b>

<b>Member of Community near</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Culverhay	9	2
Oldfield	19	10
St Mark's	24	6
Other including Primary	17	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>28</b>

**Other 'yes':** 27 made up primary age parents, grandparents, ex-pupils and people with an interest in education and in particular a church education.

**Other 'no'** to Q1: 7

## **Main issues from consultation responses**

### **Most frequently occurring comments first**

- Location of school – requirement north of river
- Preference for church school
- Requirement for more co-ed places
- Supporting six form at St Gregory's
- Closure of outstanding school
- Transport – across city to and from schools
- Loss of single sex school
- Question need for a church school
- Not educating Bristol families
- Uncertainty for staff and pupils
- No requirement for co-ed
- Lack of choice for parents
- SEN provision
- Increased planned housing

## **A Review of Secondary Schools in Bath Public Meetings**

### St Mark's 12<sup>th</sup> May

280 attended at St Mark's in the main hall, around 10 people were turned away and handed leaflets informing them of the Guildhall meeting. Approximately 75% of people who attended were local residents; 80% had a direct connection i.e. staff/governors/parents; 20% future parents – note some people put their hands up more than once.

### Oldfield 19<sup>th</sup> May

76 attended at Oldfield in the main hall. Approximately 8 parents; 30 prospective parents and 15 interested parties.

### Culverhay 20<sup>th</sup> May

58 attended at Culverhay in the main hall. Approximately 15 parents; 20 teachers; 4 parents from other schools; 5 governors and 10 in a professional capacity.

### Guildhall

93 attended at the Guildhall. Approximately 60% had attended a previous meeting in Bath; 5 Oldfield parents; 10 St Mark's parents; 1 Culverhay governor and 2 St Mark's governors. Approximately 70% were parents of primary aged children. Two governors from Broadlands also attended along with various union representatives.

(Notes of the meetings have been taken and are available.)