

## Issues raised by those who are opposed to the planned reorganisation at Dinton

Issue raised	Response
Dinton school is physically too small to take KSII children-there will not be sufficient playing field and the field at Dinton gets muddy	Dinton School has three spacious classrooms already and space within the existing buildings to create a fourth. The capacity at present is set at 82. The proposal is for a 20 entry junior department giving 80 places so well within the school's capacity. The field is large and sufficiently well drained for sport to take place.
Facilities for junior aged children not available at Dinton: there are greater sporting opportunities at Haddenham Junior Will there be a need for alterations?	The governing body has in place a detailed plan for adaptations/alterations to Dinton School to enable the necessary building work to take place. The appropriate funding has either been secured or ear-marked
The proposal if agreed would reduce the number of infant school places	Currently Dinton and Cuddington take in approximately 12 in-catchment children a year against a combined admission number of 46 and there are therefore surplus infant places in the area
The proposal reduces parental choice	The proposal is a response to parental support for a Church of England Combined School in the area. Parents will still be free to apply for a place at Haddenham Junior.
The impact of the proposal on Haddenham Junior-reducing the number of children going to the school and possibly in the long-term reducing the schools intake	In the short term there could be an impact on the number of children going to Haddenham Junior school. However there are likely to be 21,500 houses built in Aylesbury Vale over the coming years and there will then be a need for additional junior school places in the area
Junior aged children better placed in a larger school- they will not be able to mix with as many same aged children in KSII if the proposal goes ahead	In village schools across the country children are thriving in small groupings. The school already belongs to a network learning community that allows opportunities for same age children to mix together for certain activities.
Children at Dinton and Cuddington will be apart although they are a combined school	The schools have plans for numerous events to take place throughout the school year that will bring the two sites together. Staff and Governors are already fully engaged in working across the two sites.
Will children who live in Dinton still be able to get to Haddenham Junior school if that is there choice?	Yes they can apply to go to Haddenham Junior rather than Dinton if it becomes a KSII school. The position at Dinton would be no different than at present as they are not linked to Haddenham Junior.
There will be a lack of extra curricular activities at Dinton if the proposal goes ahead	The Governing body has in place a plan of extra curricular activities. In Cuddington's recent Ofsted inspection it was noted that "There is an exceptional range of extra activities, especially in sports and the arts."
Concerns about the impact of the proposal on the	Over 70% of the children at Dinton school are at

## Issues raised by those who are opposed to the planned reorganisation at Dinton

levels of traffic in and around Dinton School	present out of catchment and many travel by individual cars to get to Dinton. If the proposal goes ahead many of those children will arrive on one bus from the merged catchment area so reducing individual car usage.
Has the additional expense been budgeted for and can Dinton going to junior status be afforded?	All the anticipated costs have been calculated and allowed for in the governing body's financial plans. No additional funding has been requested.
Would be better to keep 2 KSI schools at Dinton and Cuddington and not to create surplus places at Haddenham Junior and reduce the number of infant school places in the area which the proposal does	The future of Cuddington and Dinton is insecure if they remain as infant schools as both are running below capacity and rely heavily on out of catchment children. Every year a significant number of parents enquire about the schools moving to full primary status so that their children can stay on through junior education with the same ethos.
Haddenham Junior school will have to make staff redundant if the proposal goes ahead	A large school like Haddenham Junior would generally have a reasonable level of staff turnover each year which could make it unnecessary to make staff redundant. At this stage it is not possible to say that staff from the school would have to be made redundant
Dinton staff do not have experience of teaching KSII How can KSI teachers teach KSII curriculum?	The two schools have a significant number of teachers with KS11 experience who are willing to teach that age range.
There will have to be mixed aged teaching at Dinton-where has this been done successfully	In village schools across the country there are often mixed-aged classes and these schools frequently achieve results on a par or better than single age classes. Both Cuddington and Dinton currently operate mixed age teaching successfully. Ofsted in their recent report on Cuddington rated the quality of the teaching at the school as outstanding as was Dinton's in 2005.
Why has a wider consultation not taken place?	A wide consultation has taken place and there are been responses both to the two consultation and the statutory notice from many different groups and individuals across the area
Dinton cannot offer as wide an opportunity for children as Haddenham Junior can	The school is confident that it can offer a variety of opportunities. These may be different to Haddenham Junior but no less wide ranging.
No figures on predicted numbers on roll have been provided-statistical evidence to support the creation of a KSII school at Dinton has not been made available	Predicted numbers for the proposal were shared at the open meetings held in both villages.
Why was Haddenham Junior never consulted about the proposal?	It was kept informed of the proposal since January 2006 - school held a public meeting for their parents and community at which the Headteacher and Deputy from Haddenham Junior were present in April 2006. Two consultation papers have been sent to Haddenham Junior in April 2006 and April

## Issues raised by those who are opposed to the planned reorganisation at Dinton

	2007 to which they have responded. Meetings have in the past taken place between officers and the head at Haddenham Junior
Does being in a small village KSII school prepare a child for secondary education? Wouldn't they be better able to cope if they go to secondary from a larger KSII school?	There is no evidence to support either view. This is a matter of parental choice.
There will be increase bussing of children between Dinton and Cuddington if the proposal goes ahead	Bussing at present takes place between Chearsley and Cuddington to Haddenham. Bussing to Dinton and from Dinton to Cuddington would replace that.
Can Dinton support the less-able academically?	Smaller class sizes can help those in need of greater support to provide individual attention. Children with special educational needs will continue to be very well supported as they are at present.
Are supporters of the proposal in league with the LA?	The schools have published a statutory notice and consulted on the proposal. The Local Authority has to make the final decision on whether the proposal should go ahead and they awaited the outcome of the consultation and publication of statutory notices before deciding whether to agree to the proposal or not
Too small a friend base at a small KSII village school	Schools do not work in isolation and there will be many opportunities for children from both schools to work together and for them to visit and meet with children from schools in the area.
It is a waste of public money to agree to the change	No direct funds are coming from Buckinghamshire County Council to support any necessary work. All such work would be funded by the school's grant for premises development they receive from the DCSF directly
Both Haddenham Infant schools recruited new Headteachers so why couldn't Dinton	Dinton governing body advertised twice for a headteacher and was unable to appoint. One of the Haddenham Infant Schools appointed a permanent head but the other had to make a temporary appointment
There will need to be substantial investment at Dinton to bring it up to standard	The governing body have already earmarked funding (from funds made available from central government specifically to improve buildings) to make necessary adaptations or alterations. They will also be using funding set aside from their school budget share to fund further work.
Will there be mixed aged classes at Dinton?	At this stage it is not possible to be entirely certain about the organisation of the classes if the proposal goes ahead. However evidence from Ofsted is quite clear that mixed-age classes is not a barrier to achieving very high standards or educational achievement

## Issues raised by those who are opposed to the planned reorganisation at Dinton

Wouldn't it make more sense to make Cuddington the junior school?	There is not the playing field space and building's area needed at Cuddington																															
How will two schools on two sites work together?	There are examples nationally and locally where this has worked well: St James and St John schools in the north of the county for example successfully have KSI and KSII schools on separate sites under one headteacher as does the Round Wood federation involving Tingewick and Gawcott schools in the north of the county																															
What is the future for Dinton pre-school?	The school has excellent liaison with Dinton Pre-school that will continue. Discussions have already taken place between the Headteacher and the Pre-school Leader as to how the school will continue these links if the proposal goes ahead.																															
We have not seen projected pupil numbers if the proposal went ahead	<p>The Cuddington site will retain a 20 intake so will not change from at present.</p> <p>Cuddington Site numbers on roll</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="810 801 1513 949"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reception</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>20</td> <td>19</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>20</td> <td>20</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>20</td> <td>20</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Below is the projected numbers on roll of children who will attend the proposed Junior Department from 2008 and also the present pupils at Dinton School.</p> <p>It is based on actual numbers on roll at present and parental indications for junior education. The number in brackets underneath is the number based on all pupils coming through into the junior department with no-one going elsewhere at Year 3, either to the private sector or other combined/junior schools.</p> <p>Dinton Site</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="810 1379 1513 1706"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>Year 1 22</td> <td>Year 2 17</td> <td>Year 3 25 (33)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>Year 2 22</td> <td>Year 3 26 (33)</td> <td>Year 4 25 (33)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>Year 3 36 (40)</td> <td>Year 4 26 (33)</td> <td>Year 5 25 (33)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To accommodate the high number in 2010 the school would run two parallel Year 3 classes and mixed Year 3/4 in 2011 and Year 4/5 in 2012.</p>		Reception	Year 1	Year 2	2008	20	19	14	2009	20	20	19	2010	20	20	20	2008	Year 1 22	Year 2 17	Year 3 25 (33)		2009	Year 2 22	Year 3 26 (33)	Year 4 25 (33)		2010	Year 3 36 (40)	Year 4 26 (33)	Year 5 25 (33)	
	Reception	Year 1	Year 2																													
2008	20	19	14																													
2009	20	20	19																													
2010	20	20	20																													
2008	Year 1 22	Year 2 17	Year 3 25 (33)																													
2009	Year 2 22	Year 3 26 (33)	Year 4 25 (33)																													
2010	Year 3 36 (40)	Year 4 26 (33)	Year 5 25 (33)																													
49 (41%) of those who responded were against the proposal																																