



Stanford Junior & Infant Schools

**Head Teacher: Trudy Roberts**

Stanford Road, Brighton, BN1 5PR

Telephone: 01273 565570

Email: office@stanfordjun.brighton-hove.sch.uk

<https://www.stanfordjun.brighton-hove.sch.uk/>

Head Teacher: Jenny Stratton

Highcroft Villas, Brighton, BN1 5PS

Telephone: 01273 555240

Email: office@stanford-inf.brighton-hove.sch.uk

<https://www.stanfordinfants.co.uk/>

Stanford Junior and Stanford Infant School Merger Consultation

Governors' FAQs October 2025

The Proposal

1. Why do the Governing Boards want to merge the schools?

The Governing Boards of Stanford Infant School and Stanford Junior School have been working together to explore the best structural option for the future of our schools. Both schools are rightly proud of their history, identity and achievements. However, we must also face the significant demographic and financial challenges that are affecting schools of primary aged pupils. The focus for Governors has been on identifying a sustainable structure that protects and enhances the quality of education, supports our staff, and provides stability for children and families for years to come. Having carefully considered the evidence, including input through focus groups and a community survey from staff, leadership and parents/carers, we believe that merging the two schools from September 2026 into a single all-through primary school on two sites offers the best long-term solution.

There are many successful through primary schools. In Brighton & Hove there are 43 primary schools, compared to just 5 separate infant schools, 2 of which are federated. All of the other infant schools in Brighton & Hove are bigger than Stanford Infant School. Small schools can be challenging to manage because of high staff costs relative to pupil numbers (particularly in infant schools, given the legal cap on infant class sizes). We also believe that small schools with falling pupil numbers are more at risk of mandated re-organisation by the Local Authority than larger schools. We want the Governors of the schools, who care deeply about the schools, and understand the local context personally, to develop proposals for change, not the Local Authority. We have been told by the Local Authority that no change is not an option, in light of the schools' financial positions. This is the background to the proposal to merge the schools.

2. What research have the Governing Boards undertaken to get to this proposal?

The two Boards of Governors, involving the participation of 23 Governors, have given very extensive and careful consideration to our merger proposal. We acknowledge that in any major change process, there are risks. We believe we have considered these in detail and would put every measure in place to minimise them. This would ensure the highest quality educational experience for all children to achieve their fullest personal and learning potential.

We have spent time with Head Teachers and Chairs of Governors from Hertford Primary, Hangelton Primary and Benfield Primary plus The Hove Learning Federation discussing their experience of federation, merger and academisation and taking their learning into consideration in our plans.

Following a year of initial work between the schools on collaboration, we set up a joint working committee with representatives from both schools' boards and with Terms of Reference relating to creating closer working in a broad sense. We then arranged for an Associate Governor from each school to be invited to attend the Governance meetings of the other school each half term to increase collaboration.

During April of 2024, the Joint Working Committee ran a survey of the school community to find out what the views of closer collaboration between the schools were. The results of the survey showed 83% of the community either agreed or strongly agreed that 'closer working between the schools is a positive move'.

During the process of analysing the range of options available to the school, namely doing nothing, federating, merging or academizing, in addition to the quantitative financial analysis, we also undertook a considerable qualitative review of the options. We ruled out doing nothing as it is clear that is not a viable option. We also determined that academisation would not be a workable solution for the schools. We then developed a multi-criteria decision analysis using information from the National Governance Association and input from the Hertford School merger to compile 23 factors relevant for the performance of a school which looked to rate the outcomes of federation and merger. The Governing Boards and the School leaders assessed the factors and largely found the merger to deliver better outcomes.

One of our Governors was the headteacher at two Brighton & Hove infant schools which merged with their linked junior school to create a primary school. He has shared his learning from these processes about how to make sure a school merger is successful. This learning is reflected in this paper in the Governors' proposals to address risks. We have reflected on the learning from this, and the Governors will prioritise efforts to maximise the educational success of our merger in consideration of what has been shared.

3. Who are the Governing Boards?

The governors are a diverse group, including staff Governors from both schools, civil servants, teachers and head teachers from other establishments, lawyers, economists, accountants, HR professionals, recruiters, marketers and communications professionals, psychologists, television producers and people working in the creative industries. Between the two Governing boards at the Infant School and Junior School, there are 26 people comprised of:

- 7 Parent Governors (elected by parents & carers) – parents with children at the school who understand first-hand what matters to families here
- 9 Co-opted Governors – people from the local community or with children at the school, appointed for their specific skills and expertise
- 2 Local Authority Governors, appointed by the LA for their skills and expertise and acting as a bridge between the Governing boards and the LA
- 2 Staff Governors – elected by the school staff
- 2 Head Teachers – who are automatically part of each governing body
- 2 Associate Members – who bring additional expertise (one of the Governors from each board attends the other Board's meetings).
- 2 Clerks – paid employees who run the administration and procedures of the Boards.

The Boards meet twice each term as well as regular communication around priorities and are tasked with:

- Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos, and strategic direction.
- Holding executive leaders to account for the educational performance of the organisation and its pupils, and the effective and efficient performance management of staff; and
- Overseeing the financial performance of the organisation and making sure its money is well spent.

4. What are the benefits of merging?

1. A Seamless Educational Journey for Children

- A merged school would provide a single, coherent pathway from Reception to Year 6, reducing disruption at the transition from Year 2 to Year 3. Under this proposal families would not have to apply for a place in Year 3, avoiding the uncertainty of a decision for some and additional bureaucracy for others at this point.

The Governors are not aware of any clear, statistically significant, evidence that infant/junior school structures are any better for pupil attainment than through primary schools, particularly where there is good management in place. We are aware of qualitative evidence that transitions between educational settings can be difficult for children, but clearly these can be experienced within an infant / junior structure too. The teams already work hard and successfully on this and we have had positive feedback from parents. Our comments about reducing disruption and improving coherence from Reception to Year 6 are primarily practical and qualitative. We believe many (but not all) parents and pupils would appreciate not having to make a separate application for Year 3, their child having a familiar headteacher in Year 3, and there being a feeling of one school, for example. The Local Authority is testing that statement with the community in the current consultation.

- Curriculum and pedagogy could be aligned across all year groups, ensuring continuity in teaching and learning.
- Vulnerable children and children with SEND and other additional needs would receive more consistent support through their primary school education.

2. Unified Leadership

- A merged school would have one Head Teacher, one Senior Leadership Team and one Governing Board. This provides clarity of accountability, vision and direction, enabling more effective strategic planning and operational delivery.
- Leadership could focus on long-term school improvement across all year groups, rather than navigating the complexities of two separate institutions.
- Professional development opportunities for staff would be broadened across a larger single organisation, helping with recruitment, retention and career progression.

3. Unified School Community

- Parents, carers and staff would be part of one school community, reducing the sense of two separate schools, strengthening collaboration and creating shared purpose.
- Children would identify as part of one larger school, fostering a stronger sense of belonging and continuity.
- Unified policies and practices would simplify matters, from communication to uniform, for families.

4. Opportunities for Enriched Curriculum and Wider Opportunities

- With one staff body, there is greater flexibility to share expertise across year groups, develop subject specialisms, and expand enrichment opportunities.
- Extracurricular activities and clubs could be better coordinated and accessible.

5. What is the state of each school's budget now?

Very challenging. The budgetary position is very similar in the two schools. The Infants has an in-year deficit of £105,000 in 2025/26 and a cumulative deficit of £280,000. The comparable figures for the Juniors are £75,000 and £215,000. The combined cumulative deficit is just below £500,000. To be clear, the money provided by the government to fund the Infant School no longer covers 100% of staff salaries (which are set centrally, and therefore outside of the school's control). All enrichment currently provided by the Infant School is funded by the PTFA and other parental donations.

The Infant School is projected to move to small in-year surpluses from 2026/27 but these would do little to dent its cumulative deficit. If the Juniors took some difficult but achievable savings measures it could significantly reduce but not eradicate its in-year deficit and its cumulative deficit would grow.

Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC) require schools to achieve cumulative balance within 5 years. As stand-alone schools, without economies of scale, the schools could only achieve this by making deeply unattractive and harmful cuts. These would put considerable extra strain on already hard-pressed staff and detract from the quality of education, particularly for vulnerable children and children with extra needs. The Governing Boards believe this situation presents a serious threat to the long-term sustainability of high-quality primary education in the local community, which is why they are exploring the option of merging — as a positive and proactive solution.

6. Are other schools in Brighton & Hove in the same situation?

Yes, there are many schools across the city in a similar situation. The reasons explained in the next question are common among local schools.

7. Why are the Schools' budgets in such a challenging position?

Like many schools across the city and the country, both Stanford Infant and Stanford Junior Schools are facing significant financial pressures. These challenges are due to a combination of long-term factors:

- **Funding pressures:** School budgets have not kept pace with the rising costs of running schools, including staffing, energy, and other essentials.
- **Falling pupil numbers:** There are fewer primary-aged children in the local area than there were a few years ago, which means smaller class sizes and less funding overall (since school budgets are largely based on pupil numbers).
- **Limited opportunities for efficiencies:** As relatively small stand-alone schools, it is difficult to achieve the economies of scale that larger or combined schools can benefit from.

8. How would a merger make the schools' finances better?

To estimate the financial impact of merger and other options we looked at the effect we might expect the change to have on funding, on senior staffing needs and on cross-school support. We did this in discussion with the schools' senior leaders. We sense-checked our findings with senior BHCC experts.

We found that merger has the potential to deliver the budgetary improvement the schools need by cutting out duplication and economies of scale. This would enable us to reduce costs without placing extra demands on hard-pressed staff.

Under merger we would become one school and have:

- **One Head Teacher**
- **One set of Governors and Governor meetings**
- **One Senior Leadership team**
- **One staff body**
- **One relationship with BHCC and other local partners**
- **One relationship with Ofsted**
- **One set of supplier relationships**
- **One budget to manage and report on**
- **One pupil and parent community to engage with**

- **One website**
- **One set of policies**
- **One admissions process**

This means less work, and hence the potential for cost reductions, in:

- senior leadership (c.£100,000 including pension and NICs costs from moving to a single Head Teacher);
- administration (c.£40,000pa); and
- opportunities through more flexible working across the years and sites (c.£40,000pa).

Any proposed changes to staffing would be subject to a formal consultation with affected staff.

We envisage the senior leadership structure below the Head Teacher remaining broadly as it is now.

Other possible financial benefits of a merger include:

- The possibility that the automatic transition into Y3 in an all-through primary would increase pupil retention and hence funding – two extra pupils in a year would bring in around £10,000 a year, increasing over time as the extra pupils rise up through the year groups.
- Possible opportunities for bulk purchasing (for example, paying for one licence for educational resource platforms). We have not yet scored any savings from this.

Offsetting this would be a reduction in lump sum funding from central government. Schools receive lump sum funding just for being a separate school and for operating across split sites. These payments are designed to reflect the extra costs involved in those circumstances. We would expect to lose around £70,000 of lump sum funding under merger.

Taken together this means we would expect merger to improve our budgetary position by around £120,000+ a year. This would put us comfortably into in-year surplus and enable us to clear our debt to BHCC by 2029/30, potentially sooner. We would then be able to reinvest the projected surpluses into extra support for our children. Savings would be achieved by reducing duplication and through economies of scale – maintaining the quality of education – not through arbitrary cuts that impose extra demands on our heavily loaded team and reduce support for pupils.

9. Looked at financially, how does merger compare to federation?

We consider that merger is significantly better than federation in financial terms for our schools because it cuts out more duplication and delivers more economies of scale. Most of the things we would only need to do once under merger we would need to do twice, or at least make an active decision not to do twice, under federation. Relative to merger this means we'd require more senior leadership, there would be more administrative work to do and there would be less scope for flexible working across the schools.

Relative to the current position our calculations indicate that federation might generate around £50,000 of savings a year, with no reduction in central government funding. This would not be enough to eradicate the cumulative deficits. We'd need to find an extra £70,000+ a year through deeply uncomfortable cuts. This could mean, for example, 2-3 fewer Teaching Assistants across the schools than under merger.

10. What are the risks associated with merging?

Any major change brings risk and we do not have the option to stay as we are. Governors and senior leaders would seek to mitigate these risks in the coming months. Some of that work can only really begin when the Local Authority makes its decision in February and, subject to that decision, we begin detailed implementation planning. Questions 11 - 13 look in more detail at potential risks. Question 16 outlines mitigation for risks.

11. Will merger lead to a loss of focus on Early Years or Key Stage 1 or Key Stage 2?

Governors and school leaders recognise the importance of all stages of primary education. We are determined to maintain the right balance between Early Years, KS1 and KS2 – we don't plan any changes to this. We would monitor the balance very carefully with the staff team in the implementation phase and beyond. We understand there is a fear that all funding will be directed towards Early Years and KS1 (resources) by some, or the end of KS2 (SATs) by others. We plan to mitigate the risk of this (in actuality and in perception) by having a strong and robust Senior Leadership team and good financial management practices. As noted in this paper, the budgets are so thinly stretched and the Governors, Senior Leadership Teams and the PTFAs are already working very hard to make very little money go a long way for the benefit of the children. We would continue to do this.

We have not been able to find any compelling, statistically significant, evidence that school mergers, in and of themselves, negatively affect pupils' attainment, particularly if they are well-managed by a competent leader. We have considered, in this regard, the evidence provided by a parent following a public consultation event. We fully acknowledge that all change can feel hard and that re-organisation can absorb the minds of those delivering change. However, we have also been told by the Local Authority that doing nothing is not an option. Change is unavoidable and

we would rather be the authors of that change than have changes imposed on us, as has happened to other schools in the city. While we note the evidence provided to us about the limited financial benefits that have been achieved by some school re-organisations, we have looked at the financial situation and savings to be made in our specific schools rather than elsewhere, and we remain of the view that financial savings can be made in our context.

12. There is very little time between the February decision point and the proposed merger in September. Would we be ready? Should we delay implementation until later to give us more time?

There would be a lot of work to do to prepare for the change if the Local Authority decides to proceed in February and time would be tight. We believe it is achievable, however, and in line with the time taken to bring in similar changes in other schools. To mitigate this we aim to prepare so that we are in a position to move quickly if a decision is made to proceed, for example, to ensure we are ready to recruit a permanent Head Teacher and action the constitution of a new Governing Board. We would also prioritise those steps that need to be taken before September and put a plan in place for those things that can be done over a longer time frame.

13. Would the projected reductions in senior leadership and other areas increase demands on teaching staff?

We accept that the loss of two dedicated headteachers to serve the joint school community will have some impact - we have fantastic leaders in both schools who provide support to staff and pupils. However, the reality is that we are unlikely to be able to maintain this level of senior leadership considering the financial position of the schools and the fact the schools are set to effectively decrease in size by a third with the consequential budget reductions. If merger is rejected, we would likely need to make reductions in senior leadership positions over time across the schools in any event.

We believe merger best helps ease the impact in a reduction of senior leadership time by reducing demands on senior leadership through simplification and the removal of duplication. Through merger, we are trying to reduce the workload for senior leaders as we remove the duplication of tasks such as budget management, preparing for Ofsted and updating policies. We do not believe this would increase specific demands on teaching staff. We envisage a proposed senior structure that would be comparable with that in other all-through primaries of a similar size and structure, but working across two sites would bring additional operational challenges. We would work closely with an appointed headteacher and deputies in each site to ensure that reasonable levels of senior support are available fairly and appropriately across the sites to support teachers and pupils. We are also assisted by the proximity of the school sites – other split site schools work successfully across greater physical distances.

14. What have the Governors considered to mitigate these risks?

By planning ahead systematically with school leadership and other staff where appropriate, to ensure continuity of leadership and maintenance of strong learning outcomes, we would:

- Ensure the appointment of the right headteacher for our new school. They would be someone who is experienced across the primary age range and understands that best primary practice is built on the most effective pedagogy of Early Years and Key stage 1 that is then extended and deepened to meet the needs of Key stage 2 pupils.
- Give priority to early intervention through understanding that putting the right levels of support in early on makes a significant positive impact on successful learning later.
- Put in place a leadership and management structure that ensures a strong voice in decision making for all year groups within the new school to ensure the best continuity and coherence in learning.
- Continue to prioritise the key transition point between Y2 and Y3.
- Prioritise the development of key joint policies such as "Teaching and Learning Policy" and "Behaviour Regulation Policy" to embed from the outset the best continuity for the children.
- Acknowledge that children of different ages within the primary age range are more similar than they are different. As such we are committed to researching and exploring innovative pedagogy and learning and teaching approaches that blend early years with highly effective subject-specific direct teaching to ensure the highest standards of achievement, progress and attainment for all children.
- Utilise to the full the considerable knowledge and expertise of our staff across both schools and support and empower them to continue to make a positive impact on our children.

Mergers can deliver continuity of education, staffing and estate efficiencies, and clearer single-school leadership - but in Brighton & Hove some recent experience shows the biggest risks are demography-driven funding shortfalls following unexpected birth rate changes, leadership and implementation instability, and poor expectation/communications management. Strong financial modelling, phased implementation, robust governance and active parental engagement are considered to be the clearest mitigations.

15. Why did the Governing Boards feel merging was preferable to federating?

We have discussed the benefits of merging elsewhere in this paper. Please also see the answer to the question on the financial case.

In addition, though federation provides the opportunity for cooperation between the two schools, it is less of a defined path. Each decision of whether to work together and how to work together would have to be negotiated between the two schools, taking up limited time and resource. The budgets of federated schools remain separate, creating more work in terms of preparing and managing the budget as well as missed opportunities for economies of scale.

16. What happens if the Local Authority rejects the proposal, following consultation?

We would then go back to the drawing board and determine how to make the significant savings that would be required to be made in the existing schools. If the merger is rejected, the cuts that each school would have to make in year 2026/27 and beyond would negatively affect the children's experience and provision, and place extra demands on staff, such as the loss of some Teaching Assistants (TAs).

17. What sort of cuts would have to be made if the merger doesn't go ahead and we stay as we are?

If the merger does not go ahead and the schools take no further action, each individual school would have to start making a series of very undesirable cuts to their budgets. These cuts would affect the children and the workload of staff in a significantly detrimental way. As individual schools, all of the duplication discussed elsewhere in this paper would continue and each school would continue to have a statutory obligation to have a full time headteacher. For each school to be able to afford this, and to clear the cumulative deficit within the Local Authority timeline, Governing Boards and Senior Leadership Teams would have to make changes of the following nature and scale:, without the reduction in workloads that merger would bring:

- Reduction of Deputy Head Teacher role to three days a week with the other two days a week being teaching days;
- Reduction in school business manager role;
- Reduction in SENDCo coverage;
- Cutting the roles of TAs and Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTAs), which would increase the workload of teachers;
- Cutting specialist teacher roles;
- Removing subsidies to support clubs and trips for disadvantaged pupils further widening the gap.

We clearly don't want to do those things, and actual decisions would be made further down the road, but measures of this scale and nature would be needed if we remain as stand-alone schools.

18. What happens if we don't make the cuts to the budget?

The Local Authority have to ensure schools meet their budget obligations and if it is found that the existing Governing Boards are unable to achieve these expectations, there have been instances where the Governing Board have been replaced with officers from the Local Authority who then go about making the changes required to achieve the budget cuts. We believe this possible outcome would be worse for the schools than a merger managed by the schools' own Governing Boards, who care deeply about both schools and understand the local context.

19. How would early years education change in a merged primary school?

The Governors and the Senior Leadership Teams of both schools understand the importance of the early years education provided at SIS. There are no plans to change the early years education provided to children under a merger. We understand how thinly stretched staff are, we believe that a merger changes the shape of the Senior Leadership Team but does not change the day-to-day responsibilities of Teachers, TAs and HLTAs.

20. Would PE Funding be lost?

If funding continues, a newly merged primary school would receive one amount of funding. However, any funding the new school gets would be distributed appropriately for the activities the school delivers. It is unclear whether the DfE will continue to provide PE funding nationally in any case.

21. Would we lose places for Let's Dance and The Children's Parade?

The number of places each school is offered for these events changes each year. We know this represents an important experience for many children and we will aim to offer as many places for these events for those children keen to participate in them as they progress through the merged school. A benefit for parents were we to have a Stanford Primary entry to the parade including children from Key Stage 1 through Key Stage 2, is that it would be far easier for parents with children currently at the Infants and the Juniors to enjoy the parade with both children. Since the first consultation meeting, we have contacted the organisers of Let's Dance and they have agreed that a new merged Stanford Primary School could have two places in the show.

22. Would the names, logos or uniforms of the schools change?

Yes, it is likely we would synergise the swan logos, which are essentially similar, into one logo for the new school. It is worth noting that wearing the logos is not compulsory in any case. So school uniforms would only change gradually over time where the old logos are shown.

23. Would the start and end of school times change?

There are no plans to change this, and the schools would adhere to DfE guidance and deliver at least a minimum length of school week. School start and end times would continue to be staggered to allow for drop off and pick up from both sites.

24. Would term dates change?

There are no plans to change this.

25. Would this affect the admissions process?

Admissions policies would remain the same for applying for a reception place. There would be no need to then apply for a place for Year 3 as is the case currently. Instead pupils would have a through primary experience. We will otherwise continue to serve the local community and offer places to children based on the same criteria we have always used.

Employment of Staff

26. What would it mean for the staff?

If the decision to merge the schools is taken, the new staffing structure would be developed as part of the planning for September 2026. The exact staffing structure for the future cannot be fully known until we have worked through the organisational arrangements for the new school. Governors are committed to avoiding, where possible, compulsory redundancies. There would be a formal consultation with affected staff, including the opportunity for staff to meet on a 121 basis where appropriate, as and when specific staffing changes are proposed.

Governors would work with the Local Authority, Staff and their Unions to determine the best ways to manage any changes needed.

27. How would staff employment terms and conditions be affected?

Providing there are no changes to the roles, the terms and conditions of staff would go unchanged as staff remain employed by the Governors and BHCC and that doesn't change should we merge. Staff would be provided with a variation of contract letter stating that the school name has changed to the new name, most likely, Stanford Primary School. Should any changes to roles be proposed at a later stage these would be subject to formal consultation with affected staff.

28. How would continuous service be affected?

Continuous service would continue for staff if the merged school is established.

29. What happens to staff pensions?

There would be no change to staff pensions. Teachers would remain in the Teachers' Pension Scheme and Support Staff would remain in the Local Government Pension Scheme.

30. Would staff be required to sign a new contract?

No, in most cases there would simply be a variation of the current contract to show the name of the new school as the place of work. If there are any other changes following a formal consultation process then, if agreed, these changes would result in a new contract being issued.

31. What if I currently have a TLR linked to my post?

If you have an existing Teaching & Learning Responsibility (TLR) linked to your post and there were to be significant changes to your role (these are not currently planned), those changes would be consulted on and regardless of the outcome of the changes your role, the TLR would be salary safeguarded for three years in accordance with School Teachers Pay & Conditions Document (STPCD).

32. Would staff have to apply for their own or other positions?

If the plans to merge are agreed there would be a formal staff consultation. Any future plans would be outlined at that point including a clear statement of whether people are affected and how.

33. Would staff have to work at the other site/move between Key Stages?

There may be opportunities to move to work in other Key Stages and move between sites for those interested to do so. Any changes that are proposed would be subject to formal consultation, including the opportunity to have a 121 meeting at which staff could outline their preferences. We would aim to act in line with staff preferences where it is possible to do so.

Governance

34. How would the governance structure of the schools' change?

The new school would have one Governing Board operating in the same way as each school currently has their own Governing Board. This would include elected parent, staff and community members. Existing Governors would be invited to apply to join the new Governing Board in due course should the proposal go ahead.

Consultation Opportunities

The formal consultation period runs from 29 September through to 16 November 2025.

We have organised three consultation meetings for parents, carers and the community: one at each school, one in the morning and one in the evening, plus one online meeting. We have also arranged for three consultation meetings for staff, again one at the Infant School, one at the Junior School, two meetings after school and one on an inset day so as to enable all staff to attend regardless of their working pattern.

Additionally, there is the online portal which is open throughout the consultation period from 29 September to 16 November 2025, with the survey for anyone to share their thoughts on the proposals. Further details of upcoming events and how to access the survey are below:

In Person Public Meetings	Tuesday 4 November (9.30am – 10.30am) Stanford Junior School, Stanford Road
Online Public Meeting	Tuesday 4 November (4.00pm – 5.30pm) – Microsoft Teams Use this link to join the meeting
Online Feedback	Complete the survey on “Your Voice” Portal throughout the consultation period. Access the portal at: Project: Stanford Infant and Junior Schools merger proposal Brighton & Hove City Council
Email	Email your comments to: educationandlearning@brighton-hove.gov.uk

35. What happens after the consultation?

All responses to this consultation would be considered by the Local Authority before a decision is made. The school and council are committed to a transparent and thorough decision-making process:

Phase 1: Consultation and Analysis

- Formal Consultation – 29 September – 16 November 2025 (minimum of 6 weeks)
- Analysis of all feedback – 17 November – 23 November 2025

Phase 2: Statutory Process

- If proceeding, publication of Statutory Notice proposing merger of Stanford Infant and Stanford Junior Schools
- Further representation period: 24 November – 21 December 2025 (further 4 weeks for further submission of comments on the proposals)
- All additional feedback considered and incorporated

Phase 3: Decision and Planning

- Cabinet members to meet on 12 February 2026 to consider all representations and evidence before making the final decision on whether to proceed with the merger

Phase 4: Implementation

- If Cabinet Members agree to proceed then the school would implement from 1st September 2026

If the proposals go ahead there would be a formal staff consultation with all affected staff.

If the decision is taken not to proceed, then the schools would continue to operate as they did previously under existing arrangements. Financial savings would, however, need to be found in both schools.

