Appendix 6

Responses to consultation on East Sussex County Council's proposed admission arrangements for 2017/18

We asked for views on the following:-

1. Proposed changes to the admissions criteria
    a. Sibling rule
    b. Distance measurement
2. Proposed Admission numbers
3. Proposed Co-ordinated schemes
4. Any other comments

78 people completed the survey online and the headteacher from UCTC wrote in. The results are as follows:

1. a) Is the proposed change to the admissions criteria acceptable?

Yes – 34 (44%)

No – 44 (56%)

1. b) Is the proposed change to the way we measure distances acceptable?

Yes – 55 (71%)

No – 23 (29%)

Comments received

1) Distance always will be a challenge but it is important to consider the existing transport infrastructure to be realistic about the ability of students to get to school.
2) I think it would be very hard for parents to manage siblings at different schools and siblings should always be a higher priority regardless of where they live.
3) From what I can tell (informal conversations with parents on Open Days) this would be a popular change with parents
4) Whilst I understand that the change of criteria for siblings is necessary to prevent rural schools from becoming oversubscribed with families from outside the area, I would like to know that there might be some human sensibility taken if, for example, a family needs to move from one village to another, but wishes for children to remain in their school and for siblings to join them there.
5) Further in this section you say; 1) "Children who have a brother or sister who joined the school prior to 1 September 2017 (1 September 2012 for Frant CE Primary School) and who is still on roll will be admitted under the previous criteria which gave priority to brothers and sisters regardless of whether they live in the pre-defined community area or not. " Does this change mostly affect children who will be applying for entry 2018/19? Also; 2) "If an application is received after 31 October 2016 but before 1 February 2017, together with proof of a change of address* since the closing date, or proof of another good reason why it was not possible for the family to apply on time, it will be treated as on time in respect of community and voluntary controlled schools. If

there is no proof, or the reason is not considered valid by the LA, the application will be treated as late. There is no right of appeal against the decision as to whether the application is treated as on time or late. " Can an Appeal Panel review such a decision? The next paragraph in the Draft seems to suggest that an Appeal is possible. Although the next paragraph says No! 3) Why do Waiting lists stop at the end of Term 2? Can a new one start at the beginning of Term 3? 4) "There is no right of appeal against the decision as to whether the application is treated as on time or late. " Really?

6) The idea of using a community area is inspired this will stop parents feeling trapped and a much better way of doing things than the ridiculously damaging idea of scrapping the sibling rule altogether... A triumph for logic!

7) I don't think it should change I feel we should have the right to choose where are children go to school

8) We are on the East Sussex board and our children go to an East Sussex primary. The linked Secondary, where all of their friends will go, is likely to leave us outside of the 'pre-defined community area' and so our children are at risk of being split permanently from a peer group they will have been with for 6 years. This seems unnecessarily punitive.

9) At primary level it is impossible to manage siblings at different schools.

10) I would also like to have parents provide proof of residence as they do in other areas within England. On acceptance of a place a parent/carer must provide a proof of address with at least 3 month residency on it.

11) It would have been helpful to see the 'before and after' criteria - as oppose to just highlighting changes as this is not clear what it was before! We are not crows - so it is irrelevant how far it is from home to school in a straight line. It is much more relevant how far it is to walk on foot safely. Regarding those with siblings in the school and they live outside of the community area - this seems fair to move them down the priority list (apart from if the child already in the school was allocated their place because there was not a place available in the school in their community area. You cannot penalise a family twice by making it more likely that a sibling will not then get in the school.

12) If a sibling is already in the school and then a younger sibling is not accepted meaning the sibling is sent to another school this could make it impossible for parents to get one or both children to school on time. If the parent is also working this would be incredibly unfair especially in today's climate of pushing mums back into work. Location of main carers employment should be a consideration along with ability to get child to the location of school ie driving. Thankfully, i am not affected by the changes, so my opinion is completely impartial.

13) Dont' thinks children living out of the area whom have siblings at a school should be automatically given place. Consideration of the needs of the second child should be discussed with the school as often it is not appropriate provision for the second child.

14) I think it utterly unreasonable to expect siblings to attend different schools. The added pressure on the parent and the stress of the school run would not be manageable. I feel it would also negatively impact on the children if they attend different schools; two different ethos, curriculum, separate and possibly competing events, separate friend networks, etc. Even handing down school uniform becomes impossible. The emotional and financial strain is not justified. I appreciate the pressure on rural schools but the solution cannot be to disadvantage siblings, and their families, by sending them to different schools in the event of place shortages. There are other reasons why families who do not live in the community area choose rural schools, in our situation my daughter had speech and language delay and would not have coped in a larger school, indeed it could have made her condition worse. I do not feel that we should face the prospect of our other children being sent to a different school as the detriment to us outweighs the advantage to rural families, who may have just moved in to the

area. What is not taken into consideration is the fact that we may live just outside the community area, but we are very much part of the community. We attend the local rural church and this should also be taken into consideration. Because we can't afford a house in the rural area, or to move house at all, our children should not be disadvantaged, we are still a valued part of the rural community. The proposed changes do not take into consideration all the relevant information and the result would be devastating to families who ARE part of the community.

15) For most parents and carers, and particularly for those living in rural areas, to have siblings at different schools is impractical and will inevitably involved higher lateness rates for one pupil as well as extensive round trips for working parents. It may be totally impossible to get two children to two different school for the allocated start times. It is unfair to move the goal posts of accepting outside the community area when you need to fill the places at a school but not honour that placement with regards to siblings later on. It will lead to more appeals and probably having to stretch class sizes. Many rural residents are discriminated against anyway because they do not live near to a school so this proposed change would be adding insult to injury. Measuring distances as the crow flys is better as it benefits rural residents.

16) I we think first of the child's well being, then I think having a sibling at the same school is a very important factor. It is likely that the child will feel more secure with a sibling at the same school. If the family is to move house outside the community area but within reach of a school to which a child has already secured a place, then it wouldn't be fair on younger siblings to be excluded from the same school as the older sibling. This adversely affects the child's well being. From an environmental perspective it is worth considering how to minimise travelling distances to school. Why change the calculation to "as the crow flies" when children clearly do not generally fly to school? This also relates to the former change in criteria. It does not make sense for parents to travel extra distances to accommodate multiple schools. It is disruptive to family life and has an extra environmental cost in terms of fuel use (and therefore pollution as well as contribution to C02 emissions) and congestion.

17) By changing the sibling rule, this proposal will have a very negative effect on families who have a child at a school. Having two or more children at different schools will be highly inconvenient for transport to / from school but also there will be no co-ordination between the two schools for school events that parents are expected to attend. If public transport is being used, then older siblings look after younger siblings which improves student welfare and safety. Furthermore, the proposal's stated aim is to get children to go to their nearest school. This reduces parental choice and parents do not get much choice as it is. The whole schools admission process should have at its core, the aim of giving parents and students as much choice as possible.

18) Our child started at South Malling (our first choice) as it was the nearest school and also good reports. Subsequently moved house and not room or suitable after school arrangements at the local school. If criteria are changed, likely that youngest child will be offered place at different school, logistics would be impossible with both parents needing to work. I'm sure we are not the only people that could be in this situation.

19) The new distance measure will hopefully make it easier to see whether you have any chance of getting into the school of your choice.

20) As the crow flies is not practical in real terms. Should be according to actual routes - including pedestrian short-cuts. For split site schools does your criteria mean that in the case of an infant & junior site the relevant distance would be to the junior site (4 out of 7 years = majority of lessons), even though the child would not attend that site for 3 years? Or should it not be relevant if either site is the closest school?

21) Siblings need to be kept together if this is desired by parents. They look after and support one another and travel together. Parents who have to transport children to more than one school would increase traffic congestion and add to global warming, undesirable. Many schools have different term dates, inset dates and events - making

working arrangement disruptive for parents and the UK business that employ them. BAD IDEA

22) Children need to be with their siblings, to allow siblings to support during transition and allow for the most effective transport (whether provided by county or the family)

23) By changing the sibling rule, this proposal will have a very negative effect on families who have a child at a school. Having two or more children at different schools will be highly inconvenient for transport to / from school. Furthermore, there will be no co-ordination between the two schools for school events that parents are expected to attend thus inconveniencing parents even more. If public transport is being used, then older siblings look after younger siblings which improves student welfare and safety. Furthermore, the proposal's stated aim is to get children to go to their nearest school. This reduces parental choice and parents do not get much choice as it is. The whole schools' admission process should have at its core, the aim of giving parents and students as much choice as possible.

24) Children with an older sibling who live outside the designated area should remain a priority. Many parents will find it impossible to co-ordinate 2 or more children at different rural schools. Moving a child as they near GCSE to accommodate this change will harm that child's education. Siblings using public transport together improves the safety of both students particularly the younger one. Overall this a terrible proposal. Using a straight line measure is absurd since children are not Crows and have to walk or be transported on roads and designated footpaths

25) By changing the sibling rule we may end up having children at different schools. This will cause many complications including school events clashing, different rules of school being confused, older siblings unable to help younger ones. Relationships between school and parent will be weaker if it is "diluted". I believe all of these things would have a major impact on my children's learning.

26) If my children were not both at the same schools -the logistics of this - especially when there are functions on is crazy. It is bad enough when you have one at Primary and one at Secondary. Why implement something unnecessarily? My youngest child would also be unhappy that he was not at the same school as his brother. He would wonder why he couldn't go to the same school (and rightly so). My children can walk to school at the moment - any other school would involve school transport and getting the child to the appropriate place to pick it up! (this could also cause parents problems getting to work on time. We are supposed to be getting our kids moving for exercise where possible!

27) This would impact on families who already have a child at the school. How would parents manage the balance. I think the change would be negative in every way and would not benefit children at all, what is the point in a change that would not benefit the child.

28) Siblings should always be admitted to the same school as an older child as to expect parents to take children to different schools is wrong for a number of reasons. Firstly it would place a burden on parents having to go different schools. Secondly by requiring journeys to different schools it would increase car traffic and be bad for the environment. Thirdly it would reduce parental choice.

29) Changing the sibling rule will make it very difficult for families who may end up with the logistical problems of getting children to different schools at different times, with the ensuing transport problems. There will also be no co-ordination between different schools for school events that parents are expected to attend which will make it more likely that parents will not be able to attend all the events they need to so as to support their children. It is also more problematic if schools close for any reason. Different polices and support from different schools, who may also use different examination boards and offer different extra-curricular opportunities, will also make it more complex to juggle family dynamics.

30) Re siblings and 6th form pupils living outside the area. Not felt necessary as a 6th form child doesn't keep the same school hours as say a year 7-11. Therefore these should not be take. As a 'sibling' just because a sibling is in 6th form. If the family lives outside the area .

31) I have a child at Pevensey and Westham. This is classed as a rural school. I live 1.1 miles away from it but believe I'm not in its direct catchment area. With the new change I am concerned that my second daughter may now not get a space at the school if a high birth rate in village.

32) The change in the sibling rule: It should be noted that there are many benefits for a child to go to the same school as their sibling. 1. An older sibling can help to make the journey to school safer for the younger sibling. 2. Sending children to the same school can be less expensive and will avoid children having to travel earlier than necessary and having to hang about for the school to open. 3. Parents are able to attend one school for school events rather than having to choose which child to support when events clash. "Every child matters". 4. To follow in the footsteps of an older sibling can help improve the community of the school and will give the younger sibling a sense of belonging. People who can afford to send their children to private schools frequently send their children to a school where many generations of that family have attended; it should be encouraged within the state sector. Sadly if the changes are adopted parental / student choice will be further eroded.

33) If the proposed changes take place I would end up with 4 children at 3 different schools. 3 of which are unable to use public transport due to health reasons. This would cause my children to be late for school every day and be left unsupervised at the end of the day whilst I travel between the schools. It's is not a reasonable change to the current system and would cause a lot of families difficulties, would cost each family a huge amount extra with travel costs and childcare and would put children at potential avoidable risks!

34) Change to sibling priority: reduces the options for preferences. Would like as wide as possible option preferences to be available. We, for example, live rurally, but have been able to have our children in the secondary school in the town where we work. We are, door to door, only a few metres closer to the rural secondary school whose community area we come into, but it is far more convenient to us to have our children in the town where we work, even though we have to make our own transport arrangements for them. Having the option to express, and achieve this preference, was very important to us, so I would not like future families to be denied the options we have had. Having all one's children in the same school is important. It is tricky enough when one has some at primary and others at secondary, to manage all the school visits for parents' evenings etc, but to have them spread over even more schools is liable to cause problems of clashes of dates. It is vital for a child's success at school to have as much parental support as possible. The LA needs to make this as easy as possible for parents, not more difficult. Distance as the crow flies: seems nonsensical to me. Who flies to school? Why can you not use actual distance as this is easy enough to ascertain these days with, for example, Google maps?

35) I feel it's unfair not to prioritise siblings due to not being in the area, I was in the area when my son attended the school that my daughter attends (he's moved to juniors now) my daughter got in despite us moving a little out the radius, due to the fact her brother was still attending the school! (In the last year) I have a 5 year age gap between my daughter and my youngest 2 who would be starting school in sept 2019 and 20, but my older daughter would have left that school and be at the linked junior by then, so your saying my youngest 2 children may not get in? May not be able to go to the fantastic school their brother and sister attended? And would have to go to a "not so great school" that's a couple of mins closer? I feel this is extremely unfair they would have to miss out! Plus how would I get 2 to one school and 2 to another at the same time?! I think the proposition is unfair!!!

36) I am a parent of a child at UCTC. We live out of catchment in a very rural area in Chiddingly, the local school is Ringmer which I feel is less suitable for all my children. This has been proven as my oldest son obtained a place at UCTC on appeal and started in September 2015. I have twins who will be affected by the change in the sibling ruling as they will be making the transition to secondary school in September 2017. The comments regarding this change helping those in rural areas is ridiculous, it will make travel arrangements very complicated and could split my family into different schools. Travel is difficult enough when the closest secondary school is more than 5 miles away, it would prove even worse if my children were in schools miles away from each other in different directions from home and my work. The appeal process works but I found it hugely stressful, I really do not want to have to repeat it for my twins due to a change in the sibling admission criteria.

37) For those with children already at a school and are out of catchment, how would mums be able to be in two different places at once for two different schools. Impossible. There needs to be something in place for those parents who were unaware that this was to come.

38) I think this is a good idea, the roads in East sussex are so congested and I think people should therefore go to there nearest school. This hopefully will make people walk to school where possible too. We need to cut down on polution and this is a way to do this too, children should walk to school the teachers have also said in the past the children who walk to school are better behaved in school. It benefits everyone. Children will go to school where they live so therefore will be near friends at the weekends too.

39) I already have 2 children in Polegate school I'm little girl will start in a couple of years this would effect our lives so much if she didn't get in to the same school i think this isn't acceptable and I hope more people tell you the same.you don't like it when people take there kids out of school for holidays but you be fine to mess up the kids schooling by making them have to move schools if there siblings can't get in to the same school .

40) I have concerns about the impact on some village schools regarding the change to the sibling criteria. I agree in principle that priority should be given to local children. However, some village schools such as Rotherfield (Where I was previously the SBM) rely on pupils from outside the pre-defined community area for the school to be viable. If parents have no guarantee of their younger children getting a place at that school in the future this may prevent them from applying in the first place. If they are then allocated that school (eg as 2nd/3rd choice) based on the admissions criteria and their second/third/fourth child is then allocated a closer or different school based on admissions criteria in that year how does the parent get two or more children to two or more locations at the same time? The same would apply at the end of the school day. Rotherfield school has recently undergone an expensive expansion programme increasing the school from five to seven classes. If their numbers reduce as a result of this change in policy, what additional financial support will be available from ESCC to Rotherfield and to other schools in a similar position to ensure that the school still remains viable? As a School Admissions Appeal Clerk I am aware of the difficulties some parents have already in getting one child to their allocated school. A good example would be in the Eastbourne area where some parents are reliant on public transport, sometimes having to take two buses to get to school. How would this be practical if they had to get children to different schools?

41) Withdrawing sibling policy will mean that children from one family will end up at differnt schools which will be impossible for working parents to manage. Better for individual schools to have some flexibility to make their own admission decisions rather than conforming to rigid policy as different schools and areas face different challenges. One size does not fit all

42) My grandson started school in September 15. He does not live within the pre-defined community area but we chose the school we felt would be best for him. As a family, it

is important for our grandchildren to stay together, and the school was chosen on the assumption that, under the sibling rule, his sister would attend alongside him, allowing them both to benefit from the ethos of a family school. The proposed change could put this vital family bond in jeopardy. If his sister does not get a place at the same school, the logistics of the journey to school will prove almost impossible, imposing hardship on the family. If a change of this nature is proposed, there must be a longer lead time between proposal and implementation, allowing parents to make an informed decision based on future prospects.

43) Parents should have choice and we should be proud that through that choice good schools prosper. The stated aim of this proposal is to get children to go to their nearest school. This reduces parental choice and parents do not get much choice as it is. The whole schools' admission process should have at its core, the aim of giving parents and students as much choice as possible. Changing the sibling rule is equally ludicrous. This proposal will have a very negative effect on families who have a child at a school. Having two or more children at different schools will be highly inconvenient for transport to / from school, parents evenings on the same days etc. It's hard enough as it it, with my wife and i both working shifts for one of us to get to school events. Please look at the real reasons why this is being proposed and be honest with us about it.

44) I have a child at Uckfield school and we currently live slightly out of the catchment area. He has two siblings, one due to start when the ruling comes into place. The have no mother due to being deceased and so this will be virtually impossible to support the children in their activities and hold a job down if this affects us as lm sure it will many others. If I am not allow to have siblings at Uckfield school, then I may have to pull a very promising student out to make it work logistically. You have to look at each case individually from the start and measure the impact rather than a distance. We live in a modern world where a blend of children from different areas makes the school a richer place.

45) Sibling priority is extremely important for Primary School age children. Not only is it impossible for parents to be at more than one primary school at the same time, the age of the children means that they can't be left outside the school gates while you take other children to different schools (the schools themselves don't allow it either). In my town, it would take about 40 minutes to walk between each school, possibly longer with other children in tow. If you drive between the schools, not only are you adding traffic across town, but you have stressed parents rushing to get from one school to the other, risking the lives of the school children crossing the roads on their way to school. There is the added problem of people being priced out of the area. My situation is that after 5 years of renting the same house, we have to move out so that the landlord can sell the house. Buying is not possible for us, and the rental market is rising all the time with lots of competition for each house. Our options are to risk being made homeless, or rent a house out of the catchment area of the school, and risk my youngest child not getting into her older sister's school. Parent's should not be penalised if they have no choice but to move home.

46) My eldest son attends Uckfield Community College and my youngest son attends Bonner Primary School in Maresfield. We used to live in Maresfield and due to unforeseen circumstances we now live in Crowborough. Unfortunately due to finances we are unable to move back to Uckfield, but we continue as a family, to have links within the Uckfield area. I work in Buxted and my husband works in the locality also. To have two children at different schools will impose a HUGE inconvenience to us as a family. The eldest child is dyslexic and received quality education and support from UCTC. As you can imagine the youngest child has visited UCTC on many occasion throughout his brother's time there and is confident and excited about going to the school in 2017. All of his friends will be going from Bonners Primary School and it will have a huge blow to his confidence if he has to go to Beacon College. He currently suffers from anxiety as it is and should the time come that we have to tell him that he

will have to go to a different school to his friends and brother it simply doesn't bear thinking about. I can understand the reasoning's behind your proposals for Primary School admissions as some schools appear to be more popular than others, but for Secondary school education I feel that you will be restricting parents and children. The current financial climate has huge implications to working families who are just simply trying to do their best for their children's future. Imposing these restriction to us will devastate siblings and parents alike. If you go ahead with the proposal you will be putting further strain on families when trying to co-ordinate between two secondary school.

2. If the admission numbers are not acceptable, please tell us what you think the admission numbers should be and why? (Individual schools can propose a higher for their school than those shown in the 'Proposed admission numbers' documents)

1) Our Admission numbers are acceptable
2) Accross rural schools in a relatively small atea, there is quite a large discrepancy in numbers taken in reception. One village takes 15 and the next 25. I know that this can play a large part in parents finding a specific school more desirable and can also mean that there is more pressure on places at some schools. Where there are a large number of schools in reasonable proximity in a rural area, could this number not be evened out somewhat, so, for example, all schools have an intake of 20 - the average between 15 and 25?
3) It doesn't seem to tell us the numbers for the schools in the Lewes/Ringmer area
4) It should not be automatic that siblings outside the catchment attend
5) I could not find admission numbers for some schools in Crowborough (as only two are listed)!?! What about Sir Henry fermor, St John's, St Mary's? In my opinion, class sizes should not increase, nor should school size overall through multiple class entry. More school places should instead be made available through new schools.
6) Admission numbers appear acceptable and I am guessing right for the size of each school and what is can cope with.
7) I don't know specifics of any imbalance between required numbers and the places proposed, but I believe we should aim to serve local communities by ensuring that all schools are good enough and can provide enough places for all the children in the locality. The choice of where wouldn't be so important if all schools were well run and well resourced. Children shouldn't need to travel any great distances to get to school. If a local school is oversubscribed we should ensure it has the facilities to expand to accommodate all those within the community area and those who meet the other essential criteria previously given.
8) To our knowledge the numbers accurately reflect the ability of the school to manage the capacity of the facilities available. If there is a need to increase numbers then there would be a need to increase facilities first.
9) if one school is over-subscribed and has space to expand I think they should be allowed to do so even if it means reducing the number of classes in a year at an unpopular school - e.g. where 2 schools have a 2-form intake and one is very oversubscribed why not make changes to allow 3 classes at one school and only 1 at another in the town - surely this is preferable to turning many children away from a good school?
10) Admission numbers and pupil staff ratios are best advised by teachers and the facilities available at each establishment
11) The sibling criteria need to be after the looked after children

12) Admission numbers obviously need to be based on the number of classes, class size and teachers available so I cannot comment on each school and what is acceptable, but intake from outside the area should be limited until all local applications have been dealt with.

13) Schools are over subscribed already

14) I have no problem with admission numbers just the change to Admission policy

15) Siblings should take priority, then distance. Schools should be allowed to propose their own numbers.

16) Although Uctc has room for expansion I do t feel the numbers should be increase due to traffic in the neighbourhood. Which is a residential area. With the proposal of 1,000 new homes for uckfield this should be taken In to consideration.

17) I believe numbers are acceptible

18) There should be no more than 25 to a class. In ocklynge the proposed number is 35. It is at this age where a child needs the most help that schools have the largest numbers.

19) I think the admission numbers shoud be strict and are aceptable to obtain a good level of education

20) Number is unchanged

21) There does not appear to be a problem with local children accessing their nearest rural school if they so wish. Most of the rural schools e.g. Beacon, Uplands, Chailey, Ringmer, Heathfield etc. all have vacancies. In the case of Uckfield, which is over-subscribed, all the local children get their places with the sibling rule as it is.

22) I feel strongly that the council have neglected the school. The admission number for this year I believe is approximately 270. This is the same figure as it was ten years ago. The town has expanded greatly since then both naturally over time and due to several large housing developments taking place bringing in greater numbers to an already popular town. Shouldn't we be looking to service the needs of the town with better conditions at the school including allowing for more pupils comfortablely, rather than punishing them?

3. Comments on the co-ordinated schemes

1) I am delighted that there is some room for late changes of address and/or other reasons but I am disappointed that the Draft gives no right of appeal. Is this not able to be reviewed by an Appeal Panel?

2) I agree with proposals for processing late applications, this will particularly support parents moving house .later in the process

3) Late applications should be treated last unless there is proof of change of address or good reason, it should not be up to the admissions authority to decide how to handle it. It is unfair on everybody who has followed the "rules" what is the point of having a deadline if it can be overrides especially if it means your child doesn't get a place at a school because of it. It seems a bit unfair. I think this is what is done at the moment why does it need to change?

4) Please let's not discriminate against families, for whatever reasons, find it hard to follow such bureaucracy and may miss deadlines. Letters lost in the post, bereavements, or just chaotic lives. I haven't time to read such a long document about procedures. Let's do the best by the child regardless. Strict procedures seem over the top.

5) Seems fair to deal with late applications in this way. What about people moving into the area between February and September?

6) At present this seems a grey area where a family moving to the area cannot apply until they are here. Whilst I understand a house sale may fall through. Consideration should be for those who have exchanged prior to the closing admissions date ?
7) If you don't want your second child to be placed at another d book but have to make 3 choices in order of preference, what should you do? No comment re late applications.
8) Late applications should be given the choice of the most local school - late applications could be for a number of reasons and the child should not be penalised.

4. Comments on any other aspect of the proposed admission arrangements for the 2017-18 school year

1) I would like some attention given to SEND. At present, we have a very high number of children with needs - yet other local school have much fewer (or none). I am aware that this is down to parental preference. However, I did note that SEND was not noted as the admission category for all of the children who were given a place (perhaps in preference to others). I would like to see fair admissions for SEND - as ALL schools should be skilled at meeting needs (if parents are not choosing a school, then the County should find out why...and, in my opinion, take urgent action to improve practice)
2) The phasing of the de-prioritisation of 'out of area' children should be different for primary and secondary schools so that 'out of area' children who are currently at primary schools are not split from their peer groups when they go up to secondary schools. i.e. primary in 2017, secondary when primary 'out of area' children have washed through into secondary schools...or some compromise period of grace, say 2 years to give parents a chance to decide how to manage the secondary school step.
3) Would have been useful to have a link to ‘applying for a school place 2016-2017' to be informed about catchement areas
4) Unclear as to why children who wish to delay entry until the Sept after their child has turned 5 cannot stay in that year group? What is the impact supposed to be regarding transition to secondary?
5) The change to the admissions policy meaning local children will have a better chance at gaining a place in their local school is much needed and strongly supported by myself and others I've spoken to. This view is both my personal one as a parent and my professional one as a keyworker who has supported many families who have struggled due to the current policy leading to their children being excluded from an education at their local school.
6) Makes the tie breaker distance much clearer to parents and easier to understand.
7) Many parents of children entering school up to September 2016 entry will have made the choice of school based on siblings as well (i.e. not just looking at the schools with one child in mind) and based on the current admissions criteria that siblings will have a higher priority, to change the criteria when people have made a decision based on the information available at the time seems dubious. I understand there has to be a cut off point if you do decide to change things but there may need to be some overlap time to take this into consideration, after all this kind of change can effect family well-bing as well as parental involvement in a child's school. Can you imagine having to be involved in 2 or 3 schools in terms of support, events and just generally being part of a school community, it would in my opinion have the potential to be very stressful and unrewarding.
8) What about special needs provisions? What flexibility can there be if one school is clearly better suited to the child compared to another? This would seem to be an overriding factor.

9) I realise academies and free schools can set their own admission criteria but it would make the process so much easier if there was some way that all schools applied the same admission arrangements.

10) I think it needs to be made cleared what the 'predefined community area' for a school is. Living in Eastbourne when looking around schools you are told that you are able to apply for any school in the Eastbourne area regardless of if they are close to your home or not. I believe that by each school being able to issue a map with a coloured area showing the general admissions area if would make things much simpler. It will also be very hard for parents with siblings at a school already to then potentially not get a second or third child into that school. The logistics of it would be impossible.

11) Community area children should take priority

12) Church schools should no longer be allowed to carry-out their narrow-minded selective criteria where they judge children & parents they do not even know

13) I hope these changes are not implemented

14) It's important Siblings attend the same school

15) I think thought should be for the 1,000 new proposed homes in uckfield and the effect it may have on future admissions to Uctc. I feel these children should have priority being in the area. Although not over those that have a sibling already in yr 7-11 only. This I feel will have a knock on effect for say children from crowborough and surrounding areas who have their nearer secondary school but this In Turn could have an effect on the Kent system , children who may well come to crowborough etc if they don't get into grammar. I feel strongly Uctc should not be extended further due to reasons already stated and their admission process will need to be changed In The near future.

16) In time if this takes place children will go to the same school as siblings as they will all go to the nearest school it just takes a few years to be set in place I think the parents with children already in a different school will be upset initially, but this will not be the case in years to come, as once this is set in place it will become the norm. People just dont like change. but there are benefits to these changes.

17) For many years the Conservative mantra has been to give parents more choice. Is this now changing?

18) No although can I ask what are the next steps after this consultation stage and how can we help to be more actively involved to find a workable solution?