

## LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Children of Secondary School Staff

### Notes on redactions:

1. Personal data categories have been removed.
2. Personal data within all other response categories has been redacted and will appear as a white gap in the text.
3. Some redactions have been made due to the provision of the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 (ISS Regulations). Where this is the case, the text has been removed and replaced with [Deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations].

Form Submission ID		Children of Staff (Secondary Schools)			
Children of staff (Secondary Schools) What is your view of the proposal to give priority to the children of staff employed at the secondary schools in the school's admission arrangements		In particular, what is your view of the proposal to give priority to the children of staff employed at either of the secondary schools in both schools' admission arrangements		If you would like to give reasons for your view, comment on the proposed change, or make any suggestions, please do so below (if your comments relate to a specific school, please make this clear by stating the school's name):	
Agree	1040	Agree	883		
Disagree	1059	Disagree	1247		
Neutral	850	Neutral	797		
Not Applicable	1	Not Applicable	68		
No Response	43	No Response	80		
1	Agree		Neutral		
2	Agree		Agree		
3	Agree		Neutral		
4	Agree		Agree		
5	Agree		Agree		
6	Disagree		Disagree		
7	Neutral		Neutral		
8	Disagree		Disagree		
9	Neutral		Disagree		
10	Agree		Disagree		
11	Neutral		Neutral		
12	Agree		Agree		
13	Neutral		Neutral		
14	Neutral		Neutral		
15	Neutral		Neutral		
16	Agree		Agree		
17	Agree		Agree		
18	Agree		Agree		
19	Agree		Agree		
20	Agree		Agree		
21	Neutral		Neutral		
22	Agree		Agree		
23	Agree		Agree		
24	Agree		Agree		

25	Agree		No Response		
26	Disagree		Disagree		
27	Agree		Agree		
28	Disagree		Disagree		Children need to go to a school in their local community for basic safety as the area is less safe and they shouldn't be further from home than necessary. Children from Trust schools and their staff should not take places of children who live in the catchment.
29	Neutral		Neutral		If you make any of the primaries a feeder, then people only have to live in the area for the reception application/start time and then can move away, but be guaranteed a place at the senior school. So for one years investment in say higher rent, that would guarantee you 17 years of good schools for that child and any siblings. I would say that is easily open to abuse? And could lead to the school not serving the local community at all!
30	Disagree		Disagree		
31	Disagree		Disagree		
32	Disagree		Disagree		
33	Agree		Agree		
34	Agree		Agree		
35	Agree		Agree		
36	Neutral		Neutral		
37	Disagree		Disagree		
38	Disagree		Disagree		
39	Neutral		Neutral		
40	Neutral		Neutral		
41	Neutral		Neutral		
42	Neutral		Neutral		
43	Neutral		Neutral		
44	Agree		Agree		
45	Agree		Agree		
46	Disagree		Disagree		
47	Agree		Agree		
48	Disagree		Disagree		
49	Agree		Agree		
50	Neutral		Neutral		
51	Agree		Disagree		On balance, I don't think there should be a through route for the children of staff - yes, the child should have priority for the school where the parent teaches, but the privilege should not apply further.
52	Agree		Agree		
53	Agree		Agree		Only children of secondary school staff should be considered, if any. Staff at the primary schools are no different to other parents working in other industries or public sector.
54	Disagree		Disagree		
55	Disagree		Disagree		I believe that when children get to secondary school age they are sufficient enough to be able to be at home without their parents and therefore being at the same school would make no difference.
56	Agree		Agree		
57	Agree		Agree		
58	Disagree		Disagree		As above, I don't think it is important for the children to attend the same school their parent works in. By same merit, we would be trying to find schools physically close to our places of work!
59	Disagree		Disagree		
60	Disagree		Disagree		
61	Agree		Agree		
62	Agree		Agree		I think this is imperative given that the size of the catchment area is different for LPGS and LPBS. Naturally an individual cannot work for both but ought to benefit with both schools.
63	Disagree		Disagree		
64	Neutral		Neutral		
65	Disagree		Disagree		
66	Neutral		Neutral		

67	Agree		Agree		
68	Disagree		Disagree		
69	Neutral		Neutral		
70	Neutral		Neutral		I believe it will have minimal impact due to the few people this will apply to.
71	Agree		Agree		
72	Agree		Agree		
73	Disagree		Disagree		As above, what happens if a non-local teacher joins the school simply to get their child in, and then subsequently leaves the post? A local child may have been deprived of a place? Or the teacher leaves the post for a genuine reason, does their child keep the place?
74	Agree		Agree		
75	Disagree		Disagree		
76	Disagree		Disagree		
77	Disagree		Disagree		
78	Neutral		Neutral		
79	Agree		Agree		
80	Agree		Agree		
81	Neutral		Disagree		
82	Disagree		Disagree		
83	Disagree		Disagree		
84	Agree		Agree		
85	Disagree		Disagree		
86	Neutral		Neutral		
87	Neutral		Neutral		
88	Neutral		Neutral		
89	Neutral		Neutral		
90	Agree		Neutral		I do not strongly object to staff having the priority over the boy and girl's school. As they work in one of the schools they shouldn't be penalised if they have a child in the other school.
91	Neutral		Neutral		
92	Agree		Agree		
93	No Response		Agree		
94	Neutral		Neutral		
95	Agree		Agree		
96	Agree		Agree		
97	Neutral		Neutral		
98	Agree		Agree		
99	Neutral		Disagree		
100	Agree		Disagree		
101	Agree		Agree		
102	Agree		Disagree		They should apply for school near their own homes.
103	Agree		Agree		
104	Disagree		Disagree		At secondary age, children should be becoming independent I feel that being a school where your parent teachers can be a difficult position to put your child in. Depending on where the child lives there academic and social lives can be hampered but having extended days waiting for a parent to finish and not living near their peers. That said, that would be the decision of the teacher as a parent to make the decision for their child.
105	Not Applicable		Neutral		
106	Neutral		Neutral		
107	Neutral		Neutral		
108	Neutral		No Response		
109	Disagree		Disagree		
110	No Response		Agree		
111	Neutral		Disagree		
112	Neutral		Disagree		

113	Neutral		Neutral		
114	Disagree		Disagree		Same as above. Schools should serve their local communities as a priority.
115	Disagree		Disagree		
116	Neutral		Neutral		
117	Agree		Agree		
118	Neutral		Neutral		
119	Neutral		Neutral		
120	Agree		Agree		
121	Neutral		Neutral		
122	Neutral		Neutral		
123	Disagree		No Response		How is it equitable to prioritise the children of teachers over other professions eg nurses?
124	Neutral		Neutral		
125	Agree		Agree		
126	Disagree		Disagree		
127	Disagree		Disagree		
128	Neutral		Disagree		This would make the catchment too small for local children.
129	Disagree		Disagree		
130	No Response		Disagree		It should be a fair process all around and preferences should not be given to staff children. _x000D_ _x000D_ We all have to manage childcare before and after school and have to find suitable arrangements so staff should be encouraged to do the same. Also staff children will be given preferential treatment if other staff members are aware of the child being closely related to a staff member.
131	Disagree		Disagree		
132	Disagree		Disagree		
133	Neutral		Agree		
134	Disagree		Disagree		
135	Agree		Neutral		
136	Disagree		Disagree		
137	Disagree		Disagree		
138	Agree		Agree		
139	Disagree		Neutral		
140	Agree		Agree		
141	Agree		Agree		
142	Disagree		Disagree		
143	Disagree		Disagree		
144	Agree		Agree		
145	Agree		Disagree		
146	Disagree		Disagree		As above, even more so as the majority of secondary aged children do not rely on a parent to take them to school.
147	Disagree		Disagree		In any other type of business/industry, your work location does not then determine where your child can attend school. Staff in education should not be given an advantage, potentially taking places of children who live locally, and forcing them to have to travel further to attend school.
148	Neutral		Neutral		
149	Disagree		Disagree		
150	Agree		No Response		
151	Disagree		Disagree		Shouldn't matter what school a parent teaches at. A lot of parents work and have to get their children to school in the mornings relying on alternative childcare arrangements
152	Disagree		Agree		
153	Agree		Agree		
154	Agree		Agree		
155	Disagree		Disagree		
156	Agree		Agree		
157	No Response		No Response		

158	Disagree		Disagree		
159	Neutral		Neutral		
160	Disagree		Disagree		
161	Agree		Agree		
162	Neutral		Disagree		As far as I am aware these schools have always been separate from each other.... now it seems like they are almost merging. I don't mind a girl / boy going to the same school that her parent works in. They would be travelling together and would be less impact on the environment.
163	Disagree		Disagree		
164	Disagree		Disagree		Priority should be only considered for the respective school staff. I.e primary schools offer priority to children of primary school staff and secondary school offers priority to children of secondary school staff.
165	Agree		Agree		
166	Agree		Disagree		
167	Agree		Agree		
168	Agree		Agree		
169	Agree		Agree		
170	Neutral		Neutral		
171	Disagree		Disagree		
172	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair
173	Agree		Agree		Same comment as per primary school question
174	Neutral		Disagree		
175	Agree		Agree		
176	Disagree		Disagree		
177	Disagree		Disagree		
178	Disagree		Disagree		The current oversubscription criteria are adequate. This proposal would command too high a proportion of places at the exclusion of families who live near to the school.
179	Disagree		Disagree		Under Equality Act of 2010, all applicants compliant with school's admission requirements should be treated equally.
180	Disagree		Disagree		
181	Agree		Agree		
182	Disagree		Disagree		As kids are more independent in secondary school, teachers of parents should not be given priority.
183	Agree		Agree		
184	Neutral		Neutral		
185	Disagree		Disagree		
186	Agree		Neutral		
187	Neutral		Neutral		
188	Agree		Disagree		
189	Agree		Disagree		
190	Agree		Disagree		
191	Agree		Agree		
192	Neutral		Neutral		
193	Neutral		Neutral		
194	Neutral		Neutral		
195	Agree		Agree		
196	Neutral		Neutral		
197	Disagree		Disagree		
198	Neutral		Neutral		
199	Disagree		Disagree		
200	Agree		Agree		
201	Disagree		Disagree		
202	Not Applicable		Agree		
203	Neutral		Neutral		
204	Neutral		Neutral		
205	Agree		Agree		

206	Agree		Agree		
207	Disagree		Disagree		
208	Disagree		Disagree		
209	Agree		Agree		
210	Disagree		Disagree		
211	Agree		Neutral		
212	Disagree		Disagree		
213	Agree		Agree		
214	Neutral		Neutral		
215	Neutral		Neutral		
216	Agree		Agree		
217	Neutral		Neutral		
218	Disagree		Disagree		
219	Agree		Agree		
220	Disagree		Disagree		
221	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
222	Neutral		Neutral		
223	Disagree		Disagree		
224	Disagree		Disagree		As above. Our children should be able to go to a local school.
225	Agree		Agree		
226	Disagree		Disagree		
227	Agree		Agree		
228	Neutral		Neutral		
229	Neutral		Disagree		
230	Disagree		Disagree		Again for the same reasons. Local schools for local children not those who live out of area.
231	Neutral		Disagree		There is a fair point if priority is given to child of staff of which the secondary school they are currently working at. But it just becomes an added benefit of an employment package for staff, if priority is given to any secondary school within the trust. At secondary school point, a level of unique and individual case is considered in an application process, as student can start to travel to school themselves and rely less on the parents, so being close to their school is vital. If the sibling criteria is being redefined as less important once child hit secondary schools ie not affect on siblings of YR13 children, then the overall process needs to be fairer.
232	Agree		Agree		
233	No Response		Neutral		
234	Neutral		Neutral		
235	Disagree		Disagree		
236	Disagree		Disagree		
237	Disagree		Disagree		I strongly disagree with his as this breaks basic principles of democracy of qual access for everyone to the education in the UK. It's been a precedent to select students based on the catchment areas. Many parents have invested a lot of money to buy properties close to the school they believe in.
238	Agree		Agree		
239	Agree		Agree		
240	Neutral		Neutral		
241	Disagree		Disagree		
242	Disagree		Disagree		As above I don't believe it is fair admissions policy to give priority to children who may not live in the local area.
243	Neutral		Disagree		
244	Disagree		Disagree		
245	Neutral		Neutral		
246	Disagree		Disagree		
247	Disagree		Disagree		Senior children can make their own way to school _x000D_ Should not reflect on where parent works
248	Disagree		Disagree		
249	Agree		Agree		
250	Agree		Disagree		

251	Disagree		Disagree		
252	Disagree		Disagree		
253	Disagree		Disagree		
254	Disagree		Disagree		
255	Neutral		Not Applicable		It would be fair to give priority to the children of staff employed at the secondary schools in the school's admission arrangements but not to a different school.
256	Agree		Agree		
257	Disagree		Disagree		
258	Disagree		Disagree		
259	Neutral		Disagree		
260	Neutral		Neutral		
261	Disagree		Disagree		
262	Neutral		Neutral		
263	Neutral		Neutral		
264	Neutral		Neutral		
265	Disagree		Disagree		
266	Agree		Agree		This is completely standard and fair; staff priority is usual in many schools and it makes sense for Langley Boys and Langley Girls secondaries to have closer ties both in staff and sibling priority.
267	Disagree		Disagree		
268	Agree		Disagree		
269	Disagree		Disagree		
270	Disagree		Disagree		
271	Disagree		No Response		
272	Neutral		Neutral		
273	Not Applicable		Disagree		
274	Agree		Agree		
275	Agree		Agree		
276	Agree		Agree		
277	Disagree		Disagree		
278	Neutral		Neutral		I presume the number of children will be low and feel that the logistics faced by parent teachers should be relieved if possible. So Whilst I would rather no specific groups are given priority this proposal has some merits in supporting working parent teachers and therefore retainment of staff.
279	Agree		Agree		
280	Neutral		No Response		
281	Disagree		Disagree		
282	Neutral		Neutral		
283	Disagree		Disagree		Local children need to be able to access local schools.
284	Disagree		Disagree		I do not believe that children of staff should receive priority over children who live proximate to the school.
285	Agree		Disagree		
286	Agree		Agree		
287	Disagree		Disagree		
288	Neutral		Disagree		
289	Agree		Agree		
290	Agree		Agree		
291	Neutral		Neutral		
292	Agree		Agree		
293	Disagree		Disagree		
294	Agree		Disagree		
295	Disagree		Disagree		
296	Disagree		Disagree		
297	Agree		Neutral		

298	Agree		Agree		I think it makes perfect sense that the children of staff be given priority. It makes their life easier and as such can better care for all the other children. As there is one boys school and one girls school it makes sense that priority be given across both schools due to their close links and proximity.
299	Neutral		Neutral		
300	Agree		Disagree		
301	Disagree		Disagree		
302	Disagree		Disagree		I dont get to place my child in the area where i work as i do not live in the catchment. I dont thi k its fair to place a child if staff member lives out the catchment.
303	Agree		Agree		This makes complete sense and I agree with trust's views that this would allow best teachers to be recruited and make family logistical arrangements simpler. All pupils will benefit from the focus that teachers could give due to simpler family care arrangements.
304	Disagree		Disagree		This shouldn't happen. If they want to move to the area then fine. Otherwise no. This is unfair on applicants in the area
305	Agree		Disagree		
306	Disagree		Disagree		Same as for primary school as above. Schools are hard enough to get into, the system should be as fair and transparent as possible, not biased.
307	Agree		Agree		All families can travel together to school
308	Neutral		Neutral		
309	Agree		Agree		I support this as part of teacher recruitment and retention, given this is a particular challenge at secondary level. I also support this applying across both schools - but think that this should be extended to siblings of pupils at the counterpart secondary school and am disappointed that this is missing from the proposals (i.e. brothers of pupils at the girls' school should have priority for admissions at the boys school) - I think it is important for siblings to be able to attend school on the same site if possible.
310	Agree		No Response		
311	Disagree		Disagree		
312	Neutral		Neutral		
313	Neutral		Neutral		
314	Disagree		Disagree		
315	Not Applicable		Disagree		
316	Agree		Agree		
317	Disagree		Disagree		I am not against children of staff getting priority for the school that they are teaching in, if the teacher has been at the school for a while. But I don't agree with these children automatically gaining entry to a different school just because it is in the same Trust. It may help with retention of staff but I believe that it will also encourage many to play the system.
318	Agree		Agree		
319	Neutral		Disagree		
320	Neutral		Neutral		
321	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to travel to school by themselves . There is therefor no need for them to go to school with parents. Once again it is discrimination
322	Neutral		Neutral		
323	Agree		Agree		
324	Disagree		Disagree		
325	Agree		Agree		You need to have every tool available to you to attract the very best teachers and staff
326	Agree		Agree		
327	Agree		Neutral		
328	Neutral		Neutral		
329	Agree		Agree		Makes perfect sense to enhance quality staff retention. I'd also make it a higher priority over kids from inter trust primary schools
330	Neutral		Neutral		
331	Agree		Agree		
332	Neutral		Neutral		
333	Neutral		Neutral		
334	Neutral		Neutral		
335	Agree		Agree		
336	Disagree		Disagree		
337	Agree		Agree		
338	Neutral		Neutral		
339	Agree		Agree		
340	Agree		Agree		
341	Neutral		Neutral		



342	Agree		Disagree		
343	Neutral		Neutral		
344	Disagree		Disagree		
345	Disagree		Disagree		
346	Neutral		Neutral		
347	Neutral		Neutral		
348	Agree		Agree		
349	Disagree		Disagree		
350	Neutral		Neutral		
351	Agree		Agree		
352	Neutral		Neutral		
353	Neutral		Neutral		
354	Agree		Agree		
355	Disagree		Disagree		Same comment as above
356	Agree		Disagree		
357	Neutral		Neutral		I think that there are pros and cons to any possible enticement of this nature. I don't particularly mind either way, unless it turns out that all of the spaces in the school were taken by children of staff - perhaps a massive influx of teacher/parents who are hoping to secure a space at the schools. Although how you deal with a possible mass exodus when staff leave once their children have got their space they wanted is another issue. I assume the intention behind this is a genuine offer of a benefit to good staff that the schools wish to retain, offering the opportunity that their children would be able to attend the school; so you hope to recruit teaching staff which is stated in the consultation document. But it really comes down to the skill of the interviewer and interviewee - are they a really good teacher, or are they hoping to get their child into Langley Park school at any cost, including applying for a job at the school?
358	Agree		Agree		
359	Agree		Neutral		
360	Neutral		Neutral		
361	Neutral		Neutral		
362	Agree		Agree		
363	Agree		Agree		Makes sense if helps attract the best teachers
364	Disagree		Disagree		Staff may live out of the area and places should be allocated to those who live near the school for the sake of the local community, and to avoid unnecessary congestion and pollution on the roads.
365	Disagree		Disagree		
366	Disagree		Disagree		
367	Agree		Agree		
368	Agree		Agree		
369	Agree		Disagree		I strongly disagree with this unnecessary, damaging and unfair proposed change_x000D_ _x000D_ I believe the current criteria granting higher priority entry to the children of the staff working in the school is already fair and helps the school secure adequate staff. _x000D_ _x000D_ On the other hand, I believe extending this exception further will be discriminative and therefore will *negatively* impact the opportunities of all children in the area, including my kids, whose parents are not in the local education sector. _x000D_ This change will give a *clear unfair advantage* to an arbitrary set of children and therefore must be stopped
370	Neutral		Disagree		
371	No Response		Neutral		
372	Disagree		No Response		
373	Disagree		Disagree		
374	Agree		Agree		
375	Neutral		Neutral		
376	Agree		Agree		

377	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair and misleading in relation to the perceived benefits of retention. Is there any research to validate this proposal/ set of proposals and measured over time? Recruiting and retaining quality staff should be achieved through innovative workplace policies/ work life balance, staff development and remuneration that is in line with sector pay. Staff working in HE/ FE do not get preferential treatment in the form of prioritisation over others. Access to education should be fair and focus on what they stand for: academic merit, scholastic aptitude, giving talented young children opportunities to grow and further their potential and a chance for all children to benefit. Using valuable school places to better staff retention and recruitment goes against the ethos of an educational system and sets a very wrong precedent!
378	Disagree		Disagree		
379	Agree		Agree		
380	Disagree		Neutral		If staff are to be given priority for their children's admission it makes sense to include both schools
381	Disagree		Disagree		
382	Disagree		Disagree		
383	Disagree		Disagree		Again the working arrangements of a parent do not seem relevant to the school choice of a secondary school pupil who will make their own way to school.
384	Neutral		Neutral		
385	Agree		No Response		
386	Agree		Agree		
387	Disagree		Disagree		
388	Disagree		Disagree		
389	Disagree		Disagree		
390	Neutral		Neutral		
391	Neutral		Neutral		
392	Disagree		Disagree		
393	Disagree		Disagree		Same as before. If they live close by, then that is fairer, but if the teacher lives out of the area, then this is unfair to local families wanting their children to go to their closest secondary school.
394	Neutral		Neutral		
395	Disagree		Disagree		
396	Disagree		Disagree		
397	Agree		Agree		
398	Agree		Disagree		In my opinion, the current criteria granting higher priority entry to the children of the staff working in the school is already fair and helps the school secure adequate staff.  However extending this exception further will be discriminative and therefore will *negatively* impact the opportunities of all children in the area, including my kids, whose parents are not in the local education sector. This change will give a *clear unfair advantage* to an arbitrary set of children and therefore must be stopped
399	Agree		Agree		
400	Neutral		Neutral		
401	Neutral		Neutral		
402	Neutral		Neutral		
403	Disagree		Disagree		
404	Disagree		Disagree		
405	Not Applicable		Disagree		
406	Neutral		Agree		
407	Neutral		Neutral		
408	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
409	Agree		Agree		
410	Disagree		Disagree		
411	Disagree		Disagree		
412	Neutral		Disagree		
413	Disagree		Disagree		
414	Disagree		Disagree		
415	Neutral		Neutral		
416	Disagree		Disagree		
417	Agree		Agree		

418	Disagree		Disagree		
419	Disagree		Disagree		
420	Not Applicable		Disagree		
421	Disagree		Disagree		
422	No Response		No Response		
423	Agree		Agree		
424	Agree		Agree		
425	Agree		Agree		
426	Disagree		Disagree		
427	Disagree		Disagree		
428	Neutral		Neutral		
429	Disagree		Disagree		
430	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
431	Disagree		Disagree		
432	Agree		Agree		
433	Disagree		Disagree		
434	Disagree		Disagree		
435	Disagree		Disagree		
436	Neutral		No Response		
437	Agree		Agree		
438	Neutral		Disagree		It's the same as above. Its nepotism in that regard.
439	No Response		No Response		
440	Disagree		Disagree		This change will mean that the amount of children within the current catchment area. Will be significantly reduced, therefore denying the local housed children, a chance to attend the school.
441	Disagree		Disagree		
442	Agree		Agree		
443	Neutral		Disagree		I have concerns the process could be 'played', whereby staff get employed for short periods at other related schools simply to secure a places for their children elsewhere in the trust.
444	Disagree		Disagree		There is no justification for an employee of any organisation to be given priority to a public service, unless special arrangements apply, the employee status should be irrelevant
445	Agree		Agree		
446	Agree		Agree		I can understand the logic of giving priority to the children of staff employed at the two Langley secondary schools and Langley primary school, as it would make the staff's daily commute easier. However, I do not think this applies to Clare House and Hawes Down.
447	Disagree		Disagree		
448	Disagree		Disagree		
449	Agree		Neutral		
450	Disagree		Disagree		
451	Disagree		Disagree		
452	Neutral		Disagree		
453	Agree		Neutral		
454	Agree		Disagree		due to numbers I do not agree that children of staff at either school should be given priority
455	Agree		Disagree		
456	Agree		Agree		
457	Disagree		Disagree		
458	Agree		Disagree		
459	Not Applicable		Agree		
460	Disagree		Disagree		
461	Agree		Agree		As above.
462	Neutral		Neutral		
463	Agree		Agree		

464	Agree		Agree	
465	No Response		No Response	
466	Neutral		Neutral	
467	Not Applicable		No Response	
468	Agree		Agree	
469	Agree		Disagree	
470	Disagree		Disagree	
471	Agree		Agree	
472	Disagree		Disagree	
473	Agree		Agree	
474	Disagree		Disagree	Same reasons as for primary school section.
475	Disagree		Disagree	
476	Agree		Agree	
477	Disagree		Disagree	
478	Neutral		Neutral	
479	Agree		Agree	
480	Neutral		Neutral	
481	Agree		Agree	
482	Disagree		Disagree	
483	Neutral		Neutral	
484	Disagree		Disagree	
485	Agree		Neutral	
486	Agree		Agree	It supports working parents by making it easier to manage their childcare. If this option is adopted a criteria should be implemented which requires any parent employed at the school to have been employed for a certain amount of time before a child can join and in a key role in school which limits alternative childcare arrangements.
487	Agree		Agree	
488	Agree		Agree	
489	Disagree		Disagree	
490	Neutral		Disagree	
491	Agree		Agree	I understood it was already the policy at the boys school. Would seem fair for teachers at single sex schools to have access to either school.
492	Disagree		Disagree	Secondary school children can make their own way to school, therefore this will not be an incentive to retain teachers, and may lead to favouritism.
493	Agree		Agree	
494	Agree		Agree	I believe this wouldn't not affect the catchment dramatically
495	Agree		Agree	
496	Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
497	Disagree		Disagree	
498	Agree		Agree	
499	Neutral		Neutral	Agree. But only for teaching staff
500	Disagree		Disagree	
501	Agree		Agree	
502	Disagree		Disagree	
503	Disagree		Disagree	
504	Agree		Agree	
505	Not Applicable		No Response	
506	Neutral		Neutral	
507	Disagree		Disagree	
508	Agree		Agree	
509	Agree		Agree	
510	Neutral		Disagree	
511	Disagree		Disagree	
512	Agree		Agree	

513	Disagree		Disagree		I feel it is extremely unfair to give priority to staff children as this penalises parents who live very close to the school who would have gained admission under the present system. The teachers could be living a long distance away from the school. It could potentially attract staff only interested in getting their child into their preferred school rather than choosing to teach at a school for the betterment of that school.
514	Disagree		Disagree		
515	Neutral		Neutral		
516	Disagree		Disagree		
517	Disagree		Disagree		
518	Agree		Agree		
519	Agree		Agree		
520	Neutral		Neutral		If you get priority to the secondary you work at you should also get it for other school if your child is of the other sex.
521	Neutral		Neutral		
522	Disagree		Disagree		
523	Agree		Agree		
524	Disagree		Disagree		
525	Disagree		Disagree		
526	Disagree		Disagree		This would give priority to staff that do not live in the catchment area for the school taking places away from children that are. Why make children in the catchment area travel further for the sake of staff perks? Children of staff should follow the same catchment rules for where they live.
527	Disagree		Disagree		
528	Agree		Agree		
529	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
530	Agree		Disagree		
531	No Response		No Response		
532	Disagree		Disagree		
533	Agree		Agree		
534	Agree		Agree		
535	Neutral		Neutral		
536	Disagree		Disagree		
537	Disagree		Disagree		
538	Disagree		Disagree		
539	Agree		Agree		
540	Disagree		No Response		
541	Neutral		Neutral		
542	Agree		Agree		
543	Neutral		Disagree		I think it is ok for children of staff to have priority for the school they actually work at NOT across any in the trust
544	Neutral		Neutral		
545	Agree		Agree		
546	Neutral		Neutral		
547	Disagree		Not Applicable		
548	Agree		Agree		
549	Neutral		Neutral		
550	Disagree		Disagree		
551	Agree		Agree		
552	Agree		Agree		
553	Disagree		Disagree		I don't mind teachers getting priority, but I do mind any other staff members.
554	No Response		No Response		
555	Agree		Agree		
556	Disagree		Disagree		
557	Disagree		Disagree		
558	Agree		Agree		It seems justified as a means of recruiting and retaining staff and giving them a greater personal stake in the schools they work at.
559	Not Applicable		Disagree		

560	Disagree		Neutral		I understand the benefit of offering this as a benefit to teachers as it would aid with staff retention and recruitment. However, the proposal does not indicate the number of children per year this would be, therefore the potential impact is unknown.
561	Neutral		Neutral		
562	Disagree		Disagree		Forcing local children to travel miles from their home to access education that should be provided freely locally is arrogance of the highest order_x000D_ _x000D_ The very fact that the school does not dismiss such an idea without the need for a consultation is a sad indictment of the leadership of the school and governors_x000D_ _x000D_ You have failed the community and broken local trust in your ability to make the right choices for those that rely on you
563	Disagree		Disagree		
564	Neutral		Neutral		Again I would be interested to know the potential impact on school places but as this is already established in both schools my position is neutral
565	Disagree		Disagree		
566	Disagree		Disagree		
567	Disagree		Disagree		
568	Disagree		Disagree		
569	Agree		Agree		I agree with the point that children of secondary school staff should be able attend either secondary school and should not be put at a disadvantage because of their sex.
570	Agree		Agree		
571	Neutral		Neutral		
572	Disagree		Disagree		
573	Neutral		Neutral		
574	Neutral		Neutral		There needs to be quotas on the number of children of staff who will be able to have priority to Langley Park schools
575	No Response		No Response		
576	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
577	Neutral		Neutral		I can see the reasoning if it is purely regarding secondary school teachers.
578	Agree		Agree		Useful for convenience and retention of staff - a school's key asset.
579	Agree		Agree		
580	Agree		Agree		Children from certain schools must not have an advantage over children from other schools. This is totally unacceptable and I am appalled to even fill out this consultation.
581	Neutral		Neutral		
582	Disagree		Disagree		
583	Disagree		Neutral		
584	Disagree		Disagree		
585	Agree		Agree		
586	Disagree		Disagree		
587	Neutral		Neutral		
588	Agree		Agree		
589	Agree		Agree		
590	Agree		Agree		
591	Agree		Agree		It is important to retain staff that they are given priority to send their children to the school they work at. And if staff are happy to send their own children to the school they work at, it reflects well on that school.
592	Disagree		Disagree		
593	Neutral		Neutral		
594	Neutral		Disagree		
595	Agree		Disagree		
596	Neutral		Neutral		
597	Disagree		Disagree		
598	Neutral		Neutral		
599	Neutral		Neutral		
600	Neutral		No Response		
601	Disagree		Disagree		
602	Neutral		Neutral		
603	Disagree		Disagree		

604	Disagree		Disagree		
605	Disagree		Disagree		
606	Disagree		Disagree		
607	Neutral		Neutral		
608	Neutral		Neutral		
609	Disagree		Disagree		
610	Disagree		Disagree		
611	Neutral		Neutral		
612	Disagree		Disagree		
613	Agree		Agree		
614	Agree		Agree		
615	Agree		Agree		It seems fair and reasonable for a child of a parent teaching at that school to be given priority advantage to be admitted to that school. It would not be fair and reasonable for a child of a primary teacher to be given priority for LPBS or LPGS or vice versa.
616	Neutral		Neutral		
617	Neutral		Neutral		
618	Neutral		Neutral		
619	Disagree		Disagree		Being honest this is all about house price values. People have paid a premium to be in catchment areas and rely on this continuing in order to recoup said premium when they sell. It is sheer theft by the trust to remove this from honest hardworking parents and families who have invested in this route for decades.
620	Neutral		Disagree		
621	Disagree		Disagree		
622	No Response		No Response		
623	Neutral		Neutral		
624	Neutral		Disagree		
625	Neutral		Neutral		
626	Neutral		Neutral		
627	Agree		Agree		
628	Agree		Agree		Children of staff are currently prioritised in the admissions criteria at LPSB. _x000D_ This change to put in place a reciprocal arrangement between LPSB and LPGS would enable siblings to attend schools in the same area. _x000D_ It would be fairer to staff members with children of different genders, who may end up attending schools in different local authorities._x000D_ It would have a significant impact upon recruitment and retention of quality staff.
629	Neutral		Neutral		
630	Agree		Agree		
631	Disagree		Disagree		Why should they have priority. Only children of staff at the actual school should be prioritised
632	Neutral		Neutral		
633	Agree		Agree		
634	Disagree		Disagree		
635	Disagree		Disagree		
636	Neutral		Neutral		
637	Agree		Agree		
638	Neutral		Neutral		
639	Agree		Disagree		
640	Neutral		Neutral		
641	Disagree		Disagree		As above.
642	Disagree		Disagree		
643	Agree		Agree		
644	No Response		No Response		Help with the recruitment and retention of highest quality teachers to the secondary schools.
645	Disagree		Disagree		
646	Disagree		Disagree		My reasons ate the above feedback.
647	Disagree		Disagree		
648	Disagree		Disagree		

649	Neutral		Neutral		
650	Agree		Agree		
651	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
652	Disagree		Disagree		
653	Neutral		No Response		
654	Agree		Agree		
655	Agree		Agree		
656	Agree		Agree		In order to retain the very best specialist staff it is essential that we provide them with the facility to have their own children allocated within the Trust. If prioritising the children of staff will help the school retain the very best teachers for our own children this proposal seems sound.
657	Disagree		Disagree		
658	Neutral		Neutral		
659	Neutral		Neutral		
660	Neutral		Neutral		
661	Neutral		Disagree		
662	Agree		Agree		Appreciate the difference this can make in attracting and retaining the best staff, and that this is not an unusual arrangement. Given the proximity of the two schools and the fact they're single sex, it makes sense to extend this across the two.
663	Agree		Disagree		LPSB admissions criteria should not be changed as was promised by the MAT before LPSB became part of LPLT.
664	Disagree		Disagree		This seems unfair to give priority to staff who may live much further away. Beckenham is an expensive place to live in part due to the schools available in the area. This allows a person to bypass the system and would also be an unfair way to attract talented teachers and staff members who may otherwise choose to teach at their own local schools. What would stop a person taking a job to get a place at the school and then leaving shortly after.
665	Neutral		Neutral		
666	Agree		Agree		
667	Agree		Agree		
668	No Response		No Response		
669	Neutral		Neutral		
670	Disagree		Disagree		Local schools for local children please
671	Neutral		Agree		I think this would increase talent from which the school can choose teachers. It should apply to all schools in the trust equally
672	Agree		Agree		It will assist with recruitment and retention of staff. At present the system is unfair as it discriminates against teachers who may have a son but who work at LPGS, and teachers who may have a daughter but work at LPSB. The fact that the two secondaries are single sex makes this a necessity.
673	Disagree		Disagree		Again seems undemocratic and highly socially selective though I can see it will make it easier for these schools to get staff.
674	Neutral		Neutral		
675	Neutral		Neutral		
676	Agree		Agree		
677	Agree		Disagree		
678	Agree		Disagree		
679	Neutral		Neutral		
680	Disagree		Disagree		
681	Disagree		Disagree		this will have a terrible effect on the children of the teachers. They should go to the schools of their home area.
682	Neutral		Neutral		
683	Disagree		Disagree		
684	Agree		No Response		
685	Agree		Agree		
686	Agree		Agree		Makes complete sense
687	Agree		Agree		
688	Disagree		Disagree		
689	Agree		Agree		
690	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to make their own way to and from school and therefore it is not necessary for children of staff to attend. It would open the system to abuse - teachers coming and going but their children allowed to remain in the school if their parents leave the job.
691	Disagree		Disagree		
692	Agree		Agree		



693	Neutral		Neutral		
694	Agree		Agree		
695	Agree		No Response		
696	Agree		Disagree		Staff should not be given priority in both schools because they are not employed there okay.
697	Agree		Disagree		Seems reasonable standard practice - a perk by way of employment package. But not reasonable for both schools as the basis for the perk is invalid - LPSB and LPSG are separate schools.
698	Neutral		Neutral		
699	Disagree		Disagree		
700	Neutral		Neutral		It should be based on distance from school. Those children will be further and they will put pressure on the area at school times with parents dropping off.
701	Disagree		Disagree		Older children are more capable of managing themselves and their journeys to and from school. Local schools should in the first instance serve the local community. All working parents have to juggle and this is unfair to working parents living in the local area who need their children to be able to travel to a nearby school unsupervised.
702	Neutral		Disagree		I believe that it is fair to give priority places to children of staff at any school but that it should be limited to only those working at the specific school.
703	Disagree		Disagree		
704	Agree		Neutral		
705	Disagree		Disagree		
706	Neutral		Neutral		
707	Agree		Agree		
708	Agree		Agree		
709	Neutral		Disagree		
710	Neutral		Neutral		
711	Agree		Agree		
712	Agree		Agree		Langley Boys and Girls secondary are in very close proximity so it shouldn't matter whether you have a boy or girl and what school you work at. Priority should be given to staff employees who've been at the school for a set period of time. Maybe for staff who have been employed for 2 years minimum.
713	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
714	Agree		Agree		
715	Neutral		Neutral		
716	Agree		Agree		
717	Neutral		Neutral		
718	Disagree		Disagree		
719	Agree		No Response		
720	Agree		Agree		
721	Agree		Neutral		
722	Disagree		Disagree		As mentioned priority should only be considered for staff working at the secondary school.
723	Agree		Disagree		
724	Agree		Agree		
725	Disagree		Disagree		
726	Neutral		Neutral		
727	Disagree		Disagree		
728	Agree		Agree		
729	Disagree		Disagree		
730	Disagree		Disagree		
731	Disagree		Disagree		
732	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair somewhat discriminatory
733	Agree		Agree		This is fair and reflects the need to retain good experienced teachers in secondary schools.
734	Agree		Agree		
735	Neutral		Neutral		
736	Agree		Agree		

737	Agree		Disagree		After the negative press regarding public schools behaving like they are private institutions, it's surprising to see the trust prove this opinion through suggesting it should cut off children from other schools. Public schools are just that, public. Elitism has no place here, and it just proves yet again that the government needs to overhaul the system of placement. A move such as this will have dire impact on other primary schools in the area including Highfield, that, by the way, has extraordinary leadership and churns our exceptional students.
738	Disagree		Disagree		
739	Neutral		Neutral		I appreciate this is beneficial for staff retention - however it's not clear on the number of possible places this will have effect on.
740	Agree		Agree		
741	Agree		Agree		
742	Agree		Agree		
743	Disagree		Disagree		
744	Neutral		Neutral		
745	Agree		Agree		
746	Neutral		Neutral		
747	Neutral		Neutral		
748	Disagree		Disagree		local school places should be offered to local children. It changes the community spirit when people are bussed in from far afield. I also don't think it's good for those children who have to travel to maintain out of school friendships, I think they often feel isolated. (based on personal experience of having moved away from my school, then finding my friends were all together and able to visit each other's houses easily, when I could not)
749	Disagree		Disagree		
750	Agree		Agree		
751	Neutral		No Response		
752	Disagree		Disagree		
753	Agree		Agree		
754	Neutral		Neutral		Children of staff provisions are fairly standard and it is not fair to discriminate based on gender.
755	Agree		Agree		
756	Agree		Agree		
757	Neutral		Neutral		
758	Neutral		Neutral		
759	Agree		Agree		
760	Neutral		Neutral		
761	Disagree		Disagree		
762	Agree		Agree		
763	Agree		Agree		
764	Agree		Agree		
765	Disagree		Disagree		
766	Disagree		Disagree		
767	Disagree		Disagree		
768	Disagree		Disagree		
769	Neutral		Neutral		
770	Disagree		Disagree		
771	Agree		Agree		We should make it easier for teachers with families to pursue their careers.
772	Disagree		Disagree		Children of secondary school age should be independent enough to go to school without their parents. Also, the sheer number of teachers/potential numbers of children would have unfair impact as would reduce number of local Other Children eligible to attend. _x000D_ You have not sufficiently defined "All Staff" _x000D_ Does this mean just teaching staff or would that include all staff that have a direct contract/are employed by the schools (therefore including Admin/premises/staff etc? _x000D_ Would there be a minimum tenure that staff had to be at the school before this applies?
773	Disagree		Disagree		
774	Agree		Agree		
775	Agree		Agree		
776	Not Applicable		Disagree		
777	No Response		No Response		

778	Agree		Disagree		
779	Agree		Agree		
780	Agree		Agree		
781	Agree		Agree		
782	Neutral		Neutral		
783	Neutral		Neutral		
784	Disagree		Disagree		
785	Agree		Agree		Makes sense if would help staff retention - continuity is better for the pupils
786	Agree		Agree		
787	Disagree		Disagree		
788	Disagree		Disagree		<p>The Code sets out at paragraph 1.39 that admission authorities may give priority in their oversubscription criteria to children of staff in either or both of the following circumstances _x000D_ _x000D_ a) where the member of staff has been employed at the school for two or more years at the time at which the application for admission to the school is made; and/or_x000D_ b) the member of staff is recruited to fill a vacant post for which there is a demonstrable skill shortage._x000D_ _x000D_ The Consultation notice is a little light on the wording (reference is simply made to the &amp;lsquo;children of staff&amp;hellip;&amp;rsquo; ) but the proposed arrangements contain the correct wording._x000D_ _x000D_ There are difficulties with the proposed arrangements for each of the two secondary schools, where the relevant oversubscription category extends to the children of staff at the other secondary school. _x000D_ _x000D_ Our view is the Code does not allow for an extension of this type: the Code permits priority to children of staff &amp;lsquo;at the school&amp;rsquo; only. we are aware of at least one Adjudicator decision which ruled against a multi academy trust applying the LPLT proposed approach. _x000D_ _x000D_ We would be prepared to seek a view from the OSA on this point.</p>
789	Disagree		Disagree		
790	Neutral		Disagree		
791	Neutral		Neutral		
792	Disagree		Disagree		
793	Agree		Agree		
794	Neutral		Neutral		
795	Disagree		Disagree		
796	Neutral		Neutral		
797	Agree		Disagree		
798	Neutral		Neutral		I can understand if the staff members children are primary age but not over 11/12.
799	Agree		Agree		
800	Disagree		Disagree		Children at Secondary school do not need to be taken to school by parents so I do not understand the logic of extending this right to staff of the other school.
801	Disagree		Disagree		
802	Disagree		Disagree		
803	Agree		Agree		I agree with this proposal for the convenience of staff at the secondary schools and their children, and because it would have the positive result of increasing shared journeys to and from the campus with benefits to health and the environment.
804	Agree		Agree		I agree with this proposal for the convenience of staff at the secondary schools and their children, and because it would have the positive result of increasing shared journeys to and from the campus with benefits to health and the environment.
805	Neutral		Neutral		
806	Agree		Agree		Because the schools are single-sex it should not discriminate for staff, particularly as the schools are on the same site
807	Agree		Agree		The numbers involved must be relatively immaterial.
808	Neutral		Neutral		
809	Agree		Agree		I'm in overall agreement with the proposal to give priority to children of staff who are contracted to do at least two days a week in the primary schools. I wouldn't wish to give priority to children of staff who aren't sufficiently working at the school to receive this potential benefit.

810	Agree		Agree		
811	Agree		Disagree		
812	Disagree		Disagree		
813	Agree		Neutral		This should only apply to the secondary school admission policy.
814	Agree		Agree		
815	Neutral		Disagree		
816	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
817	Neutral		Neutral		
818	Agree		Agree		
819	Disagree		Disagree		
820	Agree		Agree		Anything that enables a school to recruit and retain quality teaching staff particularly at this time of teacher shortage is of benefit to the school and the students educated there.
821	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
822	Disagree		Disagree		This would not be fair to take places away from children based on proximity to the school
823	Agree		Agree		
824	Agree		Neutral		
825	Neutral		Disagree		
826	Neutral		Neutral		
827	Disagree		Disagree		
828	Disagree		Disagree		There is no problem if the children live locally - they can be assessed with other local children. Otherwise, see my reasoning above.
829	Disagree		Disagree		Reasons provided above.
830	Agree		Agree		
831	Disagree		Disagree		
832	Agree		Agree		
833	Agree		Agree		
834	Agree		Agree		
835	Agree		Agree		
836	Agree		Agree		This is good for recruitment and retention purposes
837	Agree		Agree		
838	Agree		Agree		
839	Agree		Agree		I support this but think you are treading dubious gender equality grounds by not making the same provision available to local parents with children of different genders. _x000D_ _x000D_ I have a daughter and son. She&rsquo;s at LPGS and this consultation is playing up the sense that this is an integrated MAT. But without prioritising my son for LPBS on sibling grounds when he&rsquo;s in Year 7 you are discriminating against him and us. _x000D_ _x000D_ Please reconsider this and make a genuine reality the sense that this is an inclusive and integrated school community. Gender neutral sibling rules should apply for parents as well as teachers please.
840	Agree		Agree		
841	Agree		Agree		It seems reasonable that teachers are able to have their children at the school they work at, should they so wish, given the number of times parents need to attend school for events and the inevitable issues this causes for teachers themselves.
842	Disagree		Disagree		Teachers do not necessarily live close to their place of work and work longer hours than pupils attend school, so there is no need or relevance for a child to go to the same school as their parent.
843	Neutral		Agree		
844	Disagree		Disagree		
845	Agree		Agree		It is important to secure high quality teaching staff and maintain consistency. If it would help retain staff, I would be happy to see their children admitted accordingly.
846	Agree		Agree		
847	Disagree		Disagree		
848	Agree		Agree		
849	Disagree		Disagree		As per previous comment.
850	Neutral		Neutral		

851	Neutral		Neutral		
852	Agree		Agree		
853	Disagree		Disagree		
854	Agree		Agree		
855	Disagree		Disagree		
856	Disagree		Disagree		
857	Disagree		Disagree		
858	Disagree		Disagree		
859	Agree		Agree		
860	Disagree		Disagree		
861	Disagree		Disagree		
862	Agree		Agree		
863	No Response		No Response		
864	Neutral		Neutral		I understand that a teacher in an adjacent single sex school should perhaps be able to send their child to the opposite gender school, especially as they are on the same campus. This might be considered fair when compared to teachers at mixed secondary schools who can send children of both genders to their school.
865	Disagree		Disagree		
866	Neutral		Neutral		There is some logic allow staff who are also parents to have all their children on one campus. This is also a sound policy from an environmental perspective.
867	No Response		No Response		
868	Disagree		Disagree		
869	Agree		Agree		
870	Agree		Agree		
871	Disagree		Disagree		See above. I favour equal treatment for all children. Why should children of staff be given priority. I assume this also is not restricted to just teaching staff. Schools should be able to attract talented teachers by the services they offer and pay the make available. Local schools should be for local children.
872	Agree		Agree		
873	Neutral		Neutral		
874	Agree		Agree		I feel this would be appropriate as it would be attractive to teachers to work at Langley Boys and Girls and would also be a retainer for teachers.
875	Disagree		Disagree		See response above.
876	Neutral		Disagree		
877	Disagree		Disagree		
878	Neutral		Disagree		As above
879	Disagree		Disagree		
880	Agree		Agree		To aid staff retention and assist staff in having a less stressful work/life balance.
881	Neutral		Neutral		
882	Disagree		Disagree		This proposal is discriminatory, it places at a disadvantage any child who lives locally but whose parents are not employed by the secondary schools. This proposal if adopted would highly reduce admission chances of children who live locally as the staff group of both secondary schools is vast
883	Disagree		Disagree		
884	Neutral		Disagree		
885	Disagree		Disagree		See earlier comments above
886	Agree		No Response		
887	Neutral		Neutral		
888	Agree		Agree		SAME AS ABOVE
889	Disagree		Disagree		Please see other comments section.
890	Disagree		Disagree		In any other profession, parents have to make provision for childcare. I do not agree that children of staff employed at either of the secondary schools should be a priority to maintain "recruiting and retaining quality staff". Initially when a vacancy arises within the secondary schools the candidates apply for the job as advertised and would have made childcare provision before applying-surely the job is offered to the best candidate who should be of "quality".
891	Agree		Disagree		
892	Agree		Agree		As these parents are colocated with their children this makes sense. In makes busy role of being a parent and teacher slightly easier knowing your commute is the same as the school run. Obviously when your a teacher drop off and work starting are the exact same time!
893	Agree		Agree		
894	Disagree		Neutral		

895	Disagree		Disagree		
896	Disagree		Disagree		
897	Neutral		Neutral		Students at secondary school would usually be independent of their parent(s) in terms of travelling to and from school and so therefore there is little need for them to attend the same school as their parent.
898	Agree		Agree		
899	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
900	Agree		Agree		
901	Neutral		Neutral		
902	Agree		Neutral		
903	Agree		Agree		
904	Disagree		Disagree		
905	Disagree		Disagree		
906	Neutral		Neutral		
907	Disagree		Disagree		
908	Disagree		Disagree		Staff
909	Neutral		Neutral		I believe this has always been the case for children of staff to get priority admission if the member of staff has completed a certain length of service. Unfortunately for LPBS and LPGS the approval by Bromley Council for an abundance of new housing within the catchment has of course had an effect on the catchment area shrinking. Hopefully with Harris Beckenham doing so well and Eden Park High now open this will have an effect on the catchment growing.
910	Disagree		Disagree		I appreciate there is a crisis in teacher retention in the secondary phase (and possibly primary too) but I do think that if you want to retain teachers you need to look at salary, conditions of work and overall quality of life. I would honestly say that a school place may not be top of the list here. It is vitally important that Trusts DO NOT undermine the rights of their staff and their other stakeholders (parents and students included).
911	Disagree		Disagree		
912	Neutral		Neutral		
913	Disagree		Disagree		Again conflict of interest
914	Agree		Agree		As above and agree the sex of the child should disadvantage the teacher or child.
915	Disagree		Disagree		secondary school children independently travel to school at this age and should attend their local school.
916	Agree		Agree		
917	Disagree		Disagree		
918	Agree		Disagree		
919	Disagree		Disagree		Disagree, as this will mean children from further afield will be travelling to the school. That will increase the number of people travelling by car and bus, reducing the current amount of pupils, the majority of which, currently walk to the schools. That will then, in turn, mean that those displaced children in the current catchment area, will be forced to travel by car and bus to other schools. These changes will, therefore, greatly increase traffic congestion and increase carbon emission' which all authorities are attempting to reduce. There is also the national policy of encouraging children to get active, in an attempt to reduce the increasing obesity epidemic. Walking to school is beneficial to children' health and removing the option to walk to school for many children is negative. Why does LPLT think they are exempt from actively supporting these national almost global policies? Not to ignore the fact that we moved to , paying inflated prices as we wanted our son to attend your excellent school. I urge you to re think changing the current admission policy.
920	Disagree		Disagree		
921	Disagree		Disagree		
922	Neutral		Neutral		
923	Agree		Disagree		
924	Agree		Agree		
925	Agree		Agree		
926	Agree		Agree		
927	Disagree		Disagree		
928	Disagree		Disagree		
929	Neutral		Neutral		
930	Agree		Agree		
931	Disagree		Disagree		Local schools for local children
932	Disagree		Disagree		

933	Agree		Agree		
934	Disagree		Disagree		
935	Agree		Agree		
936	Agree		Agree		
937	Neutral		Neutral		
938	Agree		Disagree		It has never been the case where the LPBS and LPGS staff benefit from their children attending the other school. I agree their child should be able to attend the school they teach at but not the other school. This again reduces the number of children who are eligible to attend from other primary schools in the area.
939	Neutral		Neutral		
940	Neutral		Neutral		
941	Agree		Agree		
942	Disagree		Disagree		
943	Neutral		Neutral		
944	Disagree		Disagree		
945	Disagree		Disagree		
946	Disagree		Disagree		
947	Disagree		Disagree		
948	Disagree		Disagree		
949	Disagree		Disagree		
950	Disagree		Disagree		
951	Neutral		Neutral		
952	Neutral		Neutral		
953	Disagree		Disagree		These changes will prioritise individuals based on arbitrary selection criteria and create an elitist system of nepotism. In my current profession I work as an organisation has very strict rules against nepotism and preferential treatment based on anything other than . I think that Langley Park Learning Trust would do well to mirror these principals
954	Neutral		Neutral		
955	Agree		Disagree		Children should attend school near where they live - to provide them with independence, but not a massive journey to school each day.
956	Neutral		Neutral		
957	Disagree		Disagree		School admissions should be for local children unless as I stated above the child has social or medical need.
958	Neutral		Disagree		The Current Oversubscription Criteria is sufficient and priority should only be given to children of staff at that particular school. I.e. teacher parents at LPSB should have priority access for their child, providing they live within the catchment area.
959	Neutral		Neutral		
960	Disagree		Disagree		Priority should first be given to pupils living within the catchment area.
961	Disagree		Disagree		
962	Disagree		Disagree		
963	No Response		Disagree		
964	Neutral		Agree		This makes sense in terms of equality of opportunity for both boys and girls.
965	Disagree		Disagree		I don't think this should be a perk of the job for any school. I understand that it may be handy for a teachers child to get a place, but the criteria for getting the job is not based on proximity to the school. They are likely to live greater distances than those who would be eligible under the current catchment system.
966	Agree		Agree		
967	Agree		Disagree		I think it's important for children to go to school where they can make local friends so they can start to build independence out of school. Without needing to have that facilitates by endless car journeys as that's not very green! _x000D_ _x000D_ For the same reasons of independence, children need to be at school away from their parents.
968	Disagree		Disagree		why should they?
969	Disagree		Disagree		on what basis is that fair on the children in the local area?
970	Agree		Agree		
971	Disagree		Disagree		All parents be they employed by the education department or not have to send their children to school. As a working parent, I have no choice in a school located to my place of employment. This 'perk' should be available to all council employees, police officers, nhs workers and firefighters to keep this fair and unbiased.
972	Neutral		Neutral		
973	Disagree		Disagree		

974	Agree		Agree		
975	Agree		Agree		
976	Agree		Agree		Makes sense for any school including this as part of their admissions arrangements, though these secondary schools probably have little difficulty in attracting staff!
977	Neutral		Neutral		
978	Neutral		Neutral		
979	Agree		Agree		
980	Disagree		Disagree		
981	Disagree		Disagree		
982	Neutral		Neutral		
983	Agree		Agree		
984	Neutral		Neutral		
985	Disagree		Disagree		Admissions priority should simply not be given to staff members of the schools.
986	Disagree		Disagree		
987	Agree		Agree		
988	Disagree		Disagree		
989	Neutral		Neutral		
990	Disagree		Disagree		This gives those children an advantage over children in the community and state education should not be based on favouritism to staff.
991	Agree		Agree		Again i dont see this as an issue, if they work at the establishment i dont see any issue if their children are granted acces to education there.
992	Disagree		Disagree		
993	Neutral		Neutral		
994	Disagree		Disagree		
995	Disagree		Disagree		
996	Agree		Agree		
997	Neutral		Neutral		
998	Agree		Agree		
999	Disagree		Disagree		
1000	Agree		Agree		
1001	Disagree		Disagree		The quality of the teachers at these schools are good enough to have resulted in fantastic test results over many years and I can't see how changing this arrangement will significantly improve the quality of teachers at the schools.
1002	Agree		Neutral		
1003	Agree		Agree		
1004	Disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree. Should be only for those in the same school as their parent not either school.
1005	Neutral		Neutral		
1006	Agree		Disagree		
1007	Agree		Agree		
1008	Agree		Agree		
1009	Disagree		Disagree		
1010	Disagree		Disagree		
1011	Neutral		Neutral		
1012	Disagree		Disagree		
1013	Neutral		Neutral		
1014	Neutral		Disagree		
1015	Disagree		Disagree		I don't see the need for children of secondary school age to be located at a school with their parent.
1016	Disagree		Disagree		As above.
1017	Agree		Agree		
1018	Agree		Agree		
1019	Disagree		Disagree		
1020	Neutral		Neutral		
1021	Disagree		Disagree		



1022	Agree		Agree		I feel that as a person whom is dedicated to educating children, that it may be difficult for them to take their own children to a different school and still arrive for work on time.
1023	No Response		No Response		
1024	Agree		Disagree		
1025	Agree		Disagree		In Bromley it has been an accepted change for staff at secondary schools, once they've worked at school for a set period of time, to apply for a place for their child. This should remain the case for the Boys and Girls school staff, only.
1026	Agree		Agree		
1027	Neutral		Disagree		
1028	Agree		Agree		
1029	Agree		Agree		
1030	Agree		Agree		
1031	Disagree		Disagree		
1032	Agree		Agree		As above
1033	Disagree		Disagree		
1034	Agree		Agree		
1035	Neutral		Disagree		Admission based on a parent working at that specific school is reasonable for obvious convenience reasons. Admission based on working at a school within the trust but not the actual school being attended by a pupil would constitute nepotism or a perk, and is therefore unfair to other more eligible candidates.
1036	Disagree		Disagree		All children should have an equal opportunity, have 2 grandsons at Oak Lodge, where will they be sent, outrageous that they may have to travel miles when Langley boys is within walking distance.
1037	Neutral		Neutral		
1038	Agree		Agree		This makes sense - to recruit for teachers from a broader radius.
1039	Neutral		Neutral		
1040	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1041	Agree		Agree		
1042	Agree		Agree		
1043	Neutral		Neutral		
1044	Disagree		Disagree		No child should be given preferential treatment over another based on who they know or are related to.
1045	Neutral		Neutral		
1046	Disagree		Disagree		Again it should be based on proximity. How long does the member of staff have to be working there?
1047	Agree		Agree		
1048	Disagree		Disagree		
1049	Disagree		Disagree		Priority should be given for teaching staff for both schools but not all staff as it is good eaching staff that need to be recruited and retained
1050	Neutral		Neutral		
1051	Agree		Agree		
1052	Agree		Disagree		
1053	Disagree		Disagree		Again I do not have a problem with the policy including the children of teaching staff as I know that schools are experiencing a recruitment crisis at present. I cannot support the policy if it says the children of 'staff' as this is open to abuse. Presumably it would then include all admin and support staff of which there would be a very high number in a secondary school. Some people could and would get an admin job at the school for a short time just to get their child into the school.
1054	Agree		Neutral		
1055	Disagree		Disagree		
1056	Neutral		Disagree		
1057	Neutral		Neutral		
1058	Disagree		Disagree		
1059	Disagree		Disagree		
1060	Disagree		Disagree		Families pay good money to live in the catchment it is not fair to all of a sudden change this, they can be next on the list after catchment families
1061	Disagree		Disagree		No reason why children of staff should be given priority especially if they are not in the catchment. Plenty of people work away from their children's school. Ridiculous to give priority just because they work there!!!
1062	Agree		Agree		
1063	Agree		Agree		I believe members of staff should have the knowledge & Security of helping their child to get into school of their choice
1064	Neutral		Neutral		

1065	Neutral		Neutral		
1066	Disagree		Agree		
1067	Disagree		Disagree		
1068	Disagree		Disagree	My	and although it complicates logistics, we manage and the policy is fair to the local community.
1069	Agree		Neutral		
1070	Disagree		Agree		
1071	Agree		Agree		It is important to provide an incentive to the Langley staff, in terms of recruiting and retaining high quality staff.
1072	Neutral		Neutral		
1073	Agree		Agree		
1074	Neutral		Neutral		
1075	Agree		Disagree		The staff already appear to have priority according to the consultation document._x000D_ _x000D_ I do not support staff at either school getting priority. The schools should be treated independently.
1076	Disagree		Disagree		
1077	Disagree		Disagree		Not fair on local children who live closer to the schools
1078	Disagree		Disagree		
1079	Disagree		Disagree		
1080	Neutral		Neutral		
1081	Disagree		Disagree		
1082	Agree		Agree		
1083	Disagree		Disagree		
1084	Neutral		Neutral		
1085	Agree		Neutral		
1086	Agree		Agree		
1087	Disagree		Disagree		
1088	Disagree		Disagree		
1089	Disagree		Disagree		
1090	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1091	Not Applicable		Neutral		
1092	Agree		Neutral		
1093	Agree		Agree		Keep good teachers
1094	Agree		Disagree		
1095	Neutral		Neutral		
1096	Disagree		Disagree		This would impact children within a closer vicinity (Unicorn) who may not get a place, increase traffic congestion which is bad for the environment. People have made made long term financial committments with where they live which has taken into account schools._x000D_ _x000D_ I believe that this is against the ethos of local community schools and would have a negative impact on other existing catchment area schools. It could also lead to no local places for local children.
1097	Agree		Agree		I think that this a reasonable way to improve staff retention. In addition the impact of this proposal will be far lower than the feeder primary proposals. There cannot be enough children of staff to materially impact admissions. The feeder primary school matter is the key issue.
1098	Disagree		Disagree		I don't agree with staff children having advantage over children in catchment area.
1099	Agree		Agree		
1100	Disagree		Disagree		
1101	Disagree		Disagree		Children of staff should be subject to the same criteria as everyone else
1102	Agree		Agree		
1103	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school aged children can make their way to and from their local school with no assistance from their parents - therefore I do not see why a secondary school aged child should have any priority to attend a secondary school over a local secondary aged child just because their parent teaches at the school
1104	Neutral		Neutral		
1105	Disagree		Disagree		
1106	Disagree		Disagree		

1107	Disagree		No Response		The proposed changes could potentially reduce the amount of places for local children, this will have an environmental impact as well as discriminating against local children who may miss out on a place at a school within walking distance.
1108	Disagree		Disagree		
1109	Not Applicable		Disagree		See above.
1110	Neutral		Neutral		
1111	Neutral		Disagree		I can understand the desire to offer a perk to attract staff, but would have preferred you to have given more information as to the total number of staff in both schools and the number of places this would affect. And I believe you should also be explaining why it is necessary to offer this perk to attract or retain staff. What data do you have to support this need? Are you struggling to attract or retain staff? Children mostly travel independently to school so I see little need for this arrangement other than a pure staff perk. Since you are choosing to operate two separate schools I see no valid reason presented as to why to extend this to the opposite sex school. There will be plenty of applicants who do not have children of the appropriate age for secondary, or do not have children at all. I would understand your logic more if you were proposing to give staff priority access to any of the schools in the trust, but you are not. As things stand, I can see no valid reason to extend this beyond the specific school the member of staff works at, which is exactly what you proposing for your primaries, and that most other schools do.
1112	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1113	Agree		Agree		
1114	Neutral		Neutral		
1115	Neutral		Neutral		
1116	Agree		Agree		Whilst I am generally supportive of allowing children of (either) secondary school staff to have priority, for obvious practical reasons as well as for the purposes of retaining and attracting talented teachers, I think the sole criterion should be where teachers "have been continuously employed for two or more years at the date that the application is submitted". To have the possibility of allowing children of teachers who "were recruited to fill a vacant post for which there was a demonstrable skill shortage" is an arbitrary classification, potentially open to being abused over time, and potentially subject to challenge. I would favour only have the "2 year minimum service" criterion.
1117	Disagree		Disagree		
1118	Agree		Agree		
1119	Agree		Agree		
1120	Neutral		Neutral		
1121	Disagree		Disagree		I think secondary schools are different from primary schools whereby children can make their own way to school and are more self-sufficient.
1122	Disagree		Disagree		it again fails to provide a fair opportunity to families within the existing catchment and applying equally to either school distorts it further
1123	Disagree		Disagree		
1124	Neutral		Neutral		
1125	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1126	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary age children are assumed to be capable of travelling to their local school so they should not need to attend a school that their parent (teacher) works at. They should be attending a school local to their own home.
1127	Disagree		Disagree		
1128	Disagree		Disagree		
1129	Disagree		Disagree		
1130	Disagree		Disagree		
1131	Agree		Agree		
1132	Disagree		Disagree		
1133	Agree		Agree		
1134	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to travel to school independently so should have the same admissions criteria applied as all local children (proximity to school)
1135	Agree		Agree		
1136	Agree		Agree		
1137	Agree		Agree		
1138	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1139	Neutral		Neutral		
1140	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1141	Disagree		Disagree		
1142	Agree		Agree		
1143	Disagree		Disagree		Again this is just nepotism
1144	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		

1145	Disagree		Disagree	
1146	Disagree		No Response	
1147	Disagree		Disagree	
1148	Agree		Agree	
1149	Agree		Agree	
1150	Disagree		Disagree	
1151	Agree		Agree	
1152	Agree		Agree	
1153	Neutral		Neutral	
1154	Neutral		Neutral	
1155	Disagree		Disagree	
1156	Disagree		Disagree	
1157	Agree		Neutral	
1158	Neutral		Neutral	
1159	Disagree		Disagree	
1160	Agree		Agree	
1161	Neutral		Neutral	
1162	Neutral		Disagree	
1163	Neutral		Neutral	
1164	Neutral		Neutral	
1165	Disagree		Disagree	
1166	No Response		No Response	
1167	Not Applicable		Neutral	
1168	Neutral		Neutral	
1169	Agree		Agree	
1170	Neutral		Neutral	
1171	Neutral		Neutral	
1172	Disagree		Disagree	I think this would be unfair to children of parents who are not teachers
1173	Neutral		Neutral	
1174	Neutral		Neutral	
1175	Disagree		Disagree	Secondary school children make their own way to school. They do not NEED to be at the same school as their parent staff, they should be encouraged to be independent. I do believe primary school children with parent staff would benefit from being at the same school from a logistical viewpoint but it is not a point I would campaign for or against, therefore my view on this is neutral.
1176	Neutral		Neutral	
1177	Neutral		Neutral	
1178	Agree		Agree	
1179	Disagree		Disagree	
1180	Neutral		Neutral	
1181	Neutral		Neutral	
1182	Neutral		Neutral	
1183	Neutral		Disagree	
1184	Neutral		Neutral	
1185	Neutral		Disagree	
1186	Agree		Agree	
1187	Agree		Agree	
1188	Disagree		Disagree	

1189	Disagree		Disagree		I reiterate my point above &ndash; _x000D_ _x000D_ This is an unnecessary arrangement in an already oversubscribed area. This offers no benefit to adult or child and instead a serious cause for concern should the member of staff live outside of the area. The child travelling to and from the school would increase burden on public transport or worse if travelling by car. In addition it is unacceptable that a local child should miss out on a place at a local school because that place is being offered as a &lsquo;perk&rsquo; of the job.
1190	Disagree		Disagree		I reiterate my points above &ndash; _x000D_ _x000D_ &bull; A local child should not miss out on a place at a local school due to a teacher (who may live at the area) being offered this as part of a recruitment package. There are plenty of other options which can tempt and retain people into teaching. This is an out of date solution to a very modern problem, schools are becoming more and more oversubscribed so this cannot continue. _x000D_ &bull; No information is provided detailing how long the teacher has to have been working with the trust to enjoy this benefit and how long they would have to stay. What is being proposed here is potentially a child could gain a place in a feeder school and then be entitled to education within the trust until they are 18 years of age, irrespective of where they live and if their parent is still working for the trust.
1191	Disagree		Disagree		
1192	Disagree		Disagree		
1193	Disagree		Disagree		
1194	Agree		Agree		
1195	Agree		Agree		
1196	Agree		Agree		
1197	Disagree		Disagree		
1198	Neutral		Neutral		
1199	Disagree		Disagree		
1200	Agree		Agree		
1201	Neutral		Neutral		
1202	Neutral		Neutral		
1203	Neutral		Neutral		
1204	Neutral		Neutral		
1205	Neutral		Neutral		
1206	Disagree		Disagree		
1207	Agree		Agree		
1208	Disagree		Disagree		
1209	Disagree		Disagree		
1210	Neutral		Neutral		
1211	Disagree		Disagree		Children of secondary age can go to school by themselves. There is no reason for a parent to work in the same place as their child.
1212	Neutral		Neutral		
1213	Neutral		Neutral		
1214	Disagree		Not Applicable		
1215	Not Applicable		Agree		
1216	Neutral		Neutral		
1217	Neutral		Neutral		
1218	Neutral		Neutral		
1219	Disagree		Disagree		My children attend _____ and want to go to Langley Park school for _____. We oppose the consultation.
1220	Neutral		No Response		
1221	Neutral		Neutral		
1222	Disagree		Disagree		All children should be given school places based on their home address and locality to a school, not because their parent has a foot in the door.
1223	Disagree		Disagree		
1224	Neutral		Neutral		
1225	Neutral		Neutral		
1226	Disagree		Disagree		
1227	Disagree		Disagree		As above

1228	Disagree		Disagree		
1229	Disagree		Disagree		
1230	Neutral		Disagree		
1231	Disagree		Disagree		
1232	Agree		Agree		
1233	Agree		Agree		
1234	Neutral		Neutral		
1235	Disagree		Disagree		Same as above. I do not see why children from other areas should have priority over local children just because their parents are employed by the school. It's not fair, our children should have priority, why should they be forced to go to schools in other areas.
1236	Neutral		Not Applicable		
1237	Neutral		Neutral		
1238	Agree		Agree		
1239	Neutral		Neutral		Sometimes kids do well without parents managing or being involved in everything however I understand it could make their jobs easier if it's only one commute - I don't work with my children and they are fine so totally neutral
1240	Neutral		Disagree		Since you do not offer places to siblings across the Secondary schools I think it would be very unfair to offer this to pupils of staff.
1241	No Response		Neutral		I think it's reasonable to think a child could go to a school where their parent is working - AS LONG AS THEY ARE LIVING WITH THEM AT LEAST HALF OF THE TIME.
1242	Disagree		Disagree		
1243	Neutral		Neutral		
1244	Agree		Agree		
1245	Disagree		Disagree		Children of teachers do better when not at the same school as their parents.
1246	Neutral		Neutral		
1247	Neutral		Neutral		
1248	Neutral		Neutral		
1249	Disagree		Disagree		
1250	Disagree		Disagree		
1251	Agree		Agree		
1252	Agree		Agree		
1253	Neutral		Neutral		
1254	Disagree		Disagree		
1255	Neutral		Neutral		
1256	Agree		Disagree		
1257	Disagree		Disagree		This will limit numbers for local children.
1258	Agree		Agree		
1259	Agree		Agree		
1260	Disagree		Disagree		
1261	Agree		Agree		
1262	Neutral		Agree		
1263	Agree		Disagree		If this policy is implemented then this is akin to applying a sibling policy across both schools. It has always been stressed that the schools are run separately so to implement a policy that links the schools but only to the benefit of staff seems grossly unfair and open to potential legal challenge.
1264	Agree		Agree		
1265	Neutral		Neutral		
1266	Agree		Agree		If I were to retrain as a teacher, I would choose to work in a school where both of my children (boy and girl) could benefit. This proposal will help both schools recruit and retain better quality staff, and will be fair on their families and better for the environment as they will all be able to travel together.
1267	Disagree		Disagree		There might be preferential treatment by other teachers to those children who have parents working in the school; this is for secondary only as I understand that for primary kids are small and that may ease the logistics for parents who teach
1268	Neutral		Neutral		
1269	Agree		Agree		I think incentivising high quality staff to accept employment at the schools is a positive thing and will have a limited impact on overall admissions arrangements given the relatively low numbers of staff who would wish to benefit.
1270	Disagree		Disagree		

1271	Agree		Agree		There are significant conveniences for secondary staff members to have their own children at the secondary schools. It brings the additional advantage of shared travel to school, potentially saving traffic. I would expect the numbers of children involved to have a minimal impact in admissions via other criteria.
1272	Agree		Agree		
1273	Agree		Agree		
1274	Disagree		Disagree		
1275	Agree		Agree		
1276	Disagree		Disagree		
1277	Disagree		Disagree		only local kids should go to the local schools.
1278	Agree		Disagree		Comments refer to LPSB
1279	Disagree		Disagree		This disadvantages local children. Siblings and distance are in my view the most important criteria.
1280	Neutral		Neutral		As above I note that this can be a useful incentive to attract and retain staff but as the secondary schools presumably have a higher number of staff (In order to deal with the larger student numbers) I assume this will also have more of an impact on places available to other children.
1281	Agree		Agree		The staff working for the two high schools should be given priority as some staff travel distance.
1282	Disagree		Disagree		
1283	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1284	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1285	Disagree		Disagree		
1286	Disagree		Disagree		No numbers have been given as to how many places would be taken from local children.
1287	Disagree		Disagree		
1288	Disagree		Disagree		I always thought it wasn't allowed for children of staff to be allowed at same school as their may be favouritism and the child may feel uncomfortable knowing his dad mom is at their school watching them. Not feeling free to express themselves independently
1289	Agree		Agree		They work there so make the staff lives easier. Teachers have it hard enough already.
1290	Disagree		Disagree		
1291	Agree		Agree		
1292	Disagree		Disagree		
1293	Neutral		Neutral		
1294	Agree		Agree		
1295	Agree		Neutral		
1296	Agree		Neutral		
1297	Disagree		Disagree		
1298	Disagree		Disagree		
1299	Disagree		Disagree		
1300	Disagree		Disagree		
1301	Disagree		Disagree		
1302	Agree		Agree		
1303	Neutral		Neutral		
1304	Disagree		Disagree		
1305	Neutral		Neutral		
1306	Neutral		Neutral		
1307	Neutral		Neutral		
1308	Disagree		Disagree		
1309	Disagree		Disagree		
1310	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1311	Agree		Agree		
1312	Agree		Agree		The teachers are already travelling to the secondary schools, often by car. For logistics, I can appreciate that it may be easier if children of secondary school staff are given priority.
1313	Disagree		Disagree		
1314	Agree		Neutral		
1315	Agree		Agree		
1316	Not Applicable		Agree		

1317	Agree		Agree		
1318	Agree		Agree		
1319	Disagree		Disagree		
1320	Disagree		Disagree		
1321	Neutral		Disagree		
1322	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1323	Disagree		Disagree		
1324	Agree		Agree		
1325	Neutral		Disagree		
1326	Neutral		Neutral		
1327	Disagree		Disagree		
1328	Neutral		Neutral		
1329	Disagree		Disagree		
1330	Neutral		Neutral		
1331	Disagree		Disagree		
1332	Agree		Agree		
1333	Agree		Agree		
1334	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children can go to/from school without parental chaperone so can attend their local/closest school.
1335	Agree		Agree		
1336	Agree		Agree		
1337	Agree		Agree		
1338	Neutral		Neutral		
1339	Agree		Agree		
1340	Agree		Agree		
1341	Agree		Agree		
1342	Agree		Agree		
1343	Agree		Agree		
1344	Neutral		Neutral		
1345	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1346	Disagree		Disagree		
1347	Agree		Agree		
1348	Disagree		Disagree		
1349	Disagree		Disagree		<p>The people who made the proposal are thieves as they wanted to take advantages of being part of the same trust and steal public benefits from other people. Park Langley secondary schools are state schools funded by British tax payers and they are not just funded by the trust. Local families should have an equal chance to get a place for their children, based on the distance from their house.</p> <p>We are a local family with two hard working parents and we moved here , so that we hope our can go to the school in a few years time. They are currently in school. We have been VERY angry and distressed with the proposal since it was released in December, as we (us and LOTS of other families in ) would be massively affected by those thieves with their horrible intention. This is utterly ridiculous!!! We would ask the people who proposed the new school's admission arrangements to withdraw them!!</p>
1350	Neutral		Neutral		
1351	Disagree		Disagree		
1352	Neutral		Disagree		
1353	Agree		Agree		
1354	Neutral		Neutral		
1355	Agree		Disagree		
1356	Disagree		Disagree		
1357	Disagree		Disagree		
1358	Agree		Agree		
1359	Neutral		Neutral		



1360	Disagree		Disagree		The question is Why? For what reason do the staff get priority? The teacher and their family may live miles away and travel in to work but their child would get a place over another family like mine who live a stone throw away from the school. My children would then have to travel miles out. Ridiculous! Think also of the Carbon Print!
1361	Agree		Disagree		
1362	Disagree		Disagree		
1363	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1364	Disagree		Disagree		For what reason do teachers require priority for their children and the admissions of their school choice?
1365	Disagree		Disagree		
1366	Neutral		Neutral		
1367	Agree		Agree		I feel this is a reasonable policy as they share a site. This is a common policy across the area and country for priority access to be given for direct staff.
1368	Disagree		Disagree		allocation should be as normal LBB criteria eg proximity to school
1369	Neutral		Neutral		I feel that this would be fair to the children of staff but feel that, if the schools are going to effectively be treated as a single entity for admissions in this way, a similar sibling policy should apply throughout so that anyone applying with a sibling at either school should be covered by the sibling rule. I.e. why a sibling girl would not receive a sibling place at Langley Girls if their older brother already had a place at Langley Boys.
1370	Neutral		Neutral		
1371	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1372	Neutral		Neutral		
1373	Neutral		Neutral		
1374	Agree		Agree		
1375	Disagree		Disagree		I do not believe that children of staff should be granted priority placement at just any school within the Trust, other than to the school which the parent currently works. There is no certainty in those staff continuing employment in the Trust once they have secured a place at their preferred school. The local children will have already then been displaced to schools further away, with preference having been given to the children of Trust staff, who are not local in the immediate catchment areas. The impact of part time staff would also potentially be significant in this respect. There is currently no sibling rule between LPSB and LPSG, so it would be unfair to have this exist, albeit under a different guise, for staff of either school, but not the local population.
1376	Agree		Agree		Seems sensible for staff retention
1377	Disagree		Disagree		If the staff lives near by, in the catchment area, then fine. If they live at quite a distance, it does not make sense.
1378	Neutral		Neutral		
1379	Agree		Agree		This is a fair request
1380	Neutral		Disagree		This seems unfair as the same rule does not apply to parents of different sex children when applying to both of the schools.
1381	Agree		Disagree		To roll out the Children of Teachers from either Secondary school policy, but to not have a sibling policy that can be enforced in the same way across both schools for parents, means that this is a very uneven playing field. I would argue that this breaks fundamental principles of fair and equal access. if that playing field could be levelled, I would not object.
1382	Agree		Agree		
1383	Agree		Agree		
1384	Agree		Agree		
1385	Disagree		Disagree		
1386	Agree		Agree		
1387	Disagree		Disagree		
1388	Disagree		Disagree		If the children are not resident in the area why should they take priority over those that are
1389	Disagree		Disagree		
1390	Neutral		No Response		
1391	No Response		Neutral		
1392	Disagree		Disagree		
1393	Agree		Agree		
1394	Neutral		Neutral		
1395	Agree		Agree		
1396	Disagree		Disagree		
1397	Neutral		Neutral		
1398	Neutral		Neutral		
1399	Agree		Agree		
1400	Neutral		Agree		

1401	Disagree		Disagree		
1402	Neutral		Neutral		As above
1403	Disagree		Disagree		This is only slightly less objectionable than above, but only because it involves less teachers so less kids thus improving the chances of children in the surrounding areas gaining access to their local school. _x000D_ _x000D_ Please please do not offer 'perks' to staff that discriminate against other potential pupils - improve the school environment and access to further education and opportunities that encourages continued learning and growth. Shared decision making and leadership promotion is usually a good start.
1404	Agree		Agree		
1405	Agree		Agree		
1406	Agree		Disagree		
1407	Neutral		Neutral		I support this as a way to support recruitment and retention of staff. However, I think it should be more closely linked to types of staff where there are recruitment and retention challenges. I.e. is the challenge the same for teaching staff, teaching assistants, admin staff, other support staff?
1408	Agree		Agree		
1409	Neutral		Disagree		
1410	Neutral		Neutral		
1411	Agree		Agree		
1412	Disagree		Disagree		
1413	Disagree		Disagree		This is an unfair disadvantage to local residents and their children. Like many other residents, we specifically chose as our choice of residences (13 years ago), with schools in mind for their children. How can it be deemed slightly fair that staff and their children who potentially reside some distance away from the Langley schools secure a place within their desired school without any factor of proximity in place.  The affect this would have on pollution due to extra traffic congestion into the area would almost certainly have a negative impact.  Local children should be able to walk to their nearest school, not be forced to take a different form of transport purely because they cannot secure a place for your proposed reasons.
1414	Neutral		Neutral		
1415	Agree		Disagree		
1416	Agree		Agree		Comments as above.
1417	Disagree		Disagree		
1418	Neutral		Neutral		Secondary school age children are independent in their travel to school. I don't see the importance to have parents and children co located at the same school.
1419	Agree		Agree		
1420	Disagree		Disagree		I don't think it is a necessarily a good thing for parents to be employed in a school as it can give rise to conflicts of interest. Whilst it may be an aid to recruitment, there is no evidence given that recruitment is particularly difficult.
1421	Agree		Disagree		Bad for the climate. _x000D_ Equity for children / parents. Many of us do not work as teachers, but also work hard and want the best for our children. There are a huge number of staff employed by all these schools in total - to give them unlimited access across all sites is unprecedented and DISCRIMINATORY against other hardworking parents and children. _x000D_ As these trusts grow and more trusts become ever larger this would set an inappropriate precedent that could potentially have worrying ramifications across the country. _x000D_ Of course it is what staff would lobby for and what would make them happy - but the bigger picture is important. _x000D_ This is not what the Trusts were set up to do - it was about raising standards of teaching, reducing costs, sharing resources (in terms of staff, HR, good practice). The Trusts focus should be on this not admissions that would benefit certain groups and DISCRIMINATE against others.
1422	Neutral		Neutral		
1423	Neutral		Disagree		
1424	Neutral		Disagree		
1425	Disagree		Disagree		This would be an unfair selection that will only disadvantage children within Bromley, and all local schools that are not part of the trust. This is just an unfair bribe to force education staff with children to work within the trust to obtain school places for their children. Whilst I understand the logistical benefit of children of staff working at the school in question having priority, this does not apply to other schools. _x000D_ This is just an attempt to form a cartel, going completely against the principal of non-selective education. State schools are, and should remain, non-selective for the benefit and betterment of all children.
1426	Disagree		Disagree		I think at primary age 4-11 this is helpful and may assist retention of staff. At secondary school age 11-18 when children are much more independent this is not necessary and will impact local children. I do not see why it should be applied across the boys & girls schools as no such arrangement exists across the schools for anyone else.

1427	Neutral		Neutral		
1428	Agree		Agree		Strong connection turn between the staffs family and the school.
1429	Disagree		Agree		
1430	Disagree		Disagree		Staff come and go and it may also encourage people to take jobs at schools just to get their children a place there, unfairly then taking places away from local children.
1431	Neutral		No Response		
1432	Disagree		Disagree		
1433	Agree		Agree		
1434	Disagree		Disagree		School places should go to local children not to children of teachers that do not work at the school. I think if a teacher works at the school for a certain period of time (3 years) than they can get a place for their child but only if they work at the school in question.
1435	Disagree		Neutral		
1436	Agree		Agree		
1437	Disagree		Disagree		All children should have equal opportunity not a 'everyone is equal but some are more equal than others' mentality
1438	Agree		Neutral		
1439	Disagree		Disagree		
1440	Neutral		Neutral		
1441	Disagree		Disagree		
1442	Disagree		Disagree		
1443	Disagree		Disagree		
1444	Agree		Disagree		
1445	Agree		Agree		
1446	Neutral		Disagree		
1447	Disagree		Disagree		
1448	Neutral		Neutral		
1449	Neutral		Neutral		
1450	Neutral		Neutral		
1451	Neutral		Neutral		
1452	Disagree		Disagree		Exactly the same reason as above and additionally, any staff at the Primary or Secondary schools could leave their employment at any point after the child had been admitted to the Primary or Secondary schools, again proving this arrangement proposal to be bias and unfair.
1453	Disagree		Disagree		
1454	Agree		Agree		
1455	Disagree		Disagree		
1456	Agree		Agree		
1457	Neutral		Disagree		Whilst it is fair and reasonable that pupils of staff at each of the schools should be able to attend those schools, the Langley secondaries are separate entities and should be treated as such.
1458	Neutral		Neutral		
1459	Agree		Agree		
1460	Agree		Agree		
1461	Agree		Agree		
1462	Disagree		Disagree		
1463	Disagree		Disagree		
1464	Agree		Agree		
1465	Disagree		Disagree		
1466	Neutral		Neutral		
1467	No Response		No Response		
1468	Agree		Agree		
1469	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair
1470	Disagree		Disagree		I do not think that priority needs to be given to children of staff attending the school over children living in the nearby area - as it can be difficult enough getting your child into the closest school due to very small catchment areas.
1471	Neutral		Neutral		
1472	Neutral		Neutral		

1473	Agree		Agree		
1474	Disagree		Disagree		
1475	Agree		Agree		
1476	Neutral		No Response		
1477	Agree		Agree		We agree as long as the sibling rule applies across boys and girls schools. Otherwise it is unfair.
1478	Agree		Agree		
1479	Disagree		Disagree		The only reason for a children of staff priority would be so that the staff member can deliver their child to school and still attend work on time. That is completely unnecessary for secondary aged children who can get themselves to school independently._x000D_ _x000D_ I would consider it feasible only if primary aged children of staff at LPGS and LPBS were given priority at LPPS.
1480	Disagree		Disagree		
1481	Neutral		Disagree		
1482	Neutral		Neutral		
1483	Neutral		Neutral		
1484	Disagree		Disagree		
1485	Agree		Neutral		Environmental factors and supporting working parents with children
1486	Disagree		Disagree		
1487	Disagree		Disagree		
1488	Disagree		Disagree		
1489	Agree		Disagree		Children who liver nearer to the school should be given priority
1490	Neutral		Neutral		
1491	Neutral		Neutral		
1492	Disagree		Disagree		
1493	Neutral		Neutral		
1494	Agree		Agree		
1495	Neutral		Neutral		
1496	Not Applicable		Agree		
1497	Agree		Agree		
1498	Agree		Agree		
1499	Agree		Agree		
1500	Disagree		Disagree		
1501	Neutral		Neutral		
1502	Neutral		Neutral		
1503	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1504	Neutral		Neutral		
1505	Disagree		Disagree		
1506	Disagree		Disagree		Is this the norm as it now stands or a proposed change? If a change it will affect the parameters of fair access.
1507	Neutral		Neutral		
1508	Agree		Agree		
1509	Disagree		Disagree		
1510	Neutral		Neutral		
1511	Neutral		Neutral		
1512	Agree		Agree		
1513	Neutral		Neutral		Seems reasonable if the child is currently living with the staff member and they have parental responsibility. Less convinced of child lives with the other parent
1514	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1515	Agree		Neutral		
1516	Agree		Agree		
1517	Agree		Agree		
1518	Neutral		Neutral		
1519	Disagree		Disagree		

1520	Disagree		Disagree		They could be employed there but could live outside of the catchment area which will cause a ripple effect of another kid in the area having to move to another school in another area and taking a spot there. Not to mention the personal hassle of school drop off etc if you're not in the catchment
1521	Neutral		Neutral		See above.
1522	Neutral		Neutral		Staff attainment is important, if there is evidence that this will help in the schools then i cant imagine it being a problem.
1523	No Response		No Response		
1524	Neutral		Neutral		
1525	Neutral		Neutral		
1526	Disagree		Disagree		
1527	Neutral		Neutral		
1528	Disagree		Disagree		
1529	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary School children should be able to go make their own way to and from their local school, without the assistance of their parents. It is totally unfair that secondary school children should have any priority to attend a secondary school over a local child just because they have a parent that works at that school.
1530	Disagree		Disagree		There should be no preferential arrangements in connection with employment The number of staff at the school is significant which would drain the number of places available to the wider community. Proximity of home should be the sole criteria
1531	Disagree		Disagree		
1532	Disagree		Disagree		
1533	Agree		Disagree		
1534	Disagree		Disagree		
1535	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1536	Agree		Agree		
1537	Neutral		Neutral		
1538	Neutral		Neutral		
1539	Agree		Agree		Despite the two schools being separate, they do co-habit the same site so it would seem strange to me not to have any privileges applying to both schools as if they were one. I do believe that this would unfairly impact siblings of the opposite sex.
1540	Disagree		Disagree		
1541	Disagree		Disagree		
1542	Disagree		Disagree		
1543	Disagree		No Response		
1544	Neutral		Neutral		
1545	Disagree		Disagree		Same reason as above
1546	Neutral		Neutral		
1547	Agree		Agree		As long as they are teaching in the same school as child then fine
1548	Disagree		Disagree		
1549	Disagree		Disagree		
1550	Neutral		Neutral		
1551	Agree		Agree		
1552	Neutral		Neutral		
1553	Neutral		Neutral		
1554	Disagree		Disagree		
1555	Neutral		Disagree		
1556	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school pupils are of an age where they should be encouraged to make their own way to school, I see no reason why pupils of staff working at the two secondary schools should be given priority over other local pupils who do live in the catchment area.
1557	Disagree		Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff at any of the secondary schools may mean children of staff are not local to the area which creates a level unfairness and inequality to those children who do live in the catchment area. This also goes against the trusts' suggestion that there are educational benefits in the primary schools being feeder schools particularly as some children of staff may currently be at a primary school well away from the primary schools in the trust and also current catchment area.
1558	Disagree		Disagree		
1559	Agree		Agree		This is a sensible proposal given that the schools are single sex and teachers with children of different sex will be required to send them to the two different schools albeit on neighbouring campuses.

1560	Disagree		Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff at any of the secondary schools may mean children of staff are not local to the area which creates a level unfairness and inequality to those children who do live in the catchment area. This also goes against the trusts' suggestion that there are educational benefits in the primary schools being feeder schools particularly as some children of staff may currently be at a primary school well away from the primary schools in the trust and also current catchment area.
1561	Agree		Agree		
1562	Agree		Neutral		
1563	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1564	Agree		Agree		I agree that it doesn't make sense for there to be an exclusion if you are a member of staff at one school and your child is the opposite sex.
1565	Agree		Agree		
1566	Disagree		Disagree		
1567	Disagree		Disagree		
1568	Disagree		Disagree		
1569	Disagree		Disagree		
1570	Disagree		Disagree		
1571	Neutral		Neutral		
1572	Agree		Agree		
1573	Neutral		Neutral		
1574	Disagree		Neutral		For the same reasons as set out above in relation to the primary schools, I take the view that local children should be prioritised over children of staff members especially in the absence of strong empirical evidence that it would secure the recruitment and/or retention of high quality staff: the absence of a criterion prioritising the children of staff does not appear to have caused a difficulty in recruiting high quality staff to date. If, however, there is a move to prioritise children of staff, I agree that that should apply to either secondary school, i.e. a daughter of a member of staff at the boys' school should have the same priority as a daughter of a member of staff at the girls' school (and the same should apply to sons).
1575	Disagree		Disagree		
1576	Neutral		Disagree		I am less opposed to children of secondary school teachers getting preferential access to the other secondary than I am to the children of teachers at the primary schools getting access to secondaries. But given the other pupils of the individual secondary schools don't benefit from a cross gender sibling rule I'm not sure its really that fair to give teachers such a sibling policy in isolation.
1577	Disagree		Disagree		
1578	Neutral		Disagree		
1579	Agree		Agree		
1580	Neutral		Neutral		
1581	Disagree		Disagree		
1582	Agree		Agree		
1583	Disagree		Disagree		Local children should get priority.
1584	Disagree		Disagree		Local children should get priority.
1585	Neutral		Neutral		
1586	Agree		Agree		
1587	Disagree		Disagree		
1588	Disagree		Disagree		
1589	Neutral		Neutral		
1590	Agree		Agree		
1591	Agree		Agree		
1592	Disagree		Disagree		
1593	Neutral		Neutral		
1594	Not Applicable		Disagree		
1595	Neutral		Neutral		
1596	Agree		Agree		
1597	Disagree		Disagree		
1598	Neutral		Neutral		
1599	Not Applicable		Neutral		
1600	Agree		Agree		
1601	Disagree		Disagree		

1602	Disagree		Disagree		
1603	Agree		Agree		
1604	Disagree		Disagree		
1605	Neutral		Neutral		
1606	Agree		Agree		
1607	Agree		Agree		
1608	Disagree		Disagree		
1609	No Response		No Response		
1610	Neutral		Neutral		
1611	Agree		Agree		
1612	Agree		Agree		The current system discriminates by gender so this change is positive.
1613	Disagree		Disagree		
1614	Neutral		Neutral		
1615	Disagree		Disagree		Same as stated above
1616	Neutral		Neutral		
1617	Agree		Agree		
1618	Agree		Agree		
1619	Disagree		No Response		
1620	Neutral		Neutral		
1621	Disagree		Disagree		
1622	Agree		Agree		Same argument as before and it is more equitable if staff have children of both sexes.
1623	Disagree		Disagree		
1624	Disagree		Disagree		as long as they meet the requirements like the other families
1625	Neutral		Neutral		I am neutral on this stance. I agree that it will attract good quality teachers however if a local child is unable to attend the school because the place has been taken from someone out of area they will not benefit from the high quality teachers as they will have to go to another school. Also at 11 children can travel to school independently and do not need to be taken to the same school their parent teaches at.
1626	Agree		Agree		
1627	Neutral		Neutral		
1628	Disagree		Disagree		
1629	Disagree		Disagree		Other children who really need to be there may miss out
1630	Disagree		Disagree		
1631	Neutral		Neutral		
1632	Neutral		Neutral		
1633	Neutral		Neutral		
1634	Disagree		Disagree		
1635	Agree		Agree		
1636	Disagree		Disagree		
1637	Disagree		Disagree		I do not think it is fair that others are given preference and that all admissions should be based on vicinity to the school, unless in the case of siblings or special requirements.
1638	Neutral		Neutral		
1639	Disagree		Disagree		There should be no preference given other than for siblings or special requirements. Children's admissions should be based on their vicinity of the applicant home.
1640	Disagree		Disagree		Why; whose interest is it in "the pupil who get left out"!
1641	Agree		Agree		
1642	Agree		Agree		
1643	Disagree		Disagree		As above - should be one rule for all.
1644	Neutral		Neutral		
1645	Agree		Agree		
1646	Neutral		Neutral		
1647	Agree		Neutral		
1648	Disagree		Disagree		

1649	Disagree		Disagree		
1650	Neutral		Neutral		
1651	Disagree		Disagree		
1652	Neutral		Disagree		Whilst it is fair and reasonable that pupils of staff at each of the schools should be able to attend those schools, the Langley secondaries are separate entities and should be treated as such.
1653	Neutral		Neutral		
1654	Neutral		Neutral		I don't feel strongly either way, there is a practical element to having children travel to school to the same geographical location as parents.
1655	Agree		Neutral		
1656	Disagree		Disagree		
1657	Agree		Agree		
1658	Disagree		Disagree		
1659	Disagree		Disagree		
1660	Neutral		Disagree		
1661	Agree		Disagree		
1662	Neutral		Neutral		
1663	Agree		Agree		
1664	Neutral		Neutral		
1665	Disagree		Disagree		If these staff are travelling in from a far then it is unfair for local children to lose places to them. I appreciate life is hard for teachers with children, bur it hard for all us working parents and we don't get priorities with our jobs. We make it work. I am a local to all these schools and an ex pupil of . I am very proud of my area but these changes could mean my children can not have the oppotunity I was given with the schools in our area. They put a lot of us in a "no mans land" for school zones.
1666	Neutral		Neutral		If the child lives within the catchment area, then yes. If not, then no.
1667	Agree		Agree		
1668	Disagree		No Response		
1669	Disagree		Disagree		
1670	Neutral		Disagree		
1671	Neutral		Neutral		
1672	Agree		Agree		
1673	Neutral		Neutral		
1674	Agree		Agree		
1675	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1676	Disagree		Disagree		
1677	Disagree		Agree		While I disagree with the principle of favouring children of staff members on the basis of fairness, if they do have preferential treatment, then on the same principle it is only fair to allow them to attend either school and not be discriminated against based on the gender of their children.
1678	Agree		Agree		
1679	Disagree		Disagree		As above.
1680	Neutral		Neutral		
1681	Agree		Agree		
1682	Agree		Agree		
1683	Neutral		Disagree		
1684	Neutral		Neutral		
1685	Neutral		Neutral		
1686	Disagree		Disagree		
1687	Disagree		Disagree		see above
1688	Agree		Agree		
1689	Neutral		Neutral		Whilst the 2 secondary schools are separate entities, it would be discriminatory to give priority to one sex or the other in attracting or retaining secondary staff.
1690	Neutral		Disagree		I can see the rationale for priority for staff at that particular school. However, I disagree that you could be employed at the boys and then have a daughter given priority at the girls when you are not including a sibling criteria across the two secondary schools. I feel that you should be consistent with this approach and if the gender of your child is then irrelevant for staff,, this should be the case for parents who have a son and a daughter.
1691	Disagree		Disagree		



1692	Agree		Disagree		If there is no sibling priority for children across the two secondary schools, I do not think it is fair that there is a sibling rule for staff where it doesn't matter what school they teacher at.
1693	Disagree		Disagree		
1694	Neutral		Disagree		
1695	Neutral		Disagree		
1696	Agree		Agree		
1697	Neutral		Neutral		
1698	Agree		Agree		
1699	Neutral		Neutral		
1700	Neutral		Neutral		
1701	Disagree		Disagree		
1702	Neutral		Neutral		
1703	Neutral		Neutral		
1704	Agree		Agree		If priority is given to the children of staff, it makes sense that this priority extends to staff employed at either of the secondary schools.
1705	Disagree		Disagree		The priority should be local schools for local children
1706	Agree		Agree		
1707	Disagree		Disagree		
1708	Agree		Agree		
1709	Agree		Agree		
1710	Neutral		Neutral		
1711	Agree		Disagree		
1712	Agree		Agree		
1713	Disagree		Disagree		
1714	Neutral		Neutral		
1715	Neutral		Disagree		
1716	Disagree		Disagree		
1717	Disagree		Disagree		
1718	Agree		Agree		Fairness, good employment benefit!
1719	Neutral		Neutral		
1720	Agree		Agree		Expected to be a small impact and teachers have a tough enough job
1721	Neutral		Neutral		
1722	Neutral		Neutral		
1723	Disagree		Disagree		I will say that same again, as previous, I don't see any advantage that children of staff that work in schools should attend the same school. It appears to be a conflict of interest and I would suspect causes anxiety to the child and arrested development encouraging this as an admissions policy, I believe it is outdated and should disappear from ALL admissions criteria for schools. At secondary schools the proposal suggesting that staff should be given priority over school admission criteria, ie through this being their workplace. I would raise the question how does this benefit the pupil or member of staff. Should we not be encouraging independence at the age of 11+ and not creating children that have no separation from their parents? I find this proposal outdated and most relevant with schools that are in densely over populated areas. Such as all the LPLT schools.
1724	Neutral		Neutral		
1725	Neutral		Neutral		I understand the thought process behind trying to retain good teachers with children at school age .
1726	Agree		Disagree		
1727	Neutral		Neutral		
1728	Disagree		Disagree		
1729	Agree		Agree		
1730	Disagree		Disagree		Whilst I understand that the Trust wishes to recruit high calibre staff and the offer of a school place to the children of prospective staff might be an attractive offer, this effectively removes places for children who live locally to the school. If prospective teachers live close to the school then their child may be able to obtain a place the usual way.
1731	Disagree		Disagree		
1732	Disagree		Disagree		

1733	No Response		Agree		
1734	Neutral		Neutral		
1735	Disagree		Disagree		
1736	Disagree		Disagree		Children benefit from attending a school that is local to where they live and where their friends live. Therefore a child who's only real connection to the school is the parent as a teacher I think is unhealthy and detrimental to their education. _x000D_ A family or child and their carer's needs (convenience in getting a child or siblings to school on time and them getting to work as well a providing a healthy start to the day) far out-way the convenience given to a teacher in arriving to work. I disagree that this should be an employee 'benefit' and that it helps in retaining staff. _x000D_ The retention of staff is based on the management of the school, their job satisfaction, progression and salary - not benefits.
1737	Agree		Agree		
1738	Neutral		Disagree		
1739	Disagree		Disagree		
1740	Agree		Neutral		
1741	Agree		Agree		
1742	Agree		Agree		
1743	Agree		Disagree		
1744	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1745	Neutral		Not Applicable		
1746	Disagree		Disagree		
1747	Neutral		No Response		
1748	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1749	Neutral		Neutral		
1750	Neutral		Agree		
1751	Agree		Agree		
1752	Neutral		Neutral		
1753	Agree		Agree		
1754	Disagree		Disagree		
1755	Agree		Agree		
1756	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair to local children
1757	Disagree		Disagree		Why should they get priority at the expense of local children!
1758	Disagree		Disagree		
1759	Agree		Agree		
1760	Agree		Agree		
1761	Neutral		Neutral		
1762	Agree		Neutral		
1763	Disagree		Disagree		Of course children of staff employed at one of the two secondary schools should have priority to that school only.
1764	Neutral		Neutral		
1765	Neutral		Disagree		
1766	Agree		Agree		It seems reasonable to avoid an arbitrary outcome based on gender.
1767	Disagree		Disagree		
1768	Disagree		Disagree		
1769	Disagree		Agree		
1770	Not Applicable		No Response		
1771	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1772	Agree		Agree		The two schools effectively share a campus. It avoids gender based discrimination.
1773	Neutral		Neutral		
1774	Neutral		Neutral		
1775	Neutral		Neutral		
1776	Neutral		Neutral		
1777	Disagree		Disagree		

1778	Disagree		Disagree		
1779	Disagree		Disagree		
1780	Neutral		Neutral		Given the proximity of the two schools, this appears to be a reasonable proposal which could support the attraction and retention of staff. However, an indication of likely numbers involved would have been helpful to include in the consultation notice in order to make a more informed response.
1781	Agree		Agree		
1782	Neutral		Neutral		
1783	Agree		Agree		
1784	Disagree		Disagree		
1785	Disagree		Disagree		
1786	Agree		Agree		
1787	No Response		Agree		
1788	No Response		No Response		
1789	Agree		Agree		
1790	Agree		Neutral		
1791	Neutral		Neutral		
1792	Neutral		Agree		
1793	Neutral		Neutral		
1794	Neutral		Neutral		
1795	Neutral		Neutral		
1796	Agree		Agree		
1797	Agree		Agree		
1798	Agree		Agree		
1799	Agree		Agree		
1800	Neutral		Disagree		
1801	Neutral		Disagree		
1802	Disagree		Agree		
1803	Disagree		Disagree		
1804	Agree		Agree		
1805	Agree		Agree		
1806	Disagree		Disagree		As above, this would be very difficult to administer and manage. Please read response above to primary school teachers. Also, at senior school age, children generally are independent enough to travel to and from school themselves. The requirement of wrap around care for primary school pupils is greater than senior school pupils and therefore there is no need to give priority in the senior schools' admission arrangements.
1807	Disagree		Disagree		This considerably shrinks the catchment area_x000D_ By this age children should be able to get themselves to school_x000D_ Which means, as I believe local schools should be for local children, there is no unfair advantage
1808	Disagree		Disagree		
1809	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1810	No Response		Agree		it makes sense for teachers in the secondary school to be able to send their children to the school where they are teaching as it is more convenient and because the school is a same sex school, they should have the choice to send their children to the relevant school.
1811	Neutral		Neutral		
1812	Disagree		Disagree		
1813	Neutral		Neutral		I have no real objection to the children of staff at the Langley secondary schools being given priority so long as the numbers are small and have no real impact on catchment areas or selection. Assuming numbers are relatively small, it would make life far easier for parents working at Langley secondary schools.
1814	Disagree		Disagree		
1815	Agree		Agree		
1816	Disagree		Disagree		This discriminates against pupils who do not qualify without a reasonable explanation
1817	Agree		Agree		
1818	Neutral		Neutral		
1819	Agree		Agree		
1820	Agree		Agree		

1821	Disagree		Disagree		
1822	Neutral		Neutral		
1823	Disagree		Disagree		
1824	Agree		Neutral		
1825	Neutral		Neutral		
1826	Disagree		Disagree		
1827	Neutral		Neutral		
1828	Disagree		Disagree		
1829	Neutral		Neutral		
1830	Agree		Disagree		
1831	Agree		Agree		This is a common policy as long as it is restricted to the employed school i.e. it would be unfair to allow automatic access to a daughter to Langley Girls who has a parent working at Langley Boys since they are separate schools
1832	Agree		Agree		
1833	Agree		Disagree		I understand priority given to a staff members child at their school as they can travel together and it encourages staff to work at schools they would want to send their children to. Disagree with priority for their child to attend another school just because it's in the trust
1834	Disagree		Disagree		
1835	Agree		Agree		
1836	Agree		Agree		
1837	Neutral		Disagree		
1838	Agree		Agree		As above I believe this should be only in certain circumstances, please suggestions above.
1839	Agree		Disagree		Staff should have priority access for their child at the specific school they are working at and no more then this
1840	Neutral		Neutral		
1841	Agree		Agree		
1842	Disagree		Disagree		
1843	Neutral		Neutral		
1844	Disagree		Disagree		
1845	Agree		Agree		
1846	Agree		Agree		
1847	Agree		Disagree		
1848	Disagree		Disagree		
1849	Agree		Agree		
1850	Agree		Agree		
1851	Neutral		Neutral		
1852	Agree		Agree		Agree. The policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school at which the parent teaches does not seem unfair.
1853	Neutral		Disagree		
1854	Agree		Agree		
1855	Neutral		Neutral		
1856	Neutral		Neutral		
1857	Agree		Agree		As above, I support the proposed changes, giving priority to children of staff, providing that staff members are permanent employees and serve a minimum term of employment and suggest two years prior to application. This would stop staff members working at the schools for temporary period, securing a place for their child and then resigning. It seems fair for this to be across the two secondaries, regardless of the child's sex.
1858	Agree		Agree		
1859	Disagree		Agree		
1860	Disagree		Disagree		
1861	Agree		Agree		
1862	Agree		Agree		Both the secondary schools are at the same location, so the proposal to not discriminate against children of the opposite gender to the school at which the parent teaches seems fair.
1863	Agree		Agree		No comment.

1864	Agree		Agree		
1865	Disagree		Disagree		
1866	Neutral		Neutral		
1867	Agree		Agree		No comment.
1868	Neutral		Neutral		
1869	Agree		Disagree		
1870	Neutral		Neutral		
1871	Neutral		Neutral		
1872	Neutral		Neutral		
1873	Neutral		Neutral		
1874	Disagree		Disagree		You have not provided enough information in your consultation document to enable people to assess the impact this would have on admissions - for example, how many staff and their children might qualify.
1875	Neutral		Neutral		
1876	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
1877	Neutral		No Response		
1878	Disagree		Disagree		Again this automatically influences the availability of spaces.
1879	Neutral		Disagree		Again this will limit the admission and also not make it a fair system.
1880	Agree		Agree		
1881	Agree		Disagree		
1882	Disagree		Disagree		
1883	Disagree		Disagree		
1884	Disagree		Disagree		
1885	Agree		Agree		
1886	Agree		Agree		As above, I consider it would be fair to give staff of teaching and managerial staff priority but not other staff like admin, kitchen, cleaning. My reason for this is people could seek advantage by getting an easy to come by job to get children into school and then leave.
1887	Disagree		Disagree		
1888	Disagree		Disagree		
1889	Agree		Agree		
1890	Neutral		Disagree		
1891	Disagree		Disagree		This proposal has simialr disadvantages to the first - again the impact is not quantified, and the effect would certainly be to dilute the local nature of the schools in order to advance the attractiveness of the schools to existing & potential staff. It is putting the Trust's interests above the interests of the existing catchment area parents. _x000D_ But if this bad change were to be introduced, I see no reason why the LPSSs should not be considered a single 'campus' for admissions purposes.
1892	Disagree		Disagree		
1893	Disagree		Disagree		
1894	Neutral		Neutral		
1895	Neutral		Agree		It seems discriminatory to only allow children of one gender entry.
1896	Disagree		Disagree		Once again, these are schools that serve the local community, and this applies to teachers as it does to everyone else.
1897	Neutral		Neutral		
1898	Neutral		Disagree		
1899	Neutral		Neutral		
1900	Agree		Neutral		
1901	Agree		Agree		
1902	Neutral		Neutral		
1903	Agree		Disagree		
1904	Disagree		Disagree		It is the schools responsibility to organise and employ high quality staff and retain these staff, the teachers will be aware of any family constraints they have when applying for the post already.
1905	Agree		Disagree		
1906	Agree		Agree		
1907	Agree		Agree		I think it's fair enough if a teacher is actually working at the secondary school their children should be prioritised.
1908	Neutral		Neutral		

1909	Agree		Neutral		
1910	Neutral		Neutral		
1911	Neutral		Neutral		
1912	Agree		Agree		
1913	Agree		Agree		
1914	Neutral		Neutral		
1915	Agree		Agree		This is fair, but only if the policy is used to recruit the best possible teachers.
1916	Disagree		Disagree		
1917	Agree		Agree		This is an acceptable and fair proposal. Other schools also include children of staff working there in their admission policy (both Pickhurst schools) and it seems fair to not discriminate on the grounds of the sex of the child as outlined in your proposal.
1918	Agree		Agree		
1919	Agree		Agree		seems fair.
1920	Agree		Agree		
1921	No Response		Neutral		
1922	Agree		Agree		
1923	Neutral		Neutral		
1924	Disagree		Disagree		
1925	Neutral		Neutral		
1926	Neutral		Neutral		
1927	Disagree		Disagree		Not necessary as children of secondary school age can make their own way to school
1928	Disagree		Disagree		
1929	Agree		Agree		
1930	Agree		Disagree		
1931	Neutral		Neutral		
1932	Agree		Agree		
1933	Neutral		Disagree		
1934	Agree		Disagree		The policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school at_x000D_ which the parent teaches does not seem unfair.
1935	Neutral		Neutral		
1936	Neutral		Neutral		
1937	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary age children are able to make their own way to the school nearest to where they live..
1938	Agree		Agree		
1939	Agree		Agree		
1940	Disagree		Disagree		Only acceptable if staff live in the catchment area of the secondary schools
1941	Neutral		Neutral		
1942	Neutral		Neutral		
1943	Agree		Agree		
1944	Disagree		Disagree		
1945	Disagree		Disagree		
1946	Neutral		Neutral		
1947	Neutral		Neutral		
1948	Neutral		Neutral		I understand the need to recruit and retain good teachers.
1949	Agree		Agree		
1950	Disagree		Not Applicable		Same reasons given as above.
1951	Disagree		Disagree		Your consultation notice states: The Board of Trustees believe that this is necessary to avoid an unfair situation where a staff member's child does not receive priority because they are the wrong sex, for example, where they work at LPSG but their child is a boy, or where they work at LPSB and have a son who will have priority, and a daughter who will not._x000D_ _x000D_ However, with no intention of allowing the sibling rule to work over the both schools this is also unfair. If I had two boys my second son would receive a place on a sibling rule but if I had a boy and a girl my daughter would not receive priority. Surely this is also unfair situation.

1952	Disagree		Disagree		
1953	Agree		Agree		
1954	Neutral		Neutral		
1955	Agree		Agree		
1956	Agree		Agree		
1957	Agree		Agree		
1958	Agree		Agree		I think these are sensible amendments to the admissions arrangements.
1959	Neutral		Disagree		
1960	Agree		Agree		
1961	Disagree		Disagree		
1962	Agree		Neutral		
1963	Agree		Agree		
1964	Neutral		Neutral		
1965	Neutral		Neutral		
1966	Neutral		Neutral		
1967	Agree		Agree		
1968	Disagree		Disagree		
1969	Disagree		Neutral		
1970	Disagree		Disagree		
1971	Neutral		Neutral		
1972	Disagree		Disagree		
1973	Agree		Agree		
1974	Disagree		Disagree		Most secondary aged students make their own way to and from school, so not sure why teachers would need to have priority as they don't have to deliver or collect their children from school. All working parents have the same responsibilities
1975	Disagree		Disagree		
1976	Agree		Neutral		
1977	Agree		Disagree		
1978	Disagree		No Response		
1979	Disagree		Disagree		
1980	Agree		Neutral		
1981	Agree		Agree		
1982	Neutral		Neutral		I am neutral with children of secondary school teachers being able to apply over both secondary schools. I do not think that they should get priority into the Primary schools as this is a step too far. Although, it must be added that the theory of retention of teachers is rather thin. They may work there up until the point their child is admitted, then leave and seek pastures new.  Also, I wish to add that the majority of the working population do not get the option of their child being at school where they work or near where they work - however I do understand that this seems to be the norm for secondary school teachers and on that basis am neutral
1983	Disagree		Disagree		As stated, children of staff should not be given preferential treatment, it should be based on the applicable catchment area
1984	Neutral		Disagree		I think the fairest option is to just keep the admissions policy as it is across the board.
1985	Disagree		Disagree		
1986	Neutral		Neutral		
1987	Disagree		Disagree		As above, they are not the only public servants in the area. Such a bias would be unfair to others serving the state.
1988	Agree		No Response		
1989	Disagree		Disagree		Local schools are already hugely over subscribed. Local children have a right to take precedence over children who are not otherwise in the school catchment area.
1990	Neutral		Neutral		
1991	Disagree		Disagree		Again will be taking places away from local children
1992	Neutral		Neutral		
1993	Agree		Disagree		
1994	Agree		Agree		

1995	Neutral		Disagree		
1996	Disagree		Disagree		
1997	Disagree		Disagree		
1998	Neutral		Neutral		
1999	Agree		Agree		
2000	Neutral		Disagree		
2001	Neutral		Neutral		
2002	Neutral		Neutral		
2003	Disagree		Disagree		
2004	Disagree		Disagree		
2005	Disagree		Disagree		
2006	Disagree		Disagree		
2007	Disagree		Disagree		
2008	Agree		Agree		
2009	Disagree		Disagree		
2010	Agree		Agree		
2011	Neutral		Neutral		
2012	No Response		No Response		
2013	Disagree		Disagree		
2014	Disagree		Disagree		
2015	Disagree		Disagree		
2016	No Response		No Response		
2017	Disagree		Disagree		
2018	Agree		Agree		
2019	Neutral		Neutral		
2020	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2021	Neutral		Neutral		
2022	Neutral		Neutral		
2023	Neutral		Neutral		
2024	Agree		Agree		Teachers at either secondary school within a trust that includes single sex schools, should be allowed to send their children of the opposite sex to the corresponding school.
2025	Agree		Neutral		This proposal seems fair if siblings are also given priority over both schools.
2026	Disagree		Neutral		
2027	Disagree		Disagree		
2028	Disagree		Disagree		
2029	Disagree		Disagree		I can't agree within the context of the proposed changes. The temptation to obtain short term employment to occupy a place in school and afterwards leave the school or move away from the community creates an unfair admission situation from infant to senior school for the initial child and all siblings.
2030	Neutral		Neutral		
2031	Agree		Agree		
2032	Neutral		Neutral		
2033	Agree		Agree		
2034	Agree		Disagree		
2035	Agree		Agree		
2036	Agree		Disagree		
2037	Agree		Agree		
2038	Neutral		Neutral		
2039	Disagree		Disagree		
2040	Disagree		Disagree		
2041	Agree		Agree		
2042	Neutral		Neutral		
2043	Agree		Agree		



2044	Agree		Agree		
2045	Neutral		Neutral		
2046	Disagree		Disagree		
2047	Disagree		Disagree		
2048	Disagree		Disagree		
2049	Neutral		Neutral		
2050	Disagree		Disagree		
2051	Agree		Agree		
2052	Neutral		Neutral		
2053	Neutral		Neutral		
2054	Agree		Agree		
2055	Agree		Disagree		
2056	Disagree		Disagree		
2057	No Response		No Response		
2058	Agree		Agree		
2059	Disagree		Disagree		
2060	Neutral		Neutral		
2061	Neutral		Neutral		
2062	Neutral		Neutral		
2063	Agree		Agree		This seems fair and in line with other school admission policies
2064	Agree		Disagree		
2065	Neutral		Neutral		
2066	Agree		Disagree		
2067	Agree		Agree		I recognise that there are significant benefits giving priority spaces to children of staff at either of the secondary schools (being so closely located) , and it seems fair that this priority does not discriminate on the basis of gender.
2068	Neutral		Neutral		
2069	Disagree		Disagree		
2070	Neutral		Neutral		I understand the need to retain good staff.
2071	Neutral		Neutral		
2072	Neutral		Neutral		
2073	Neutral		Neutral		
2074	Neutral		Neutral		
2075	Disagree		Disagree		
2076	Agree		Agree		
2077	Neutral		Neutral		
2078	Agree		Agree		
2079	Disagree		Disagree		This will result in more places being taken by teacher's children than at present thus reducing the number of places available to the rest of the community.
2080	Agree		Agree		
2081	Neutral		Disagree		
2082	Neutral		Neutral		
2083	Agree		Agree		
2084	Neutral		Neutral		I understand that this is potentially a reasonable aid to staff retention to allow this priority and that other schools do offer this, so I am neutral on this proposal.
2085	Disagree		Disagree		
2086	Disagree		Neutral		I disagree that children of staff should get priority over local children. However if it is going to be for children of staff at 1 school I think it should be for children of staff at either.
2087	Neutral		Neutral		
2088	Disagree		Disagree		Should not have priority as many staff live outside current admissions area and would be unfair to those children of non staff who do live in the admissions area.
2089	Disagree		Disagree		
2090	Neutral		Neutral		
2091	Disagree		Disagree		This will result in more places being taken by teacher's children than at present thus reducing the number of places available to the rest of the community.

2092	Agree		Agree		
2093	Disagree		Disagree		
2094	Neutral		Neutral		
2095	Neutral		Neutral		
2096	Neutral		Disagree		I understand it has been a 'perk' for some time children of staff at secondary schools to attend the school if the parents request this. However, as having a brother at LPBS meets the sibling rule for a brother, it has never applied to a sister meeting the criteria to attend LPGS so it would be unfair to introduce this as additional spaces will be taken up.
2097	Agree		Agree		
2098	Neutral		Neutral		
2099	Agree		Agree		I think that it is an important and effective way of recruiting good teachers who will stay with the school long term
2100	Neutral		Neutral		
2101	Disagree		Not Applicable		
2102	Disagree		Disagree		
2103	Neutral		Neutral		
2104	Disagree		Disagree		It would seem more appropriate that children of secondary school age should walk to their local schools. There seems no real reason for them to go to their parents school.
2105	Neutral		Neutral		
2106	Agree		Agree		
2107	Agree		Agree		
2108	Disagree		Disagree		
2109	Disagree		Disagree		
2110	Agree		Agree		
2111	No Response		No Response		
2112	Disagree		Disagree		
2113	Disagree		Disagree		
2114	Agree		Agree		I see no reason why the teaching staff's children shouldn't be given a place at either school
2115	Disagree		Disagree		As above
2116	Disagree		Disagree		
2117	Disagree		Disagree		
2118	Disagree		No Response		As a working (not at a school) parent myself, I do not expect my children to be given priority to any school near my place of work. The same should apply to the children of teachers in a school. Admission criteria in a state school should be fair and equal for everybody, regardless of where their parents work.
2119	Disagree		Disagree		A secondary school aged child does not need to go to school with or next door to where their parent teaches. They should go to their local secondary schools as all children should.
2120	Agree		Neutral		This seems common practice across other schools in the borough.
2121	Neutral		Neutral		
2122	Neutral		Disagree		
2123	Disagree		Disagree		
2124	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2125	Disagree		Disagree		I feel children at Secondary School level are less dependent on their parents and therefore shouldn't be required to attend the same school.
2126	Agree		Agree		The policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school at which the parent teaches does not seem unfair
2127	Disagree		Disagree		Same as reasons stated above, but I strongly disagree that teachers should be given priority for their children at a school they do not even work out and are not directly contributing to. I disagree that this will help with recruiting the best teachers, as teachers will be even more likely to want a job for the wrong reasons.
2128	Agree		Neutral		
2129	Agree		Agree		
2130	Disagree		Disagree		
2131	Neutral		Neutral		
2132	Agree		Agree		
2133	Disagree		Disagree		
2134	Disagree		Disagree		

2135	Neutral		Disagree		With children of teachers from 5 schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community. Therefore I don't feel anyone should be given priority and should simply be based on distance, local schools for local kids regardless of whether their parents work at the school.
2136	Neutral		Neutral		
2137	Agree		Agree		
2138	Agree		Neutral		
2139	Disagree		Disagree		The fact that a member of staff works in one of the secondary schools should not give their child an automatic place at that same school let alone an entirely separate school they are not in any way contributing to. I disagree that this proposal will help recruit and retain quality staff. Whilst in some cases, this may happen in many other cases it will encourage staff to work at the school for the wrong reasons, and will actually mean that poorer or substandard teachers are encouraged to stay within the school simply to ensure their child gains a place. If the schools are performing well, and present themselves as an attractive place to work, they will attract the best teachers. They should not have to add an incentive such as this. By secondary school age, children can travel to school on their own, therefore the practical aspect of parent and child travelling together that might apply at primary school level does not fit here.
2140	Disagree		Not Applicable		I can see no reason why staff should be prioritised, school places should be based on catchment, i.e. living in proximity of school._x000D_ If the 'staff' live within the catchment area then there should be the opportunity for children of staff to attend._x000D_ With regard to the Trust's commentary regarding staff recruitment and retention, I fail to see a correlation to retention of staff and children attending the same school, conversely I would suggest children of staff should not attend the school their parents teach as there is the potential to disadvantage such pupils._x000D_ _x000D_ I would further also query what the definition of 'staff' is, teachers, support staff, dinner ladies, cleaners etc. This should have been made abundantly clear in the question, the deliberate ambiguity could have a dramatic effect on what such a proposal could mean and impact on other children attending the school._x000D_ _x000D_ To have a teacher at the boys school, give priority for a daughter to attend the girls school regardless of geographical catchments again is entirely unreasonable and has the potential to skew the catchment further.
2141	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school admissions should be based on locality.
2142	Disagree		Disagree		
2143	Disagree		Disagree		
2144	Agree		Agree		
2145	Neutral		Neutral		
2146	Disagree		Disagree		As my above comment re primary school same applies. _x000D_ What level of staff is this referring too? Teachers and senior leadership or Ta&rsquo;s technicians caretakers?? This is not clear at all and requires further clarification.
2147	Agree		Disagree		
2148	Agree		Agree		
2149	Neutral		Agree		
2150	Disagree		Disagree		
2151	Disagree		Disagree		
2152	Agree		Agree		
2153	Neutral		Neutral		
2154	Agree		Agree		
2155	Agree		Agree		I have used the priority given to staff children and feel it has several benefits. . As I have got to know other parents this has also given me a further perspective, all of which has enhanced my teaching. I also think having children at the school where you work means you have that extra level of commitment and investment into the school and are likely to stay longer at the school meaning more stability for the school.  I would strongly support extending this to staff from either school. This would be hugely beneficial for families with siblings of both genders meaning that all children could be educated on the same site at schools with a shared ethos. As this is currently not the case whilst . It would also bring the two schools in closer contact as links can be established through teachers children attending the other school encouraging further collaboration and benefiting both schools. As this would only affect a small number of staff it would not have any meaningful impact on catchment area and so can be done without causing a negative impact on others and yet bring lots of positives for both secondary schools.
2156	Neutral		Agree		
2157	Neutral		Neutral		
2158	Disagree		Disagree		

2159	Disagree		Agree		
2160	Neutral		Neutral		
2161	Disagree		Disagree		
2162	Disagree		Disagree		With children of teachers across 5 schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and will shrink the catchment areas, with significant negative effects on the community. This will have a knock on effect on my daughter who currently attends Oak Lodge Primary School and will absolutely effect her chances of securing a place at Langley Girls Secondary School.
2163	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are old enough to make their own way to and from school. So there is even less reason to prioritise staff children for secondary schools as there is for primary ones (which I already disagreed with). _x000D_ Furthermore, there is a provision to prioritise staff children in the current admission criteria which I consider sufficient.
2164	Neutral		Neutral		
2165	Agree		Agree		
2166	Agree		Agree		
2167	Disagree		Disagree		Why shouldn't their children go to their local secondary schools like with every other employment situation. Just because I work for a University does not mean that my child should take preference over another and call it a job perk.
2168	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2169	Neutral		Neutral		
2170	Disagree		Disagree		
2171	Neutral		Neutral		
2172	Disagree		Disagree		
2173	Agree		Agree		I would love to see teachers compensation package improve, until that happens I believe allowing school admission to their kids girls or boys is a well earned incentive
2174	Neutral		Neutral		
2175	Agree		Disagree		
2176	Agree		Neutral		
2177	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children should be able to go to their nearest school, they shouldn't be travelling to a school outside of a reasonable distance from their home and on that basis they should be able to travel independently thus not needing to attend a school their parents work at unless they already live close to it.
2178	Neutral		Neutral		
2179	Agree		No Response		
2180	Agree		Agree		
2181	Neutral		Neutral		
2182	Neutral		Neutral		
2183	Agree		Agree		
2184	Neutral		Neutral		
2185	Disagree		Disagree		
2186	Disagree		Disagree		
2187	Disagree		Agree		
2188	Disagree		Neutral		
2189	Neutral		Neutral		
2190	Disagree		Disagree		
2191	Disagree		Disagree		
2192	No Response		No Response		
2193	Neutral		Disagree		
2194	Agree		Agree		
2195	Neutral		Neutral		
2196	Disagree		Disagree		

2197	Disagree		Agree		I disagree with children of staff employed at the secondary schools being given priority because: _x000D_ &bull; Children of secondary school age are usually given the freedom to transport themselves to school, particularly around a highly populated area such as that near the LP secondary schools and so they should be seeking education at a school they are local to, which will also mean that their friends from school would also be close to where there live. _x000D_ &bull; The consultation itself does not define &lsquo;staff&rsquo; and so this could be anyone in any capacity employed by the school, there is no indication as to how many places these children could take. Even though the school&rsquo;s themselves go into a little more detail, this is still too ambiguous. _x000D_ &bull; The consultation mentions that the child does not need to live with the staff member, so any transportation benefit of travelling with their parent is not achieved. _x000D_ _x000D_ If the proposal does go ahead then I see that as the secondary schools are on the same campus then the gender of the child should not be discriminated against.
2198	Neutral		Neutral		
2199	Agree		Agree		
2200	Agree		Agree		
2201	Disagree		Disagree		This criteria is unfair and does not fully clarify if there is a qualifying criteria (I.e. if teacher leaves the school after a term, does the child stay on and will siblings be given preference?) _x000D_ This criteria also negatively impacts able, local children who would otherwise have gained a place at Langley Park, who&rsquo;s parents are not teachers at the school, resulting in them losing out and having to travel further to access a good school.
2202	Agree		Agree		
2203	Neutral		Neutral		
2204	Disagree		Disagree		
2205	Agree		Agree		
2206	Neutral		Neutral		
2207	Neutral		Neutral		
2208	Disagree		Disagree		
2209	Agree		Agree		
2210	Disagree		Disagree		
2211	Agree		Agree		Again, this seems sensible and reasonable to attract good staff with children, regardless of whether they have boys or girls.
2212	Agree		Disagree		
2213	Neutral		Neutral		
2214	Neutral		Neutral		Please see above.
2215	Disagree		Disagree		It should be a fair admission for all children otherwise children who live within proximity will be of disadvantage. It looks like the school will be made for those within feeder school and children of staff employed by the school and I don't think it's fair. This will have a major impact on community and environment (air pollution).
2216	Disagree		Disagree		If more schools join the trust in the future it will have set the rule and precedent that children of staff can attend any secondary school in the trust, which could end up with over subscriptions for certain schools.
2217	Disagree		Disagree		
2218	Disagree		Disagree		
2219	Neutral		Neutral		
2220	Neutral		Neutral		
2221	Agree		Agree		
2222	Disagree		Disagree		I enrolled my daughter in with the knowledge that she would be able to go to Langley. It is not fait that this can now be changed.
2223	Disagree		Disagree		
2224	Neutral		Neutral		
2225	Neutral		Neutral		
2226	Neutral		Neutral		
2227	Disagree		Disagree		
2228	Disagree		Disagree		
2229	Disagree		Disagree		
2230	Agree		Agree		I am not a teacher but if I worked in a school, I would like it if my kids could school there because it makes life a lot easier but for me as a parent of a child that is in that school, it will reduce staff turnover. More stability for my child. _x000D_ Also, for the teachers they don't get penalised for having the 'wrong' sex child.
2231	Agree		Disagree		

2232	Neutral		Neutral		
2233	Neutral		Disagree		
2234	Disagree		Disagree		Same catchment rules should apply to all children
2235	Neutral		Neutral		Whilst this proposal has an aim of recruiting and retaining quality staff at the secondary schools, no evidence is provided of any significant difficulty with current recruitment/retention that requires this aim. If no particular need is clear then to introduce criterion could be to the detriment of other children on the basis of proximity. Due to the reasoning being unclear but impact hopefully small, I can only provide a neutral response.
2236	Agree		Agree		
2237	Agree		Agree		It seems fair not to discriminate where a member of staff may have a daughter though they work within the boys school
2238	Disagree		Disagree		Me
2239	Disagree		Disagree		
2240	Neutral		Neutral		
2241	Disagree		Disagree		
2242	Disagree		Disagree		
2243	Disagree		Disagree		
2244	Agree		Agree		
2245	Neutral		Neutral		
2246	Disagree		Disagree		
2247	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2248	Disagree		Disagree		Unfair and arbitrary. Why should a teacher in the boys school be able to take a place from a local girl because they happen to have a daughter and so can fast track them into the girls school? If this staff member lives locally they should be subject to the same post code distance rules as all other locals. If they commute from far away then they should send their child to their own local school!
2249	Neutral		Neutral		
2250	Disagree		Disagree		
2251	Neutral		Disagree		Children of staff should only be allowed to go to the secondary school where the parent teaches. Must also be compliant with 1.39 of the School Admissions Code.
2252	Disagree		Disagree		
2253	Agree		Disagree		
2254	Disagree		Disagree		
2255	Not Applicable		Agree		
2256	Disagree		Disagree		
2257	Neutral		Neutral		I think it can be good for children of staff to be at the school their parents teach at and this can be good for retention but I feel that this unofficially applies already as I know a number of staff do have their children at the school. I don't think that this change needs to be wrapped in with the feeder school changes which i emphatically don't agree with.
2258	Agree		Agree		do not agree for access to any school in the Trus, t, but I do agree for the Secondary School at which the parent is employed or if they have a child of the opposite sex for the other Secondary School; due to the fact that they are single sex secondary schools, in the same location and to avoid discrimination due to sex.
2259	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2260	Neutral		Neutral		
2261	Disagree		Disagree		
2262	Disagree		Disagree		
2263	Agree		Agree		It makes sense.
2264	Agree		Disagree		
2265	Disagree		Disagree		
2266	Disagree		Disagree		By secondary school age, children usually make their own way to school, so the question of transport logistics no longer applies for daily transport to school. For transport home from after school activities I don't see that there is any difference between children with parents working at the school or not.
2267	Disagree		Disagree		
2268	Agree		Disagree		Staff priority should only be applicable for the school staff is part of.
2269	Disagree		Disagree		
2270	Disagree		Disagree		
2271	Disagree		Disagree		
2272	Agree		Agree		
2273	Neutral		Neutral		

2274	Disagree		Disagree	There should be no discrimination
2275	Neutral		Neutral	
2276	Neutral		No Response	
2277	Disagree		Disagree	One of the reasons outlined for this is to get better quality teaching staff. Is this really the best way to get better staff onboard? Surely a good working environment, a school that encourages personal development, a management team that promotes flexible working and job satisfaction should be the absolute base level for recruiting and retaining good quality staff. Surely the admissions criteria as a selling point should be a last resort and not the main selling point. Developing, entrusting, empowering and paying your staff fairly is where management should be focussing on. Not plastering over the cracks at the expense of local children who should have every right to attend a school in their local area. My three children are and will be attending
2278	Disagree		Disagree	
2279	Disagree		Disagree	
2280	Agree		Neutral	
2281	Disagree		Disagree	No details have been provided on length of duty or type of contract before being able to secure a pupil allocation._x000D_ No details have been provided on what happens if the staff member leaves their employment._x000D_ No limit has been placed on the number of pupils that can be allocated._x000D_ No definition has been provided on staff members eg is this for Teachers, Admin, Cleaners or Canteen ladies that are included within this._x000D_ Horrible wording used and therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2282	Disagree		Disagree	
2283	Disagree		Disagree	Schools should be for local children. Fine if the teacher's children live locally!
2284	Neutral		Neutral	
2285	Disagree		Neutral	
2286	Neutral		Neutral	
2287	Disagree		Disagree	Horrible and incorrect wording has been used and is not correct. Therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2288	Agree		Agree	
2289	Agree		Agree	
2290	Disagree		Disagree	
2291	Disagree		Disagree	
2292	Disagree		Disagree	
2293	Disagree		Disagree	
2294	Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
2295	Disagree		Disagree	
2296	Neutral		Disagree	
2297	Neutral		Neutral	
2298	Disagree		Disagree	
2299	Agree		Agree	
2300	Agree		Agree	
2301	Neutral		Neutral	
2302	Agree		Agree	If a parent is teaching at either school it seems fair for their child to attend the school. This will help with their childcare as their holidays will align. Also, if they travel by car to school then at least it is a shared journey by parent and child(ren). The policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school at which the parent teaches does not seem unfair.
2303	Disagree		Disagree	I don't think my argument above (re primary schools) stands at secondary school age.
2304	Neutral		Neutral	
2305	Agree		Agree	
2306	Disagree		Disagree	No, I don't think children of staff should be given priority, as it takes away from children that live in the catchment area.
2307	Agree		Agree	
2308	Agree		Agree	
2309	Agree		Agree	
2310	Neutral		Neutral	
2311	Agree		Agree	
2312	Neutral		Neutral	
2313	Agree		Agree	

2314	Agree		Agree		
2315	Neutral		Neutral		
2316	Disagree		Disagree		
2317	Neutral		Neutral		
2318	Neutral		Neutral		
2319	Disagree		Disagree		
2320	Neutral		Neutral		
2321	Agree		Agree		As above.
2322	Agree		Agree		This could be helpful in recruitment and retention of staff.
2323	Neutral		Disagree		
2324	Neutral		Neutral		
2325	Disagree		Disagree		
2326	Agree		Agree		
2327	Agree		Agree		This makes absolute sense. It could be a factor in attracting and retaining staff and the amount of children that would be given preference as a result should not have a significant detrimental impact on places available to children living locally.
2328	Disagree		Disagree		Teacher might not live in local area, so unfair on people who do and also what happens if the teacher leaves? Also, the child could be far away from the friends they had in their previous school. And teachers also have different work time to the pupils school hours
2329	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2330	Neutral		Neutral		
2331	Disagree		Disagree		
2332	Agree		Agree		
2333	Neutral		Neutral		
2334	Agree		Agree		
2335	Disagree		Disagree		By secondary school age children will be more independent and the focus should be on allowing children to access their nearest schools, allowing children of staff priority only seems justifiable as a "perk" to staff and this should not be to the detriment of other local children.
2336	Neutral		Neutral		
2337	Disagree		No Response		Please see above for the relevant answer
2338	Neutral		Neutral		
2339	Agree		Agree		
2340	Neutral		Neutral		
2341	Neutral		Neutral		
2342	Neutral		Neutral		
2343	Neutral		Neutral		
2344	Neutral		Neutral		
2345	Neutral		Neutral		
2346	Disagree		Disagree		
2347	Disagree		Disagree		
2348	Disagree		Disagree		The children of staff should attend their own local schools, not commute to Langley senior school with parents. Children should benefit from education with their local peers
2349	Agree		Agree		It seems sensible for teachers to be given priority for their children in the school that they work in as it will help retain staff.
2350	Agree		Agree		
2351	Agree		Agree		
2352	Agree		Agree		
2353	Agree		Disagree		The policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school at _x000D_ which the parent teaches does not seem unfair
2354	Neutral		Neutral		
2355	Agree		Agree		
2356	Agree		Neutral		
2357	Disagree		Disagree		Same as above
2358	Agree		Agree		



2359	Disagree		Disagree		
2360	Agree		Neutral		I think staff retention at secondary schools is difficult and therefore by given priority places to teachers children could assist with long term staff retention.
2361	Disagree		Disagree		
2362	Agree		Agree		
2363	Disagree		Disagree		
2364	Neutral		Neutral		
2365	Not Applicable		Disagree		
2366	Agree		Agree		Finding and retaining quality teaching staff is evidently a challenge. It seems like a natural decision to allow children of secondary school staff to attend, if they so wish.
2367	Agree		Agree		
2368	Agree		Agree		I think that this is fair for the children of staff teaching at either the boys or girls secondary school.
2369	Agree		Neutral		
2370	Disagree		Disagree		
2371	Neutral		Neutral		
2372	No Response		No Response		
2373	Neutral		Neutral		
2374	Neutral		Neutral		
2375	Neutral		Neutral		
2376	Neutral		Neutral		
2377	Neutral		Neutral		It may be advantageous in terms of recruitment to offer access to the children of staff. It may also be thought necessary to offer this across both schools to avoid discrimination on the basis of the sex of the child. But overall this is likely to have a detrimental effect on the chances of applicants from the local area.
2378	Neutral		Neutral		
2379	Disagree		Disagree		
2380	Neutral		Neutral		
2381	Disagree		Disagree		
2382	Agree		Agree		
2383	Disagree		Disagree		
2384	Neutral		Neutral		
2385	Agree		Agree		
2386	Neutral		Neutral		
2387	Agree		Agree		
2388	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2389	Disagree		Disagree		
2390	Neutral		Neutral		
2391	Agree		Agree		
2392	Neutral		Neutral		
2393	Neutral		Neutral		
2394	Disagree		Disagree		
2395	Agree		Agree		
2396	Agree		Agree		
2397	Agree		Agree		
2398	Agree		Agree		
2399	Neutral		Neutral		
2400	Neutral		Neutral		
2401	Agree		Agree		
2402	Disagree		Disagree		
2403	Neutral		Neutral		
2404	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2405	Disagree		Disagree		
2406	Disagree		Disagree		

2407	Agree		Disagree		I don't see how it is relevant that a child should get priority for one school when their parent works at a different school. This just results in an admissions policy that is arbitrary in nature and not providing equal opportunities for children in the local area.
2408	Agree		Agree		
2409	Agree		Neutral		Maybe this should be just a teacher privilege. We need to incentivise teachers. I can see why an assistant or a dinner lady might want this privilege but got to draw the line somewhere and all children are important not just those who have parents with jobs in the school - particularly if they don't live in the area
2410	Disagree		Disagree		
2411	Agree		Agree		I think it would be much more fair for staff to have access to both the girls' and the boys' school as you set out in the document, you shouldn't miss out because your child is the 'wrong gender' or you work at the wrong part of the school (boys v girls).
2412	Neutral		Neutral		
2413	Disagree		Disagree		
2414	Neutral		Neutral		
2415	Neutral		Neutral		
2416	Agree		Agree		
2417	Agree		Agree		No child should be discriminated against. I do not think this policy is unfair at all. As the children of staff may be at a small percentage.
2418	Disagree		Disagree		
2419	Agree		Agree		
2420	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2421	Agree		Agree		
2422	Disagree		Disagree		
2423	Disagree		Disagree		
2424	Agree		Agree		This seems fair as it will help teacher recruitment
2425	Disagree		Disagree		
2426	Agree		Neutral		
2427	Neutral		Disagree		
2428	Disagree		Disagree		
2429	Neutral		Agree		Agreed as impact is negligible in the grand scheme of things . Should be a Perk of the job in the teaching profession to have your kids attend the school you teach at for logistics reasons .
2430	Neutral		Neutral		
2431	Agree		Disagree		
2432	Neutral		Neutral		6. I am well aware of the difficulty of recruiting and retaining staff. I think it is reasonable, as some other Bromley schools do to make this available to staff (and it would have to really be for the two schools as indicated). However, some other schools do not allow this opportunity until the staff member has been at the school for a minimum period. I think this is sensible and in the schools' interest. One would not like to see a staff member arrive just before the time for applications for children and then leave soon afterwards. A commitment over a longer period for the staff member should be expected. Also the document does not make clear whether it applies to all staff or just to teachers.
2433	Disagree		Disagree		
2434	Agree		Agree		
2435	Agree		Agree		I agree that recruitment and retention at individual schools would potentially be enhanced by the offer of places for the children of staff. By limiting this to the secondary school staff I do not think the demand for places from year to year would be too onerous on admission numbers and it would not be to the detriment of the local population
2436	Neutral		Neutral		
2437	Agree		Agree		
2438	Agree		Disagree		
2439	Disagree		Disagree		This could significantly reduce the amount of places for children of the local area
2440	Disagree		Disagree		
2441	Agree		Neutral		
2442	Disagree		Disagree		
2443	Neutral		Neutral		
2444	Agree		Neutral		
2445	Disagree		Disagree		
2446	Agree		Agree		This seems fair and will be irrespective of sex of the children

2447	Disagree		Disagree		
2448	Neutral		Neutral		
2449	Disagree		Disagree		
2450	Disagree		Disagree		
2451	Disagree		Disagree		As above
2452	Disagree		Disagree		
2453	Disagree		Disagree		These schools currently operate independently and therefore it would be unfair to prioritise access to teaching staff of separate schools. If this policy went ahead the following negative impacts are likely to occur _x000D_ -Number of places left will reduce for the local community. _x000D_ -The LPGS/LPBS catchment area may reduce. Local children left outside a smaller catchment area have significantly increased uncertainty of the school they will attend and may have to travel further distance via car to a non local school._x000D_ -Increased road traffic, vehicle emissions, reduced use of public transport and congestion where staff live outside the current average catchment area._x000D_ -Attraction of &lsquo;talented&rsquo; school staff and ability for schools within the trust to &lsquo;cherry pick&rsquo; good performers, potentially reducing the quality of staff at schools outside the trust _x000D_ Parents who work in all other industries and non trustee schools have to make arrangement for their children to attend schools that may not be close to their place of work, therefore, it is only fair these parents have access to schools local to their home address for their children. _x000D_ The benefit of this proposal to the children that attend LPBS/LPGS and the local community is unclear
2454	Agree		Agree		
2455	Agree		Agree		This would seem sensible- at either - would allow the child to perhaps attend the school at which his / her parent does not teach (if that were preferred by the teaching family.)
2456	Agree		Neutral		
2457	Disagree		Disagree		
2458	Agree		Disagree		
2459	Agree		Agree		
2460	Agree		Agree		
2461	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2462	Disagree		Disagree		
2463	Disagree		Disagree		
2464	Agree		Agree		
2465	Agree		Agree		In any staff proposal consideration should be given to how long they have been employed, minimum number of hours, and directly employed.
2466	Agree		Agree		
2467	Disagree		Disagree		
2468	Disagree		Disagree		Langley boys and girls high school_x000D_ _x000D_ Children of teachers should not automatically gain places for their children as this will limit and decrease places for children who live within and in the surrounding community.
2469	Neutral		Neutral		
2470	Neutral		Neutral		
2471	Disagree		Disagree		More appropriate for primary, not relevant to secondary as majority of pupils make own way there and less reliant on parental support.
2472	Agree		Agree		Staff in both secondary schools have always had this right.
2473	Disagree		Disagree		
2474	Agree		Agree		
2475	Agree		Agree		
2476	Agree		Agree		
2477	Agree		Agree		
2478	Disagree		No Response		
2479	Neutral		Neutral		
2480	Neutral		Neutral		
2481	Agree		Agree		
2482	Agree		Agree		

2483	Neutral		Neutral	
2484	Disagree		Disagree	
2485	Disagree		Disagree	
2486	Disagree		Disagree	If the children are local, and within the current catchment area, fine. Outside of these boundaries, I disagree with them getting priority over other local children.
2487	Agree		Agree	
2488	Agree		Agree	
2489	Disagree		Disagree	
2490	Disagree		Disagree	
2491	Disagree		Disagree	
2492	Agree		Agree	seems silly to discriminate the sex of the child depending on what school the parent works in
2493	Agree		Disagree	I understand that it is common practice in the area for the children of secondary school staff to be given priority. Accordingly it would seem fair to continue this legitimate expectation. However, for non-staff, having a child at Langley Boys does not lead to prioritising the child's sibling at Langley Girls or vice versa. It therefore seems unfair to be allowing such prioritisation for staff where the non-staff siblings would not necessarily feel the benefit of staff retention.
2494	Disagree		Disagree	
2495	Disagree		No Response	
2496	Disagree		Disagree	
2497	Disagree		Disagree	
2498	Neutral		Neutral	
2499	Disagree		Disagree	
2500	Disagree		Disagree	
2501	Disagree		Disagree	I disagree with this proposal, it is unfair against all other working parents who have to manage children at school as well as work responsibilities.
2502	Agree		No Response	
2503	Agree		Agree	
2504	Neutral		Disagree	
2505	Neutral		Neutral	
2506	Agree		Agree	
2507	Neutral		Neutral	
2508	Disagree		Disagree	Same as above.
2509	Neutral		Neutral	
2510	Agree		Agree	
2511	Agree		Agree	This would be fair so as not to discriminate on sex
2512	Agree		Disagree	
2513	Neutral		Neutral	
2514	Neutral		Neutral	
2515	Neutral		Neutral	
2516	Agree		Agree	In the context of the national recruitment and retention crisis with 30% of NQTs leaving teaching in their first year of teaching I would advocate giving priority to the children of staff for the great benefit of the wider school. To clarify, on average we are talking about one child per year group.
2517	Disagree		Disagree	
2518	Agree		Agree	
2519	Neutral		Neutral	
2520	Neutral		Disagree	
2521	Agree		Agree	School pick time and after school child care is a significant commitment for every parent including teachers. Having children of teachers given priority would support work life balance for staff and reduce the administration of arranging child care after school and pick arrangements.
2522	Disagree		Disagree	
2523	Agree		Neutral	
2524	Agree		Agree	I believe it would be unfair to discriminate between male and female children of staff at langley.

2525	Disagree		Agree		It is not clear what is proposed to change to give priority to children of staff employed at the secondary schools in the school's admission arrangements as children of staff are already given priority in certain circumstances._x000D_ _x000D_ I do not object to children of staff employed at either of the secondary schools being given priority in the admissions arrangements to either secondary school on the current basis i.e. _x000D_ _x000D_ a) Where the member of staff has been employed at the School for two or more years at the time at which the application for admission to the School is made, and/or _x000D_ _x000D_ b) The member of staff is recruited to fill a vacant post for which there is a demonstrable skill shortage.
2526	Neutral		Neutral		
2527	Disagree		Disagree		
2528	Neutral		Disagree		
2529	Agree		Agree		It would be unfair to discriminate between sexes in this instance.
2530	Disagree		Disagree		
2531	Neutral		Neutral		
2532	Disagree		Agree		It is not clear what is proposed to change to give priority to children of staff employed at the secondary schools in the school's admission arrangements as children of staff are already given priority in certain circumstances._x000D_ _x000D_ I do not object to children of staff employed at either of the secondary schools being given priority in the admissions arrangements to either secondary school on the current basis i.e. _x000D_ _x000D_ a) Where the member of staff has been employed at the School for two or more years at the time at which the application for admission to the School is made, and/or _x000D_ _x000D_ b) The member of staff is recruited to fill a vacant post for which there is a demonstrable skill shortage.
2533	Neutral		Neutral		
2534	Disagree		Disagree		
2535	Disagree		Disagree		It does not seem fair to children who live in the local area to have to travel further to school, because places are taken by children who live further away.
2536	Agree		Agree		
2537	Agree		Agree		
2538	Agree		Agree		
2539	Disagree		Disagree		The stated reason for giving priority to the children of staff is, in short, staff recruitment and staff retention. _x000D_ However, there is no evidence, certainly in the consultation documentation that you have published, that _x000D_ there is: _x000D_ - (i) any material problem in attracting staff to and retaining them at these schools. These are highly _x000D_ desirable primary schools in nice areas and therefore naturally attract teachers. _x000D_ - (ii) that the proposed change to the criteria would in reality benefit the schools. _x000D_ Indeed, the objective evidence shows that these changes to the oversubscription criteria are not necessary: _x000D_ - LPSB is currently &lsquo;Good&rsquo; including the teaching aspect. In the past it has been outstanding and in _x000D_ circumstances in which the proposed oversubscription criteria did not apply. Reading the current _x000D_ Ofsted report there is not the slightest suggestion that the gap between current teaching standards _x000D_ and &lsquo;outstanding&rsquo; is in any way related to lack of staff retention, nor to difficulty in recruiting high _x000D_ calibre teachers. For instance, the comment &ldquo;The quality of teaching is strong. However, there is still _x000D_ a degree of inconsistency within some subject areas&rdquo; is indicative. No doubt the inconsistency and _x000D_ other mild shortcoming referred to can be addressed without this change to the criteria. _x000D_ - LPSG - much the same points apply _x000D_ _x000D_ The changes to the oversubscription criteria are therefore not justified or proportionate in light of the reason _x000D_ given for them. Particularly as, of course, these changes would limit the places available to the children of _x000D_ people (including other teachers) who do not teach at these school.
2540	Neutral		Neutral		By the time a child reaches secondary school it is likely that they will be travelling to school independently (or at least this should be encouraged). I would like to think/hope that secondary school teachers with children would like their own children to go to their own local.
2541	Agree		Disagree		

2542	Agree		Agree		
2543	Disagree		Disagree		
2544	Disagree		Disagree		
2545	Agree		Agree		
2546	Neutral		Neutral		
2547	Disagree		Disagree		
2548	Disagree		Disagree		There is absolutely no reason to prioritise secondary school age children of staff at a LPLT school over local children to attend any LPLT school as children of that age are able (and should be encouraged) to travel independently to their local secondary school. There are benefits to be had attending your local secondary school to encourage community spirit and offer of a safety net work, whether you are a child of LPLT staff or not. Local children should attend their local school.
2549	Disagree		Disagree		I do not recognise the benefit, to a child, of attending a secondary school where their parent teaches. My this age, independence should be encouraged and there would be no practical benefit. _x000D_ If this is changed, i think it should be applied to either of the secondary schools.
2550	Neutral		Neutral		
2551	Neutral		Neutral		
2552	Disagree		Disagree		The sibling rule doesn't apply across the schools - my daughters won't get a place at Langley Girls because their brother attends the boys school - so I don't think teachers should get priority across the schools for their children.
2553	Neutral		Neutral		
2554	Disagree		Disagree		
2555	Disagree		Disagree		This is once again giving priority to pupils unfairly.
2556	Agree		Agree		
2557	Agree		Agree		
2558	No Response		No Response		
2559	No Response		Disagree		
2560	Neutral		Neutral		
2561	Agree		Agree		
2562	Agree		Agree		Children of staff from either secondary school should have priority for either secondary school admittance _x000D_ The case is not compelling for priority to primary schools, although the LPPS onsite facility would help to reduce transport and congestion.
2563	Neutral		Neutral		
2564	Agree		Disagree		
2565	Disagree		Disagree		See comments above. It also means that schools are necessarily getting the best teaching staff; just those who want their children educated at Langley school. This is wholly unfair to parents who did not choose teaching as a profession, But who are paying a high premium to live in the local community making it a place where people outside the area want to come to (ie to teach in our schools) and contribute to the local community in many ways. Essentially you will be driving families out of the area.
2566	Neutral		Neutral		
2567	Agree		Agree		
2568	Neutral		Disagree		
2569	Agree		Agree		
2570	Disagree		Disagree		
2571	Agree		Agree		
2572	Neutral		Neutral		
2573	Disagree		Disagree		I don't consider it an essential for children of staff at a senior school to be at the same location. Children of secondary school age can travel independently, so therefore I deem it unfair for a child to get preference based on their parents job even if they are outside the catchment area.
2574	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2575	Neutral		Neutral		
2576	Neutral		Neutral		
2577	Disagree		Disagree		
2578	Neutral		Neutral		
2579	Agree		Disagree		
2580	Agree		Disagree		
2581	Agree		Agree		
2582	Neutral		Neutral		

2583	Agree		Agree		
2584	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2585	Agree		Agree		
2586	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2587	Disagree		Disagree		
2588	Disagree		Disagree		Children are old enough and independent at secondary school. Don't need to be taken to school or pick up by parents so children of staff at secondary school should not be a priority. At primary school is necessary but not at secondary school.
2589	Neutral		Neutral		
2590	Neutral		Agree		This seems fair in view of the fact of their being two single, opposite, sex schools. The teacher may have twins being a boy and a girl!
2591	Agree		Agree		
2592	Agree		Agree		
2593	Agree		Agree		
2594	Neutral		Neutral		
2595	Agree		Agree		
2596	Disagree		Disagree		
2597	Agree		Agree		
2598	Agree		Disagree		
2599	Neutral		Neutral		
2600	Disagree		Disagree		
2601	Disagree		Disagree		
2602	Neutral		Disagree		
2603	Agree		Agree		Agree that there should be cross priority do as to prevent penalizing based on gender.
2604	Neutral		Neutral		
2605	Agree		Agree		
2606	Disagree		Disagree		
2607	Neutral		Neutral		
2608	Neutral		Disagree		This reduces the catchment area for those who would like to attend the school
2609	Neutral		Neutral		
2610	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are old enough to not need to be at same school as parent who is a teacher.
2611	Agree		Disagree		I completely agree with priority for children of staff at the particular school. It's a good way of incentivising and attracting staff when financial offerings are meagre. However it should be limited to the particular school in question so that the particular school and staff member in question both benefit.
2612	Agree		Agree		
2613	Neutral		Neutral		
2614	Neutral		Neutral		
2615	Agree		Agree		Sounds very reasonable and I'm only surprised this wasn't already the case.
2616	Neutral		Neutral		
2617	Neutral		Disagree		
2618	Agree		Agree		
2619	Agree		Disagree		
2620	Disagree		Disagree		
2621	Agree		Agree		
2622	Neutral		Neutral		
2623	Neutral		Neutral		
2624	Agree		Agree		
2625	Agree		Agree		
2626	Neutral		Neutral		
2627	Disagree		Disagree		
2628	Neutral		Neutral		
2629	Not Applicable		Disagree		This should just be specific to the school. Ie primary school teachers pupils should not be given priority at the secondary schools.
2630	Neutral		Neutral		

2631	Disagree		Disagree		
2632	Neutral		Neutral		
2633	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2634	Disagree		Disagree		
2635	Agree		Agree		
2636	Agree		Agree		
2637	Neutral		Disagree		I understand a priority for the school at which your parents teaches but not for a separate school - ie if your parent teaches at LPSG why should there be a priority for you to get into the boys school?
2638	Neutral		Neutral		
2639	Neutral		Neutral		
2640	Agree		Agree		
2641	Disagree		Disagree		
2642	Agree		Agree		
2643	Neutral		Neutral		
2644	Agree		Agree		
2645	Disagree		Disagree		It doesn't seem fair to allow school staff children who could potentially live far from the school an advantage over children who live locally.
2646	Disagree		Disagree		
2647	Neutral		Neutral		
2648	Agree		Agree		
2649	Disagree		Disagree		
2650	Agree		No Response		
2651	Agree		Disagree		
2652	Neutral		Neutral		
2653	Agree		Disagree		The sibling criteria is not linked, so it is unfair for the staff of an unlinked school to have priority
2654	Disagree		Disagree		
2655	Neutral		Neutral		
2656	Disagree		Disagree		
2657	Agree		Neutral		
2658	Agree		Agree		
2659	Agree		Agree		
2660	Agree		Agree		
2661	Disagree		Disagree		
2662	Disagree		Disagree		
2663	Agree		Agree		
2664	Disagree		No Response		
2665	Agree		Agree		
2666	Agree		Agree		
2667	Disagree		Disagree		
2668	Disagree		Disagree		
2669	Disagree		Disagree		
2670	Neutral		Neutral		
2671	Neutral		Neutral		
2672	Agree		Agree		
2673	Disagree		Disagree		
2674	Disagree		Disagree		
2675	Disagree		Disagree		
2676	Neutral		Neutral		
2677	Agree		Agree		Secondary school - if teachers have children I think it makes sense for their children to attend the school. Also ensures there are great teachers
2678	Agree		Agree		
2679	Neutral		Disagree		



2680	Disagree		Disagree		
2681	Agree		Agree		
2682	No Response		No Response		
2683	Agree		Agree		
2684	Neutral		Disagree		
2685	Agree		Agree		
2686	Neutral		Neutral		
2687	Disagree		Disagree		
2688	Neutral		Disagree		
2689	Neutral		Neutral		
2690	Neutral		Neutral		
2691	Disagree		Disagree		
2692	Disagree		Disagree		
2693	Neutral		Neutral		
2694	Disagree		Disagree		
2695	Agree		Agree		
2696	Agree		Agree		
2697	Disagree		Disagree		The principle of creating a feeder school through this trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. It fragments the whole school system. I disagree to it all.
2698	Disagree		Disagree		
2699	Neutral		Neutral		
2700	Disagree		Disagree		
2701	Agree		Agree		
2702	Neutral		Neutral		
2703	Disagree		Disagree		
2704	Agree		Disagree		
2705	Disagree		Disagree		Again it has a knock on effect on other local west wickham Hayes school when u have children from Bromley/Beckenham who will get preference when Clare house is nearer Harris secondary!!!
2706	Agree		Agree		
2707	Disagree		Disagree		
2708	Agree		Agree		
2709	Agree		Disagree		
2710	Agree		Agree		
2711	Agree		Agree		
2712	Disagree		Disagree		
2713	Disagree		Disagree		
2714	Disagree		Disagree		
2715	Disagree		Disagree		
2716	Disagree		Disagree		
2717	Agree		Agree		
2718	Disagree		Disagree		
2719	Agree		Agree		
2720	Agree		Agree		
2721	Disagree		Disagree		
2722	Neutral		Disagree		
2723	Neutral		Neutral		
2724	Disagree		Disagree		
2725	Agree		Agree		
2726	Disagree		Disagree		
2727	Disagree		Disagree		

2728	Disagree		Disagree		All children should have the same chance at attending a school within their catchment area.
2729	Neutral		Neutral		
2730	Neutral		Neutral		
2731	Agree		Agree		
2732	Agree		Agree		The boys and the girls school are closely linked and as they are single sex schools it is reasonable that there is a reciprocal arrangement .
2733	Agree		Agree		
2734	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2735	Agree		Agree		
2736	Agree		Agree		
2737	Disagree		Disagree		I honestly believe that places should be reserved for children living in the catchment, have siblings at the school or have learning or physical disabilities.
2738	Disagree		Disagree		
2739	Agree		Agree		Believe this is more important for younger children at primary school though if this rule is applied for teachers, there should also be consideration for the sibling rule to apply across LPSB and LPSG. It does affect decision making of parents with siblings of both sexes to choose a mixed school over LPSB/LPSG given they can't be sure the younger child will also be able to attend the corresponding boys or girls school.
2740	Agree		Neutral		
2741	Disagree		Disagree		
2742	Disagree		Disagree		
2743	Disagree		Disagree		
2744	Disagree		Agree		If they live close to the school
2745	Neutral		Neutral		
2746	Agree		Neutral		
2747	Agree		Agree		
2748	Neutral		Neutral		
2749	Disagree		Disagree		
2750	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2751	Disagree		Disagree		
2752	Disagree		Disagree		
2753	Disagree		Neutral		Creates a bias against local children.
2754	Agree		Agree		
2755	Agree		Neutral		I do believe there should be a minimum term of employment to be eligible for this & also key positions that require retention of staff.
2756	Disagree		Disagree		
2757	Neutral		Neutral		
2758	Disagree		Agree		There is no justifiable reason whatsoever to deny local children access to their local school.
2759	Neutral		No Response		
2760	Agree		Agree		
2761	Disagree		Disagree		This will disadvantage local children and possibly put them outside the catchment area.
2762	Disagree		Disagree		
2763	Agree		Agree		
2764	Agree		Agree		
2765	Disagree		Agree		
2766	Agree		Disagree		
2767	Disagree		Disagree		
2768	No Response		No Response		
2769	Neutral		Neutral		I don't think it's particularly fair to be honest but I could understand this above giving places to staff of primary schools.
2770	Neutral		Agree		
2771	Disagree		Disagree		Area is already oversubscribed to give advantage that isn't based on catchment area
2772	Disagree		Disagree		
2773	Agree		Agree		Keeps teachers committed to schools and there needs to be a perk given how little teachers and support staff are paid
2774	Disagree		Disagree		
2775	No Response		No Response		

2776	Disagree		No Response		
2777	Disagree		Disagree		
2778	Agree		Disagree		
2779	Disagree		Disagree		
2780	Agree		Agree		
2781	Neutral		Neutral		
2782	Agree		Agree		
2783	Agree		Agree		
2784	Neutral		Neutral		
2785	Disagree		Disagree		
2786	Agree		Agree		
2787	Agree		Neutral		
2788	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2789	Agree		Agree		
2790	Disagree		Disagree		
2791	Disagree		Disagree		Why should the children be given priority for secondary schools, they can travel by themselves unlike primary school.
2792	Neutral		Disagree		
2793	Disagree		Disagree		
2794	Disagree		Disagree		Childcare pressures at secondary school are less material for teachers than primary aged children.
2795	Agree		Agree		
2796	Neutral		Neutral		
2797	Agree		Disagree		Should be specific to the school
2798	Disagree		Disagree		
2799	Neutral		Neutral		
2800	Neutral		Neutral		
2801	Neutral		Disagree		I accept that the secondary schools need to attract the best staff and that allowing children of secondary school teachers to be given priority may well be a deal breaker for a teacher accepting a position at the school. However, I think it would go too far by making this applicable to either school in both admissions arrangements as this has the potential of excluding alot of pupils who fall into the 'Other' category.
2802	Agree		Agree		It seems fair to give priority to children of staff working at the school they work at.
2803	Neutral		Neutral		
2804	Disagree		Disagree		
2805	Neutral		Neutral		
2806	Disagree		Disagree		Admission criteria in the past have been on proximity to the school. Staff can come and go, they may be granted a place and then leave the school. Priority should not be made to staff.
2807	Agree		Agree		I have no objection to either proposal.
2808	Agree		Agree		
2809	Agree		Agree		To help retain good teaching staff, especially when they have children of both male and female who would attend the boys school or the girls school
2810	Disagree		Disagree		Same as above.From experience, in this area, there is a large turnover of teachers so this, in my mind, invalidate your point.
2811	Neutral		Neutral		No potential numbers have been given, so the impact of the proposal on potential places is unknown.
2812	Neutral		Neutral		I only think that children of teachers or headteachers should have priority, not any staff. I agree that places could be utilised at either the boys or girls schools for children of those teachers.
2813	Agree		Agree		
2814	Neutral		Neutral		
2815	Agree		Agree		
2816	Disagree		Disagree		This is an unnecessary arrangement in an already oversubscribed area. This offers no benefit to adult or child and instead a serious cause for concern should the member of staff live outside of the area. The child travelling to and from the school would increase burden on public transport or worse if travelling by car. In addition it is unacceptable that a local child should miss out on a place at a local school because that place is being offered as a 'perk' of the job

2817	Disagree		Disagree		A local child should not miss out on a place at a local school due to a teacher (who may live at the area) being offered this as part of a recruitment package. There are plenty of other options which can tempt and retain people into teaching. This is an out of date solution to a very modern problem, schools are becoming more and more oversubscribed so this cannot continue.No information is provided detailing how long the teacher has to have been working with the trust to enjoy this benefit and how long they would have to stay. What is being proposed here is potentially a child could gain a place in a feeder school and then be entitled to education within the trust until they are 18 years of age, irrespective of where they live and if their parent is still working for the trust.
2818	Neutral		Neutral		
2819	Agree		Neutral		
2820	Disagree		Disagree		Any priority given to children of staff will result eventually in 50% plus of all places being given to non local children. This is exacerbated by the sibling rule where a teacher or other member of staff taking up a post and getting a priority place for a first child in year 1 of primary school could block school places for 20 years with multiple siblings. The staff member could leave the school once their first child is in after completing 1 school term! Teachers especially are in a transitory jobs market and schools are subject to massive amounts of churn.Whilst most teachers would not use this method to secure a placement to introduce their first child and then leave the school this proposal is wide open to that sort of abuse. How many teachers / staff would take up the post on the basis that their children would be obliged to leave with them? There are many good teachers living within the schools catchment area who would secure places for their children without a skewed rule. Children of local people in every profession should be given a level playing field and have the opportunity of attending their local school. The existing policy based on proximity should be retained
2821	Neutral		Neutral		Key to retain the best quality teachers at this level of a child's education. I agree every level of a child's education is important but secondary school is the most pressurised in a young person's life and the best support we can give them will help them develop into grounded adults with strength of mind.
2822	Disagree		Disagree		
2823	Neutral		Neutral		
2824	Neutral		Neutral		
2825	Neutral		Neutral		
2826	Disagree		Disagree		The suggestion to give priority to children of staff at LPSB and LPSG at either of the schools seems incredibly unfair and I am surprised to see this proposed. I am outraged and feel saddened that LPLT is even able to consider the changes they are proposing overall, but this one makes me truly outraged and feeling as though the teaching staff are getting unfair priority over families, or attempting to by the Trust. I am sure this must not be allowed on further grounds / rights / codes, and if the proposals do go ahead I will certainly be taking this to a higher level.This is giving unfair treatment to local families and not on the same basis as staff. By this I specifically mean that as a parent of a child currently at , the sibling policy is not extended to me / my son, who is currently in Year 5 at and due to start secondary school in 2021. His sister attends and although the two schools are next to each other and for many purposes jointly considered (for obvious and good reason) as it currently stands, and if the new proposals are to go ahead, my son will not be given priority through sibling policy, as this is not considered across both schools for local families applying. Even though his sister is in the school right next door and we live in walking distance. Yet given the proposal, LPLT seem to think it is fair to consider the two schools as one for admissions relating to children of staff at LPSG and LPSB. How is this on any grounds fair? If it applies for staff (in that the schools are considered as one for admission purposes) then it should, logically, morally, fairly, and with common sense, apply to everyone else applying. about how they'll walk to school together, as they understandably would, given that these two schools are next to each other and his sister is already at one of them and they are in walking distance of our home. I mention their names because they are children, not just numbers or statistics, or 'staff of this' of 'children of this'. They are real children with feelings, thoughts, rights and ideas about where they will be going to school which they have had for years. It is easy for a Trust to propose changes, but as families we then have to explain to our children that they may not go to the school they were going to walk to with their older sibling and that they can walk to from home. Who in their right mind on the Trust or elsewhere can think this is fair.If the priority is given to staff at either staff for admission across the two schools, then the same must applied to the sibling policy to families with children at either school. If the two schools are being considered as one for the staff then this must also be applied for families with children at either school. If it is not then it is not treating families fairly and is unjust on many levels, setting unfair rules across different parties.I also believe in any case that the sibling policy should already extend across both schools for the reasons I have just mentioned.
2827	Disagree		Disagree		
2828	Agree		Agree		This does not seem unfair. I agree with current policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school where the parent teaches.
2829	Agree		Agree		This does not seem unfair. I agree with current policy of not discriminating against children of the opposite sex to the school where the parent teaches.
2830	Neutral		Neutral		
2831	Neutral		Neutral		
2832	Disagree		Disagree		
2833	Agree		Agree		
2834	Agree		Disagree		In seems unfair that staff of LPSFB/LPSFG would enjoy the automatic entry of different sex siblings when parents of mixed sex children have the stress of wondering whether they will get their son/daughter into one of these secondary schools even though they already have a child at the other school.In my opinion, one of the best changes that the Trust could implement in respect of admission arrangements would be to apply the sibling rule to both of the secondary schools combined. If this were introduced for parents, then I would be happy to support the same rule to be introduced for staff.

2835	Neutral		Disagree		
2836	Neutral		Neutral		
2837	Neutral		Neutral		
2838	Disagree		Disagree		While there may be some merit in allowing preference at primary level, by the time the children of staff reach secondary school age they should attend their local school in the same way as everyone else. There is no preferential treatment in the health service for their staff, the same should apply to education.
2839	Neutral		Neutral		
2840	Agree		Agree		
2841	Neutral		Neutral		
2842	Agree		Agree		
2843	Agree		Agree		
2844	Neutral		Neutral		
2845	Agree		Agree		
2846	Disagree		Disagree		Completely unfair to pupils who live close to the Langley schools and would have to travel further afield
2847	Agree		Agree		
2848	Neutral		Disagree		
2849	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to travel to any location without a parent needing to take them so I don't see why they should be treated differently to others. (School places are not allocated on the geographical location of any other parent's workplace)
2850	Disagree		Disagree		
2851	Agree		Agree		
2852	Neutral		Neutral		
2853	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to travel to school independently.
2854	Disagree		Disagree		Secondary school children are able to travel to school independently.
2855	Neutral		Neutral		
2856	Neutral		Neutral		
2857	Agree		Agree		
2858	Agree		Agree		
2859	Neutral		Neutral		
2860	Disagree		Disagree		
2861	Agree		Disagree		
2862	Disagree		Disagree		
2863	Neutral		Neutral		
2864	Disagree		Disagree		
2865	Disagree		Disagree		
2866	Disagree		Disagree		
2867	Agree		Agree		
2868	Agree		Agree		
2869	Neutral		Disagree		
2870	Agree		Neutral		
2871	Neutral		Neutral		
2872	Neutral		Neutral		
2873	Disagree		Disagree		
2874	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2875	Disagree		Disagree		I think everyone should be given a fair and equal chance
2876	Disagree		Disagree		As above
2877	Disagree		Disagree		See reasons above. Totally unfair for a student living miles away from a school to gain a place over a student living much closer just because they happen to have a parent working at the school. What about when that parent leaves for another job a year later?! Secondary school students do not need the same level of childcare before and after school. They should be able to travel to and from school themselves. If childcare is needed, parents should arrange appropriate cover before and after school as the rest of us working parents in other sectors have to do.
2878	Disagree		Neutral		
2879	Agree		Agree		

2880	Neutral		No Response		Disagree
2881	Agree		Agree		
2882	Neutral		Disagree		
2883	Disagree		Disagree		
2884	Disagree		Disagree		
2885	Agree		Agree		
2886	Neutral		Neutral		
2887	Disagree		Disagree		
2888	No Response		No Response		
2889	Agree		Agree		
2890	Agree		Agree		Same as above
2891	Neutral		Neutral		Spaces granted for teachers who work at that specific school, allocated above demand for local children, is standard practice
2892	Agree		Agree		
2893	Agree		Agree		
2894	Agree		Neutral		
2895	Agree		Agree		
2896	Agree		Agree		
2897	Neutral		No Response		
2898	Neutral		Neutral		
2899	Agree		Agree		
2900	Agree		Agree		Enable the recruitment and retention of high quality staff.
2901	Neutral		Neutral		
2902	Disagree		Disagree		
2903	Neutral		Neutral		
2904	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2905	Agree		Agree		
2906	Neutral		Neutral		
2907	Agree		Agree		
2908	Agree		Agree		This would be a much welcomed change to the policy. , I feel that this step will definitely have a positive effect on retention. Staff who may have previously had to consider moving to be in the catchment area or moving to be closer to another preferable school would no longer have to make such a choice. Personally I feel that staff having the option to send their children to the trust secondary schools is a major selling point and .
2909	Agree		Agree		This will be a draw for high quality staff recruitment. Both schools have difficulty with recruiting to teaching posts in particular for shortage subjects. This could be a factor for applicants.
2910	Agree		Agree		This will aid recruitment and retention of quality staff, and is a means of rewarding commitment and loyalty to the school. Staff who are parents of boys should have the same privileges as those who are parents of girls, in the interests of fairness!
2911	Agree		Agree		
2912	Agree		Agree		
2913	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2914	Agree		Agree		If I were working at one of the schools, I would want the option of having my children there too for logistical reasons
2915	Disagree		Disagree		As above
2916	Disagree		Disagree		
2917	Disagree		Disagree		
2918	Disagree		No Response		Agree
2919	Agree		Agree		
2920	Agree		Agree		
2921	Agree		No Response		
2922	Agree		Neutral		
2923	Agree		Agree		
2924	Agree		Agree		

2925	Agree		Agree		
2926	Agree		Agree		
2927	Agree		Agree		Teachers work very hard for their schools & I feel there should be a 'reward' system guaranteeing their child a place, should they want it. Lots of companies offer their employees perks.
2928	Agree		Agree		
2929	Agree		Agree		
2930	Agree		Neutral		
2931	Agree		Agree		
2932	Agree		Agree		
2933	Disagree		Disagree		There is no benefit, in my opinion, for a secondary aged child to be at the school where their parent works. Children who are 11 and over are able to walk to school alone or with friends. It is not fair for the child of a teacher to take the place of potentially a local student.
2934	Agree		Agree		
2935	Neutral		Neutral		
2936	Agree		Agree		
2937	Disagree		Disagree		
2938	Disagree		Disagree		The schools are already oversubscribed and people spend a lot of money to make sure that they are living in the right area to get in the school. This would be disadvantaging people who have done this.
2939	Agree		Disagree		
2940	Agree		Agree		
2941	Neutral		Agree		
2942	Disagree		Disagree		
2943	Agree		Agree		
2944	Agree		Agree		
2945	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2946	Agree		Disagree		
2947	Neutral		Neutral		
2948	Disagree		Disagree		
2949	Agree		Agree		
2950	Agree		Agree		
2951	Agree		Agree		
2952	Neutral		Disagree		It is discriminatory against children who do not have teachers as parents.
2953	Agree		Agree		It encourages staff retention and will assist in recruiting the best staff
2954	Disagree		Disagree		I disagree on all cases, unless like everyone else this is the staff members local school. This should not just be done for convenience. Children and parents both tend to thrive better separately at work and at school.
2955	Neutral		Disagree		
2956	Agree		Agree		
2957	Agree		Agree		
2958	Agree		Agree		
2959	Disagree		Disagree		
2960	Disagree		Neutral		
2961	Agree		Agree		
2962	Agree		Agree		
2963	Neutral		Neutral		
2964	Neutral		Neutral		
2965	Disagree		Disagree		There shouldn't be any priority to them, we have to balance child care with our place of work. The same should apply for teachers. Their children should go to schools in their postcode to their house.
2966	Agree		Agree		
2967	Disagree		Disagree		
2968	Agree		Agree		
2969	Agree		Agree		

2970	Agree		Agree		
2971	Agree		Neutral		
2972	Disagree		Disagree		
2973	Agree		Agree		Allowing teachers to send their children to any school in the trust sends a strong message of being a united trust with common principles. It also supports staff in allowing them to find school education that can fit with their role as a teacher.
2974	Agree		Agree		This seems sensible and fair.
2975	Disagree		Disagree		
2976	Neutral		Neutral		
2977	Disagree		Disagree		Disagree. You could have staff leave once their child has gained a place. Also there will be children local to the school without a school place. Distance should be priority as children of secondary ages travel alone.
2978	Agree		Disagree		
2979	Disagree		Disagree		
2980	Disagree		Disagree		
2981	Disagree		Disagree		
2982	Disagree		Disagree		
2983	Disagree		Disagree		
2984	Disagree		Disagree		
2985	Agree		Neutral		This depends whether the sibling rule applies across both schools or not. This is not clear in the consultation paper. In the over subscription criteria for
2986	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
2987	Disagree		Neutral		
2988	Disagree		Disagree		This should not be a consideration as the staff may want to seek work in only top performing schools
2989	Disagree		Disagree		
2990	Neutral		Neutral		
2991	Agree		Agree		
2992	Disagree		Disagree		
2993	Disagree		Disagree		
2994	Neutral		Neutral		Children of staff within Langley Boys and Langley Girls would not have a detrimental environmental impact by travelling to school with their parent. Also there would not be a significant number each year.
2995	Disagree		Disagree		
2996	Neutral		Neutral		
2997	Agree		Neutral		
2998	Agree		Agree		
2999	Agree		Disagree		
3000	Agree		Agree		
3001	Agree		Neutral		
3002	Agree		Agree		
3003	Agree		Agree		
3004	Neutral		Neutral		
3005	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		
3006	Neutral		Neutral		
3007	Agree		Agree		
3008	Agree		Agree		
3009	Disagree		Disagree		
3010	Neutral		Disagree		
3011	Agree		Agree		
3012	Agree		Agree		
3013	Neutral		Neutral		Would not bother me or my family if children of teachers get in to the schools as long as Langley Park Primary School became a feeder school for the secondary schools.
3014	Agree		Agree		
3015	Disagree		Disagree		Again it should be catchment as opposed to staffing favouritism.
3016	Neutral		Neutral		



3017	Agree		Disagree		
3018	Agree		Agree		
3019	Disagree		Disagree		
3020	Disagree		Disagree		Again, the staff may not live anywhere in the local area.
3021	Disagree		Disagree		I disagree with allowing children of staff in either school to have priority over other children applying for places in either school. The staff children will be compounding the problem of children attending the schools that may be outside of the current catchment, as mentioned above. In addition, the staff children will be given priority places at one of the schools without regard to gender, whereas siblings of children already at either school are treated differently based on their gender (due to the lack of sibling rule across the Langley secondaries). The consultation document itself discusses the unfairness of a situation where a staff member's child does not get priority because the child is the wrong sex. That is exactly the same unfairness that currently exists for siblings of children attending one of the secondary schools who are the wrong sex.
3022	Disagree		Disagree		They should not have privileged access to education services
3023	Disagree		Disagree		<p>School Admissions Code Section 1.9(f) "It is for admission authorities to formulate their admission arrangements, but they must not: ... f) give priority to children according to the occupational, marital, financial or educational status of parents applying. The exceptions to this are children of staff at the school ... in accordance with paragraphs 1.39 - 1.39B."</p> <p>School Admissions Code Section 1.39 "Admission authorities may give priority in their oversubscription criteria to children of staff in either or both of the following circumstances: a) where the member of staff has been employed at the school for two or more years at the time at which the application for admission to the school is made, and/or b) the member of staff is recruited to fill a vacant post for which there is a demonstrable skill shortage."</p> <p>PRIORITY TO CHILDREN OF STAFF EMPLOYED AT THE PARTICULAR SCHOOL IN QUESTION As noted in my comments to the previous question, I understand that schools are permitted to give priority in their admissions arrangements to children of staff under specific circumstances (see excerpts from the School Admissions Code above).</p> <p>As it is widely understood that teaching shortages are most notable at secondary level, particularly in maths, science and modern language subjects, it would seem reasonable to include this criteria in the case of the secondary schools in order to attract and retain quality teaching talent.</p> <p>Furthermore, my objections to the criteria being introduced for the primary schools do not apply to the secondary schools as the secondary school admissions do not have similar "knock-on" implications for other schools within the Trust, and the benefit to children of staff (over and above other children) has a shorter lifespan.</p> <p>These reasonings would tend to lend support to the proposal.</p> <p>However, although children with siblings at the school would receive higher priority in the oversubscription criteria relative to children of staff, it is worth clarifying that this only relates to children with siblings of the same gender. Children with siblings of the opposing gender attending one Langley secondary school are subject to the usual proximity criteria for the other Langley secondary school together with all other applicants, and would be at a greater disadvantage under the proposal to give priority to children of staff. They would be ranked below children of staff of the school (and potentially children of staff of both secondary schools - covered separately below). This increases the risk (relative to the status quo) of a child with a sibling of the opposite gender not obtaining a place at the school which is located in the same campus as their sibling, and losing out not only to children that live closer to the school (which is not unreasonable), but potentially losing out to children of staff that live further away (which IS unreasonable). This could result in more difficult journeys for families with children attending schools in multiple locations.</p> <p>A second order point of argument is that given the Trust is attempting to align the schools more closely within the Trust, it would seem unreasonable to treat staff in the different schools within the Trust inconsistently. On this premise, and to ensure consistency with my conclusion that the same policy should not be adopted in the primary schools, I would disagree with the proposal to give priority to children of staff of the secondary schools.</p> <p>PRIORITY TO CHILDREN OF STAFF EMPLOYED AT EITHER OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS I strongly object to the proposal to give priority to children of staff employed at either of the secondary schools in both secondary schools.</p> <p>Firstly, the proposal goes against Section 1.9(f) of the School Admissions Code, which prohibits "giving priority to children according to the occupational status of parents applying" with the children of staff of "the school" being one of the few limited exceptions. Notice the use of the phrase "the school", singular, i.e. the school to which the</p>
3024	Disagree		Agree		<p>The definition of staff is too loose for this to be clear and numbers involved (estimate) have not been put forward. How many staff members would this currently affect and how many schools places? Restrictions should be made clear and furthermore it seems that the child benefitting from this arrangement should be living with the staff member.</p> <p>It does not seem fair to discriminate on a gender basis given the similarity in age ranges for both the boys and girls secondary schools, prompting the particular agreement for the second question in this section.</p>
3025	Agree		Neutral		

3026	Disagree		Disagree		I disagree with allowing children of staff in either school to have priority over other children applying for places in either school. The staff children will be compounding the problem of children attending the schools that may be outside of the current catchment, as mentioned above. In addition, the staff children will be given priority places at one of the schools without regard to gender, whereas siblings of children already at either school are treated differently based on their gender (due to the lack of sibling rule across the Langley secondaries). The consultation document itself discusses the unfairness of a situation where a staff member's child does not get priority because the child is the wrong sex. That is exactly the same unfairness that currently exists for siblings of children attending one of the secondary schools who are the wrong sex.
3027	Disagree		Disagree		
3028	Neutral		Disagree		I believe that only children of teaching staff should be given priority
3029	Disagree		Disagree		The current arrangements should continue
3030	Not Applicable		Not Applicable		The current arrangements should continue and priority should not be given to schools within the trust.
3031	Neutral		Neutral		
3032	Disagree		Disagree		
3033	Neutral		Neutral		
3034	Agree		Agree		
3035	Neutral		Neutral		
3036	Disagree		Disagree		
3037	Neutral		Neutral		
3038	Agree		Agree		It seems reasonable that if you work at the secondary school your child should be able to go there. But only if this has a direct and proven impact on retention of teaching staff.
3039	Neutral		Disagree		
3040	Neutral		Neutral		
3041	Neutral		Neutral		
3042	Disagree		Agree		I believe that a child should get into a school simply on their proximity to the school. I feel it is unfair that a child of a teacher should get priority over another child who is closer to the school.  However, I notice that children of staff teaching at LPSB and LPSG already get priority in the current set up and so I agree that they should not be penalised whether they are a girl or boy.
3043	Neutral		Neutral		
3044	Neutral		Neutral		
3045	Agree		Disagree		The benefit of having your child at the same school as you work is surely about location. Teachers at HDPS and CHPS aren't necessarily easily located for LP
3046	Neutral		Neutral		
3047	Neutral		Neutral		
3048	Agree		Agree		Again, I think teachers receive little benefits, so allowing their children to attend the school they teach at, even if they would not qualify through proximity seems fair.
3049	Agree		Agree		
3050	Agree		Agree		

3051	Disagree		Disagree	<p>The stated reason for giving priority to the children of staff is, in short, staff recruitment and staff retention. However, there is no evidence, certainly in the consultation documentation that you have published, that there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (i) any material problem in attracting staff to and retaining them at these schools. These are highly desirable primary schools in nice areas and therefore naturally attract teachers.</li> <li>- (ii) that the proposed change to the criteria would in reality benefit the schools.</li> </ul> <p>Indeed, the objective evidence shows that these changes to the oversubscription criteria are not necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LPSB is currently 'Good' including the teaching aspect. In the past it has been outstanding and in circumstances in which the proposed oversubscription criteria did not apply. Reading the current Ofsted report there is not the slightest suggestion that the gap between current teaching standards and 'outstanding' is in any way related to lack of staff retention, nor to difficulty in recruiting high calibre teachers. For instance, the comment "The quality of teaching is strong. However, there is still a degree of inconsistency within some subject areas" is indicative. No doubt the inconsistency and other mild shortcoming referred to can be addressed without this change to the criteria.</li> <li>- LPSG: much the same points apply.</li> </ul> <p>The changes to the oversubscription criteria are therefore not justified or proportionate in light of the reason given for them. Particularly as, of course, these changes would limit the places available to the children of people (including other teachers) who do not teach at these school.</p>
3052	Neutral		Neutral	<p>Whilst this seems a good idea to support recruitment and retention, we would only be supportive of this concept if it was extended to parents with girls and boys of secondary school age. It feels less than ideal to have children within the same family going to different sites for their secondary schooling. If the approach of the academy is to be more 'joined up' as the consultation alludes to then it would be sensible this is extended to parents as well. There is also no indication of impact on school numbers.</p>
3053	Disagree		Disagree	<p>I do not feel that the child attending a school at which a parent teaches is necessarily a good thing for the child. It may be different when they are in primary school, but at secondary school, children need to be able to develop independently. However there maybe some occasions where it would be beneficial for both.</p> <p>All other professionals have to work in a different place to where their children are at school and I don't see why it should be any different for teachers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">they taught at different schools to their children – and were all glad of it!</p>
3054	Neutral		Disagree	
3055	Neutral		Neutral	
3056	Agree		Agree	<p>This proposal would benefit the Trust and all its schools. It would improve recruitment and retention of the highest quality staff, which can only benefit and improve the education of our children.</p>
3057	Disagree		Disagree	<p>At secondary school age, children are able to take themselves to and from school and therefore if they don't live in the local area, can make arrangements to walk or cycle to a school near to where they live. It isn't necessary to be at the same school as their parents. In particular, I think to work at one school and get priority into the other is completely unfair.</p>
3058	Agree		Agree	
3059	Neutral		Neutral	
3060	Neutral		Neutral	
3061	Neutral		Neutral	
3062	Disagree		No Response	<p>This particular proposed change is clearly a 'perk' to attract new staff, and retain existing employees, at the schools.</p> <p>An exception might be for LA, PLA and fostered children of staff members</p> <p>Would it apply to all staff? Teachers, TAs, support staff?</p> <p>What happens when a child when the parent staff member leaves and becomes employed at another school outside of the Trust?</p>

3063	Disagree		Disagree	<p>Negative effect of this proposal are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It reduces the number of available places for local children that live within the catchment areas of LPSB and LPSG.</li> <li>2. If places for local children are reduced, the local children will end up at schools further away. The consequences of this are... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer travelling times to school, increasing the length of the school day</li> <li>• Having to use public transport resulting in a negative impact on the environment eg. more pollution</li> <li>• If private transport is used it will increase congestion within the local area</li> <li>• It can have a detrimental effect to their health (less exercise as they are unable to walk or cycle to school due to the increased distance) and mental wellbeing (anxiety of using and relying on public transport to get to school on time)</li> <li>• The children's safety is compromised</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Children that have to travel a considerable distance between home and school are unlikely to attend before and after school clubs, isolating them from the social aspect of school life.</li> <li>4. Children who are not living within the catchment/local community of the school tend to be isolated and not mix social (at weekends) with their peers.</li> <li>5. This proposal creates an admissions criteria whereby it appears that LPSB and LPSG operate as a single entity. This is a false impression as they both operate quite independently from one another on many levels.</li> </ol>
3064	Neutral		Neutral	
3065	Agree		Agree	<p>Traditionally, at the age of 11, most children should be able to act with a degree of responsibility and independence and not have to rely on potential additional support in their school careers on staff who are staff members.</p> <p>However, in today's socially media aware society with all the negative effects this can have on young adults (particularly teenagers), we believe that, as with the situation in primary schools, it can be comforting to pupils to know that there is an adult employed and potentially visible at their senior school to whom they can relate at times of distress.</p> <p>In addition, the comments made in the section "Children of Staff - Secondary Schools" in the Consultation Notice regarding the recruiting of and retaining quality staff and the attendance of their children at the senior schools, is logical and makes perfect sense.</p>
3066	Neutral		Neutral	
3067	Neutral		Neutral	
3068	Neutral		Neutral	
3069	Disagree		Disagree	
3070	Agree		Agree	
3071	Disagree		Disagree	
3072	Disagree		Disagree	
3073	Disagree		Disagree	
3074	Disagree		Disagree	
3075	Disagree		Disagree	