

LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Definition of a Sibling

Notes on redactions:

1. Personal data categories have been removed.
2. Personal data within 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		Definition of Sibling	
OTHER KEY CHANGES - Definition of Sibling		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	1489		
Disagree	518		
Neutral	1236		
Not Applicable	89		
No Response	43		
1	Neutral		Centre For Outcomes And Effectiveness Research Department Of Clinical Educational and Health Psychology
2	Neutral		
3	Neutral		
4	Neutral		
5	Neutral		
6	Agree		
7	Neutral		
8	Disagree		
9	Disagree		
10	Agree		
11	Neutral		
12	Agree		
13	Neutral		
14	Neutral		
15	Agree		
16	Agree		
17	Agree		
18	Agree		
19	Neutral		
20	Neutral		
21	Not Applicable		
22	Agree		
23	Agree		The sibling rule should apply regardless of the child's gender. e.g. a girl attending LPSG would count as a sibling for her younger brother wanting to go to LPSB. In your consultation document when talking about current gender unfairness relating to children of staff, you state that; _x000D_ "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_ I agree with this and therefore think the same principle should apply to the sibling rule too. It seems odd to not allow a sibling place to be offered just because their sibling is the wrong gender.
24	Neutral		
25	Not Applicable		
26	Agree		
27	Neutral		
28	Neutral		The principle of creating a feeder school through the trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole.
29	Neutral		
30	Neutral		
31	Neutral		

32	Disagree		
33	Agree		
34	Neutral		
35	Agree		
36	Neutral		
37	Neutral		
38	Agree		
39	Neutral		If any changes are to be made, I'd strongly support LPPS being the ONLY feeder school and the others not, simply based on what was previously promised to parents. We are within the catchment for Langley Park School for Boys and move here specifically for this reason. We are really happy with our decision and our decision to join LPPS. We believe that this wouldn't affect our chances of getting our son into the secondary school, but it would affect the local air quality and safety if all the primary schools are made into feeder schools instead of LPPS which is on the same site
40	Neutral		
41	Agree		
42	Neutral		
43	Neutral		
44	Agree		
45	Agree		
46	Disagree		
47	Agree		
48	Neutral		
49	Disagree		Your consultation document proposes to allow children of staff priority, regardless of the child's sex. The reason stated is to avoid an "unfair situation" where a ".....child does not receive priority because they are the wrong sex..." I agree this makes sense. This cross-school approach (between LPSG and LPSB) makes sense to me but my point is that this same principal should also apply to the sibling rule. The sibling rule should apply across the two secondary schools; so if a girl is attending LPSG, her younger brother should not be disadvantaged just because he is the wrong sex. He should be prioritised a place at LPSB under the sibling rule. It seems that you are trying to address the "unfair situation due to the child's sex" for children of staff but you are not doing anything about the same situation for siblings. This seems unfair to me.
50	Agree		
51	Agree		I was confused by the definition of sibling. Are you suggesting the sibling rule applies regardless of gender - i.e. if you have a child in Langley Girls you get a place at Langley Boys? The wording doesn't make this clear. I would say if it is that both genders are included then this is a good thing for families.
52	Agree		
53	Neutral		
54	Agree		
55	Agree		as noted these children would need to be living at the address of the sibling already attending and proof would need to be provided that this is their main residence
56	Agree		
57	Neutral		
58	Agree		
59	Disagree		
60	Agree		
61	Agree		
62	Neutral		
63	Disagree		
64	Neutral		
65	Agree		
66	Neutral		
67	Agree		
68	Neutral		
69	Not Applicable		
70	Neutral		
71	Agree		
72	Agree		

73	Agree		
74	Neutral		
75	Disagree		
76	Agree		
77	Neutral		
78	Agree		
79	Agree		
80	Agree		
81	Disagree		
82	Disagree		
83	Agree		
84	Agree		
85	Disagree		
86	Agree		
87	Disagree		
88	Neutral		
89	Disagree		
90	Disagree		
91	Neutral		
92	Agree		
93	Agree		
94	No Response		
95	Agree		
96	Agree		
97	Neutral		
98	Agree		
99	Neutral		
100	Neutral		
101	Agree		
102	Neutral		
103	Agree		
104	Agree		
105	Neutral		
106	Neutral		
107	Agree		
108	Neutral		
109	Neutral		
110	Agree		
111	Agree		
112	Neutral		
113	Neutral		
114	Disagree		I object to the inclusion of children of “co-habiting partners” in the definition of siblings. This opens the system up to abuse as co-habiting partners are family members and their children are not siblings unless from the same parents
115	Disagree		
116	Neutral		
117	Agree		
118	Neutral		
119	Agree		
120	Agree		
121	Agree		

122	Neutral		
123	Agree		
124	Neutral		
125	Neutral		
126	Agree		
127	Neutral		If they are completely out of catchment this also should be taken into account
128	Neutral		
129	Neutral		
130	Agree		I agree since for parents dropping and collecting there children from the same school makes it much easier, it reduces stress and pressure on parents - particularly on those that work, and it can also save costs such as on uniforms etc if things can be passed down if siblings attend the same school.
131	Disagree		
132	Neutral		
133	Agree		
134	Disagree		
135	Agree		
136	Neutral		
137	Agree		
138	Agree		
139	Agree		
140	Agree		
141	Agree		
142	Agree		
143	Disagree		
144	Agree		
145	Not Applicable		
146	Disagree		
147	Neutral		
148	Neutral		
149	Disagree		
150	Agree		
151	Neutral		Don't understand the question, do they now class something different as a sibling?
152	Not Applicable		
153	Neutral		
154	Neutral		
155	Neutral		
156	Agree		
157	Neutral		
158	Neutral		
159	Neutral		
160	Disagree		
161	Agree		
162	Neutral		
163	Agree		Some parents are divorced it's fair that siblings school together before others.
164	Agree		
165	Agree		
166	Agree		
167	Agree		
168	Agree		If one child goes to the school subsequent children should be entitled as it will be challenging for parents having children at more than one school unless it is their choice to have children at alternative schools.
169	Agree		

170	Neutral		
171	Disagree		
172	Disagree		
173	Agree		
174	Agree		
175	Agree		
176	Agree		
177	No Response		
178	Agree		
179	Disagree		
180	Neutral		
181	Agree		
182	Disagree		Parents usually ensure they first child gets in the same school and thereafter moved out of the catchment area based on sibling intake, disadvantaging those who are within the Langley academy
183	Neutral		
184	Disagree		
185	Agree		
186	Agree		
187	Neutral		
188	Agree		
189	Disagree		
190	Neutral		
191	Agree		
192	Agree		
193	Neutral		
194	Agree		
195	Neutral		
196	Agree		
197	Agree		
198	Neutral		
199	Agree		
200	Agree		
201	Neutral		
202	Agree		
203	Agree		
204	Agree		
205	Agree		
206	Agree		
207	Disagree		
208	Agree		
209	Agree		
210	Neutral		
211	Agree		
212	Neutral		
213	Neutral		
214	Neutral		
215	Agree		
216	Neutral		
217	Agree		
218	Disagree		This should remain in line with the LBB definition
219	Agree		

220	Agree		Sibling policies should only apply at Primary School level.
221	Not Applicable		
222	Agree		
223	Disagree		
224	Agree		
225	Agree		
226	Disagree		
227	Agree		
228	Disagree		
229	Neutral		
230	Neutral		
231	Disagree		<p>If I am reading this correctly, this is even more of a problem. Not only are priorities given to schools in the trust, but their siblings are? If all the existing criteria are followed for school admissions, then priority should arguable be given to siblings, especially to primary school children, more than secondary school children. But if the criteria is a Trust school, and sibling, this whole process is very unfair in the first to the existing community and students in their current setting, let alone siblings. Not to mention the impact on the non trust schools.</p> <p>which we're also planning to send to the same school, as at the primary school point its very important to keep the children together due to school runs. With the catchment for boys at Park Langley being smaller, with the Trust Feeder proposal, is very unlikely to get in. And I'm not in the position to do 2 separate primary school runs, even if does get a place at a trust school just so he can get into . This further reduces the catchment area for families who don't currently have children at . This is more of a relevant point than Siblings of Year 13 students will not be accepted.</p>
232	Agree		
233	Disagree		
234	Disagree		
235	Disagree		Do you mean sibling in any of the LPLT schools? would get priority in which case I disagree.
236	Neutral		
237	Disagree		
238	Neutral		
239	Neutral		
240	Disagree		
241	Agree		
242	Agree		
243	Disagree		
244	Disagree		
245	Not Applicable		
246	Disagree		
247	Agree		
248	Agree		
249	Agree		
250	Agree		
251	Agree		
252	Disagree		
253	Agree		
254	Neutral		
255	Not Applicable		
256	Agree		
257	Agree		
258	Disagree		
259	Neutral		
260	Agree		
261	Disagree		
262	Neutral		

263	Agree		
264	Neutral		
265	Disagree		
266	Neutral		
267	Disagree		
268	Agree		
269	Neutral		
270	Agree		
271	Disagree		
272	Neutral		
273	Not Applicable		
274	Neutral		
275	Agree		
276	Agree		
277	Disagree		
278	Neutral		
279	Neutral		
280	Neutral		
281	Disagree		
282	Disagree		
283	Agree		
284	Neutral		
285	Agree		
286	Agree		
287	Neutral		
288	Disagree		
289	Agree		
290	Agree		
291	Agree		
292	Agree		
293	Agree		
294	Disagree		The definition of siblings is too wide. Some may have more than 2 siblings and that will be unfair on people who have been considerate on world population and only have one child.
295	Disagree		
296	Disagree		
297	Neutral		
298	Agree		
299	Neutral		
300	Disagree		
301	Neutral		
302	Neutral		
303	Agree		
304	Neutral		
305	Agree		
306	Agree		There are a lot of blended and extended families nowadays.
307	Agree		I agree with the sibling criteria
308	Neutral		
309	Neutral		
310	Neutral		
311	Neutral		
312	Neutral		

313	Neutral		
314	Neutral		
315	Not Applicable		
316	Neutral		
317	Agree		
318	Agree		
319	Disagree		
320	Neutral		
321	Agree		
322	Disagree		
323	Agree		
324	Disagree		
325	Neutral		
326	Neutral		
327	Agree		
328	Agree		
329	Agree		
330	Neutral		
331	Agree	& my main worry was that I have all part of the Langley trust makes more sense for siblings to attend the same school I.E Langley girls & Langley Boys	this worry’s me so much & the fact we are
332	Agree		
333	Neutral		
334	Neutral		
335	Agree		
336	Agree		
337	Agree		
338	Neutral		
339	Agree		
340	Agree		
341	Neutral		
342	Disagree		
343	Neutral		
344	Disagree		
345	Agree		
346	Agree		
347	Neutral		
348	Agree		
349	Agree		
350	Disagree		
351	Agree		
352	Neutral		
353	Disagree		
354	Agree		
355	Agree		
356	Disagree		
357	Neutral		
358	Agree		
359	Disagree	Sibling rule should apply for those living at the same address for the same reasons as above, unless the child spends significant amounts of time at with the parent/carer who is not the primary parent/carer.	
360	Agree		

361	Neutral		
362	Disagree		
363	Agree		
364	Neutral		
365	Disagree		
366	Disagree		
367	Agree		
368	Agree		
369	Agree		
370	Neutral		
371	Agree		
372	Disagree		This proposal is open to abuse (particularly for children of cohabiting partners)
373	Agree		
374	Agree		
375	Neutral		
376	Agree		
377	Agree		
378	Disagree		
379	Agree		
380	Disagree		
381	Agree		
382	Neutral		
383	Neutral		
384	Neutral		
385	Agree		
386	Agree		
387	Disagree		
388	Agree		
389	Agree		
390	Agree		
391	Neutral		
392	Neutral		
393	Neutral		Siblings should be allowed to attend the same school as its easier for the modern family unit, as long as the 'family', are indeed a 'real' family and not trying to trick the system to get a place
394	Disagree		
395	Neutral		
396	Agree		
397	Agree		
398	Agree		
399	Agree		
400	Disagree		
401	Neutral		
402	Neutral		
403	Neutral		
404	Neutral		
405	Neutral		
406	Agree		
407	Agree		
408	Neutral		
409	Agree		
410	Agree		

411	Neutral		
412	Disagree		
413	Agree		
414	Neutral		
415	Neutral		
416	Neutral		
417	Agree		
418	Neutral		
419	Agree		
420	Not Applicable		
421	Neutral		
422	Neutral		
423	Agree		
424	Agree		
425	Agree		
426	Neutral		
427	Disagree		
428	Neutral		
429	Disagree		
430	Neutral		
431	Agree		
432	Neutral		
433	Disagree		
434	Neutral		
435	Agree		
436	Neutral		
437	Agree		
438	Agree		Blended families should be treated equally.
439	No Response		
440	Agree		This is fair.
441	Not Applicable		
442	Neutral		
443	Agree		Option A - preference to siblings within the LPPS is fair. The theme of my responses to help the family life by not having children in the same household scattered across schools.
444	Agree		
445	Neutral		
446	Neutral		
447	Agree		
448	Agree		
449	Disagree		
450	Disagree		
451	Disagree		
452	Neutral		
453	Neutral		
454	Agree		
455	Disagree		
456	Neutral		
457	Agree		
458	Agree		
459	Agree		
460	Disagree		

461	Agree		
462	Agree		Clarifying the definition is sensible to avoid confusion
463	Agree		
464	Agree		
465	Agree		
466	Agree		
467	Neutral		
468	Agree		
469	Neutral		
470	Disagree		
471	Neutral		
472	Disagree		
473	Agree		
474	Agree		
475	Agree		
476	Agree		
477	Disagree		
478	Disagree		
479	Agree		
480	Agree		
481	Neutral		
482	Neutral		
483	Neutral		
484	Neutral		
485	Agree		
486	Neutral		
487	Agree		
488	Disagree		
489	Agree		
490	Agree		
491	Agree		
492	Neutral		
493	Agree		
494	Agree		
495	Agree		
496	Disagree		
497	Neutral		
498	Agree		
499	Agree		
500	Agree		
501	Neutral		
502	Disagree		
503	Disagree		
504	Agree		
505	Not Applicable		
506	Neutral		
507	Neutral		
508	Disagree		It does not include children who live at the same address and are cared for by the same parent. i..e an adult caring for both their own child and a relative's child due to personal circumstances.
509	Agree		
510	Agree		

511	Disagree		
512	Agree		
513	Disagree		I think the new definition of sibling is too broad and open to being abused to gain a place
514	Neutral		
515	Neutral		
516	Disagree		
517	Neutral		
518	Agree		
519	Disagree		
520	Agree		
521	Neutral		
522	Neutral		
523	Neutral		
524	Neutral		
525	Agree		
526	Agree		
527	Neutral		
528	Agree		
529	Agree		
530	Neutral		
531	No Response		
532	Disagree		
533	Agree		
534	Agree		
535	Neutral		
536	Neutral		
537	Neutral		
538	No Response		
539	Agree		
540	Agree		
541	Neutral		
542	Agree		
543	Neutral		
544	Neutral		
545	Disagree		Siblings living at the same address should be given a priority. This should come first along with a parent working at the secondary school for at least 2 years.
546	Disagree		
547	Disagree		
548	Agree		
549	Neutral		
550	Disagree		
551	Neutral		
552	Disagree		
553	Agree		
554	Agree		
555	Agree		
556	Agree		
557	Neutral		
558	Neutral		
559	Disagree		
560	Agree		The change acknowledges the changes/differences in modern family structures.

561	Agree		
562	Neutral		
563	Neutral		
564	Disagree		This is random and does not allow equal access
565	Neutral		
566	Disagree		
567	Disagree		
568	Agree		
569	Agree		I agree in principle with this change in definition but appropriate safeguards should be established to prevent it being exploited by unscrupulous applicants.
570	Neutral		
571	Neutral		
572	Neutral		
573	Neutral		
574	Agree		
575	No Response		
576	Not Applicable		
577	Neutral		
578	Neutral		
579	Agree		
580	Disagree		
581	Agree		
582	Neutral		
583	Neutral		
584	Disagree		
585	Agree		
586	Neutral		
587	Agree		
588	Agree		
589	Agree		
590	Agree		
591	Neutral		
592	Neutral		
593	Neutral		
594	Not Applicable		
595	Disagree		Half Siblings etc do not always live full time together. So they may live in the same house but it might not be there main home. People would use this as an excuse to get half siblings/step siblings into the better school.
596	Neutral		
597	Disagree		
598	Agree		
599	Disagree		
600	Neutral		
601	Neutral		
602	Disagree		
603	Neutral		
604	Neutral		
605	Neutral		
606	Disagree		
607	Neutral		
608	Neutral		
609	Agree		

610	Agree		
611	Disagree		A child should be offered a place in a school where there is already a sibling attending.
612	Disagree		
613	Neutral		
614	Agree		
615	Agree		
616	Agree		
617	Neutral		
618	Neutral		
619	Disagree		Unfair on local park Langley community and the generation of parents who have paid outrageous premiums (by mortgages) in order for their children to attend LPSB.
620	Neutral		
621	Neutral		
622	No Response		
623	Agree		
624	Not Applicable		
625	Neutral		
626	Neutral		
627	Agree		
628	Agree		This is much fairer to adopted, step and foster siblings.
629	Neutral		
630	Neutral		
631	Agree		
632	Neutral		
633	Agree		
634	Neutral		
635	Disagree		
636	Disagree		
637	Agree		
638	Agree		
639	Agree		
640	Neutral		
641	Neutral		
642	Neutral		
643	Agree		
644	Agree		
645	Agree		
646	Disagree		
647	Agree		
648	Agree		
649	Neutral		
650	Agree		
651	Not Applicable		& has no choice of other schools we are only just in the catchment area anyway & the feeder school will make the catchment area even smaller which will give her no chance of getting in to another local school
652	Agree		
653	Neutral		
654	Agree		
655	Agree		Siblings should have priority to join their brothers/sisters
656	Neutral		
657	Disagree		
658	Neutral		I believe that it useful to have a wider definition of the term sibling

659	Neutral		
660	Neutral		
661	Agree		
662	Not Applicable		
663	Agree		
664	Neutral		
665	Agree		
666	Agree		
667	Neutral		
668	No Response		
669	Neutral		
670	Disagree		
671	Neutral		
672	Agree		
673	Agree		
674	Agree		
675	Neutral		
676	Neutral		
677	Neutral		
678	Agree		
679	Neutral		
680	Disagree		
681	Disagree		
682	Neutral		
683	Neutral		
684	Agree		
685	Agree		
686	Agree		
687	Agree		
688	Neutral		
689	Agree		
690	Not Applicable		
691	Agree		
692	Agree		
693	Neutral		
694	Neutral		
695	Agree		
696	Agree		
697	Agree		Seems reasonable.
698	Neutral		
699	Agree		
700	Neutral		
701	Neutral		It's important to recognise different family structures and dynamics. I'd be interested to know how this policy would impact upon the % of places available to children with no family members at the schools.
702	Neutral		
703	Agree		
704	Agree		
705	Agree		
706	Neutral		
707	Neutral		

708	Agree		
709	Neutral		
710	Agree		
711	Agree		
712	Disagree		
713	Disagree		If a child permanently lives with a child already in the school, then they should qualify as a sibling
714	Agree		
715	Neutral		
716	Not Applicable		
717	Neutral		
718	Agree		
719	Agree		
720	Agree		
721	Agree		
722	Agree		sensible
723	Neutral		
724	Agree		
725	Neutral		
726	Disagree		Surely sibling should be extended to mean those with brothers at Langley Boys?
727	Disagree		
728	Agree		
729	Disagree		
730	No Response		
731	Disagree		
732	Disagree		
733	Disagree		Expanding the definition of sibling appears to reflect complex modern families, however it is also more open to false manipulation and temporary arrangements. This would not seem sensible, mixed families do not necessarily expect children to attend the same school in oversubscribed areas.
734	Agree		
735	Neutral		
736	Disagree		Only for children who permanently live together.
737	Disagree		A sibling is a sibling regardless of categorization and internal family matters and issues.
738	Agree		
739	Agree		Yes I think this makes sense.
740	Agree		
741	Agree		
742	Neutral		
743	Disagree		
744	Neutral		
745	Neutral		
746	Neutral		
747	Agree		
748	Neutral		
749	Not Applicable		
750	Agree		
751	Not Applicable		
752	Neutral		
753	Agree		
754	Neutral		
755	Agree		
756	Agree		

757	Disagree		
758	Neutral		
759	Agree		
760	Neutral		
761	Disagree		
762	Agree		
763	Agree		
764	Agree		
765	Agree		
766	Disagree		
767	Neutral		
768	Agree		
769	Neutral		
770	Neutral		
771	Agree		
772	Agree		
773	Disagree		
774	Agree		
775	Agree		
776	Not Applicable		
777	No Response		
778	Agree		
779	Agree		
780	Neutral		
781	Agree		
782	Neutral		
783	Not Applicable		
784	Disagree		
785	Neutral		
786	Disagree		
787	Neutral		
788	Neutral		No comments
789	Disagree		
790	Neutral		My concern is that you are widening the opportunity for abuse. Genuine step siblings that live together should be counted as siblings but I fear people may abuse this and declare they are living together when not.
791	Neutral		
792	Agree		
793	Disagree		
794	Neutral		No comment
795	Neutral		
796	Neutral		
797	Agree		
798	Neutral		I think if you introduce feeder schools then the sibling rule should cross over between the two Secondary schools like at Bullers Wood boys and girls.
799	Neutral		
800	Neutral		
801	Disagree		
802	Disagree		
803	Agree		
804	Agree		
805	Agree		

806	Agree		
807	Agree		The numbers involved must be relatively immaterial.
808	Agree		
809	Agree		
810	Agree		
811	Agree		
812	Disagree		
813	Neutral		
814	Agree		
815	Agree		
816	Agree		
817	Neutral		
818	Agree		
819	Disagree		
820	Neutral		
821	Not Applicable		
822	Disagree		Not aware of change of definition of sibling.
823	Agree		
824	Agree		
825	Neutral		
826	Disagree		
827	Neutral		
828	Agree		Siblings, I feel should be given priority, as this helps families and schools to develop a good working relationship over time, which is conducive to the pupils' levels of progress through the school. This is vital for pupils, and helpful for the effectiveness of the school.
829	Disagree		Too wide ranging, keep the definition simple otherwise practically all children will be siblings in some form or another
830	Agree		
831	Neutral		
832	Agree		
833	Agree		
834	Agree		
835	Agree		
836	Agree		
837	Neutral		
838	Neutral		
839	Neutral		As above sibling gender neutrality should also be adopted to be equally compliant. There are no grounds in an inclusive and integrated MAT for families with children of the same gender getting into Langley secondaries but those with mixed gendered children do not. This is illegal sex discrimination and through this review of admissions you can stop that.
840	Agree		
841	Neutral		
842	Agree		
843	Agree		
844	Disagree		
845	Agree		It is reasonable to assume your children (with differing gender) should be able to go to the same school/geographic location.
846	Neutral		
847	Agree		
848	Agree		
849	Agree		
850	Neutral		
851	Neutral		
852	Neutral		
853	Agree		

854	Agree		
855	Disagree		
856	Disagree		
857	Disagree		
858	Neutral		
859	Agree		
860	Disagree		
861	Neutral		
862	Agree		
863	No Response		
864	Agree		Appropriate in current time to update this definition
865	Disagree		
866	Neutral		
867	No Response		
868	Neutral		
869	Agree		
870	Agree		
871	Agree		only on the basis the siblings all live together
872	Agree		
873	Neutral		
874	Neutral		
875	Disagree		This revised admission policy would exclude other local primary schools.
876	Neutral		
877	Not Applicable		
878	Disagree		
879	Neutral		
880	Agree		
881	Agree		
882	Disagree		
883	Agree		
884	Neutral		
885	Disagree		
886	Agree		It would make sense to make both boys and girls schools the same catchment criteria.
887	Agree		
888	Neutral		
889	Disagree		Please see other comments section.
890	Agree		
891	Neutral		
892	Neutral		
893	Neutral		
894	Neutral		
895	Disagree		
896	Disagree		
897	Agree		
898	Agree		
899	Agree		
900	Agree		I fully agree with the Oversubscribed Option A. A sibling rule should apply between Langley girls and Langley boys school. As a parent with a I feel a better link between the Langley parks school would be beneficial.
901	Neutral		
902	Neutral		

903	Neutral		
904	Disagree		
905	Disagree		
906	Disagree		
907	Neutral		
908	Disagree		
909	Agree		
910	Disagree		I would prefer to understand in more detail how rigorous the trust are at establishing and applying the new definition.
911	Disagree		
912	Neutral		
913	Disagree		Sibling should describe a person who is by birth or adoption part of the family, whether in residence or not
914	Agree		
915	Neutral		
916	Neutral		
917	Neutral		
918	Agree		
919	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 to attend your excellent school. I urge you to re think changing the current admission policy.
920	Agree		
921	Disagree		
922	Neutral		
923	Neutral		
924	Agree		
925	Neutral		
926	Agree		Why would you want to make siblings attend different schools? It's a must do.
927	Agree		
928	Not Applicable		
929	Neutral		
930	Agree		
931	Neutral		
932	Disagree		
933	Agree		
934	Agree		
935	Neutral		
936	Agree		
937	Neutral		
938	Neutral		
939	Disagree		
940	Neutral		
941	Neutral		
942	Agree		
943	Neutral		
944	Agree		
945	Agree		
946	Agree		
947	Agree		

948	Agree		
949	Agree		
950	Agree		
951	Neutral		
952	Neutral		
953	Agree		makes things clearer and prevents exploitation of the sibling rules
954	Agree		
955	Neutral		
956	Agree		
957	Neutral		
958	Neutral		
959	Neutral		
960	Agree		Given how family living situations are changing this should be a priority
961	Agree		
962	Agree		
963	Agree		
964	Agree		It reflects today's families more accurately
965	Neutral		If the child's sibling is already at the secondary school and they live within catchment makes sense. If the child is at a primary feeder only, I don't think the sibling should get a place in the secondary school automatically.
966	Disagree		Siblings from the Langley secondary schools should have priority admission. _x000D_ If you DON'T give priority to primary children from the Langley trust you're more likely to have enough places for siblings !!
967	Agree		
968	Neutral		
969	Neutral		
970	Disagree		
971	Agree		
972	Neutral		
973	Agree		
974	Neutral		
975	Neutral		
976	Agree		
977	Neutral		
978	Agree		
979	Agree		
980	Disagree		
981	Agree		
982	Neutral		
983	Agree		
984	Agree		
985	Neutral		
986	Disagree		
987	Agree		
988	Agree		
989	Agree		
990	Neutral		
991	Agree		
992	Neutral		
993	Neutral		
994	Agree		
995	Disagree		

996	Agree		
997	Neutral		
998	Agree		
999	Neutral		
1000	Agree		
1001	Not Applicable		
1002	Neutral		
1003	Disagree		
1004	Agree		
1005	Neutral		
1006	Disagree		
1007	Disagree		Do not agree with the addition of step siblings or cohabiting siblings to the definition. Should be siblings related by blood or legally adopted only, who live at the same address.
1008	Agree		
1009	Disagree		
1010	Disagree		
1011	Agree		
1012	Not Applicable		
1013	Agree		
1014	Agree		
1015	Agree		Recognising half and foster siblings is only right in a modern society.
1016	Neutral		
1017	Agree		
1018	Neutral		
1019	Disagree		
1020	Neutral		
1021	Neutral		
1022	Neutral		
1023	Neutral		I cannot clearly see any changes other than that if clearly defining the term 'sibling'. This must be in-line with other schools admissions.
1024	Agree		
1025	Agree		
1026	Agree		
1027	Neutral		
1028	Agree		
1029	Neutral		
1030	Neutral		
1031	Agree		
1032	Agree		
1033	Disagree		
1034	Agree		
1035	Agree		
1036	Neutral		
1037	Neutral		
1038	Agree		
1039	Neutral		
1040	Agree		
1041	Agree		
1042	Neutral		
1043	Neutral		
1044	Agree		
1045	Agree		

1046	Neutral		
1047	Agree		
1048	Agree		
1049	Agree		
1050	Disagree		
1051	Agree		
1052	Disagree		
1053	Disagree		This seems to now virtually include any one living at the same address!! How on earth are you going to prove who is who? Again this is open to abuse but I don't know how you can possibly monitor who is a sibling, half sibling, step sibling.... How long do you have to be cohabiting partners for before application? Or can you just cohabit from the day before applications are due in? Presumably utility bills and child benefit need to be registered to that address but how long for?
1054	Disagree		
1055	Neutral		
1056	Agree		
1057	Agree		
1058	Disagree		Nothing should change. If anything, we think siblings from either secondary school, boys or girls, should apply ie a sister of a brother going to the Boys school should get priority with admission to the Girls school.
1059	Neutral		
1060	Neutral		
1061	Neutral		
1062	Agree		
1063	Neutral		It makes it easier for families to be together. Although I don't think this should include the 6th form. Or if Step children do not actually live at address. This could cause a lot of extra paper work
1064	Agree		
1065	Neutral		
1066	Agree		
1067	Disagree		
1068	Neutral		
1069	Agree		
1070	Neutral		
1071	Neutral		How rigorous will checks be into the precise relationship of any sibling applicant? Widening the definition of sibling could make it easier for unscrupulous individuals to manipulate the system to their advantage.
1072	Agree		
1073	Neutral		
1074	Agree		
1075	Agree		Agreed
1076	Neutral		
1077	Neutral		
1078	Disagree		
1079	Neutral		
1080	Neutral		
1081	Disagree		
1082	Disagree		
1083	Disagree		
1084	Disagree		I only agree that the sibling rule should apply across both boys and girls senior schools as their admission should be obtained on living locally in the first instance.
1085	Agree		
1086	Neutral		
1087	Disagree		
1088	Disagree		
1089	Not Applicable		
1090	Agree		
1091	Agree		

1092	Agree		
1093	Agree		
1094	Agree		
1095	Neutral		
1096	Agree		
1097	Agree		
1098	Disagree		A sibling is blood or step brother/sister living at the same address .
1099	Not Applicable		
1100	Disagree		Again, this should come down to proximity to the school, which has been in place for years, and not giving priority to children from schools from the same trust, which appears to me nothing more than an attempt to gain more applications to Hawes Down and other schools in the same trust, and therefore increasing funding for these schools. It's crazy and not right that this proposal to prioritize children from schools much further than . This is grossly unfair on parents with kids outside of this trust. We moved to our house at great expense, as in previous years the catchment area covered our house. Our choice for primary school for would have changed if this had been known at the time, as
1101	Disagree		Foster-care by definition is a short term solution
1102	Agree		
1103	Neutral		
1104	Neutral		
1105	Disagree		
1106	Agree		
1107	Neutral		
1108	Disagree		
1109	Agree		
1110	No Response		
1111	Not Applicable		
1112	Agree		
1113	Neutral		
1114	Neutral		
1115	Neutral		
1116	Disagree		Whilst overall I am supportive of the definition I strongly disagree with this element: "the child of the parent's cohabiting partner". How is that to be measured? I believe this would be open to abuse if individuals are able to claim they cohabit when in fact they do not. And additionally, cohabitation, even if it is genuine, has far less solidity and commitment to the arrangement than marriage; cohabitation can of course end in very sudden and abrupt ways whereas marriage is a far more durable and legally recognised arrangement. I would recommend removing the cohabitation element.
1117	Disagree		
1118	Agree		Clearly if the sibling comes. It makes sense from an economic and environmental issuethat both or all children go to ye same school . Not to mention. The sociological impact.
1119	Neutral		
1120	Agree		My son attends and this would be incredibly unfair when there are a lack of (boys secondary schools in Bromley).
1121	Agree		
1122	Neutral		
1123	Disagree		
1124	Agree		
1125	Agree		
1126	Disagree		With regard to secondary schools the sibling rule becomes very difficult. Many times a student is still at school but the parents have moved out of the catchment which means that someone entering year 13 can have a younger sibling eligible for entry in year 7 with potentially 7 years of education in a school that is not local to them any more. As before, at secondary age it is considered acceptable for year 7 children to travel to a local school independently so there is no need to be at the same school necessarily. It should be based on distance for local children. Also, very often external candidates who live very far away are then eligible for their siblings to attend these schools when it is nowhere near their own home. I see frequently students boarding at New Beckenham Station in uniform which is way out of catchment so can only assume they have moved or have an older sibling still at the school.
1127	Neutral		
1128	Disagree		
1129	Agree		
1130	Agree		
1131	Agree		

1132	Agree		
1133	Not Applicable		
1134	Neutral		
1135	Agree		
1136	Agree		
1137	Agree		
1138	Not Applicable		
1139	Neutral		
1140	Not Applicable		
1141	Neutral		
1142	Agree		
1143	Neutral		
1144	Neutral		
1145	Disagree		
1146	Disagree		
1147	Disagree		
1148	Agree		
1149	Agree		
1150	Disagree		
1151	Neutral		
1152	Agree		
1153	Neutral		
1154	Neutral		
1155	Disagree		
1156	Disagree		
1157	Agree		
1158	Neutral		
1159	Disagree		
1160	Agree		
1161	Neutral		
1162	Neutral		
1163	Agree		
1164	Neutral		
1165	Neutral		
1166	No Response		
1167	Neutral		
1168	Disagree		
1169	Agree		
1170	Neutral		
1171	Disagree		This is totally unfair and unacceptable. Children already in primary setting had envisaged going to these schools and their exclusion, which is ultimately what this leads to is discriminatory and without basis.
1172	Neutral		
1173	Neutral		
1174	Agree		
1175	Neutral		
1176	Neutral		
1177	Neutral		
1178	Agree		
1179	Neutral		
1180	Neutral		

1181	Agree		
1182	Neutral		
1183	Neutral		
1184	Agree		
1185	Neutral		
1186	Agree		
1187	Neutral		
1188	Neutral		
1189	Neutral		
1190	Neutral		
1191	Neutral		
1192	Agree		
1193	Agree		
1194	Agree		
1195	Agree		
1196	Neutral		
1197	Neutral		
1198	Neutral		
1199	Neutral		
1200	No Response		
1201	Neutral		
1202	Disagree		
1203	Neutral		
1204	Neutral		
1205	Disagree		
1206	Disagree		
1207	Neutral		
1208	Agree		I wouldn't want my kids going separate schools
1209	Not Applicable		
1210	Neutral		
1211	Disagree		
1212	Neutral		
1213	Disagree		
1214	Neutral		
1215	Neutral		
1216	Neutral		
1217	Neutral		
1218	Neutral		
1219	Disagree		
1220	Neutral		
1221	Neutral		
1222	Neutral		The cohabiting aspect could easily be abused in order to get a place at the school. Where a commitment has been made through marriage or civil partnership then it is clear that the parents are sharing responsibility and the children are therefore 'equal' siblings whether full, half or step.
1223	Disagree		
1224	Neutral		
1225	Disagree		Clarification should be provided that in the case of LPSB and LPSG that the definition of sibling relates to that particular school. This then provides the same level of inequality as the trust is seeking to address by altering the children of staff criteria. In respect to LPSB and LPSG sibling should relate to either school to avoid gender discrimination.
1226	Neutral		
1227	Neutral		No comment
1228	Neutral		

1229	Not Applicable		
1230	Neutral		
1231	Neutral		
1232	Agree		
1233	Disagree		
1234	Agree		I think it is fair for siblings to attend same primary, secondary or partner schools.
1235	Agree		
1236	Neutral		
1237	Disagree		
1238	Neutral		
1239	Agree		
1240	Agree		
1241	Agree		
1242	Neutral		This new statement makes the sibling rule clearer but would allow short term partners the ability of getting their child into the school/s even if the relationship is not long term!
1243	Neutral		
1244	Agree		
1245	Neutral		
1246	Neutral		
1247	Neutral		
1248	Neutral		
1249	Disagree		
1250	Disagree		
1251	Disagree		It appears that the gender of the Sibling is currently discriminated against within the two secondary schools incorporated in the trust.
1252	Agree		
1253	Agree		
1254	Disagree		
1255	Agree		
1256	Disagree		
1257	Agree		
1258	Neutral		
1259	Neutral		
1260	Disagree		
1261	Neutral		
1262	Neutral		
1263	Agree		
1264	Agree		
1265	Disagree		
1266	Agree		
1267	Agree		
1268	Agree		
1269	Agree		
1270	Agree		
1271	Agree		
1272	Neutral		
1273	Agree		
1274	Agree		
1275	Agree		
1276	Neutral		
1277	Agree		if you child already goes to school at langley allowing siblings is fair as it's travel etc would be easier.

1278	Agree		
1279	Neutral		
1280	Agree		I think the recognition of different family structures is sensible and seems to work within acceptable bounds of who might genuinely be classed as a sibling.
1281	Agree		
1282	Neutral		
1283	Agree		
1284	Not Applicable		
1285	Disagree		
1286	Disagree		A Sibling is either a blood or step brother or sister who lives permanently in the same house.
1287	Disagree		
1288	Neutral		
1289	Agree		
1290	Not Applicable		
1291	Neutral		
1292	Neutral		
1293	Neutral		
1294	Agree		
1295	Agree		
1296	Neutral		
1297	Agree		
1298	Agree		
1299	Neutral		
1300	Agree		
1301	Neutral		
1302	Neutral		
1303	Disagree		
1304	Agree		
1305	Neutral		
1306	Neutral		
1307	Neutral		
1308	Disagree		
1309	Neutral		
1310	Neutral		
1311	Neutral		
1312	Agree		
1313	Disagree		
1314	Neutral		
1315	Agree		
1316	Neutral		
1317	Agree		
1318	Agree		
1319	Neutral		
1320	Agree		
1321	Neutral		
1322	Not Applicable		
1323	Disagree		
1324	Agree		
1325	Disagree		
1326	Neutral		
1327	Agree		

1328	Neutral		
1329	Disagree		
1330	Neutral		
1331	Disagree		
1332	Agree		
1333	Agree		
1334	Neutral		
1335	Agree		
1336	Agree		
1337	Agree		
1338	Neutral		
1339	Agree		
1340	Agree		
1341	Agree		
1342	Neutral		
1343	Agree		
1344	Neutral		
1345	Agree		
1346	Neutral		
1347	Agree		
1348	Agree		
1349	Neutral		
1350	Neutral		
1351	Neutral		
1352	Neutral		
1353	Agree		
1354	Neutral		
1355	Agree		
1356	Neutral		
1357	Neutral		
1358	Agree		
1359	Neutral		
1360	Not Applicable		
1361	Agree		
1362	Agree		
1363	Not Applicable		
1364	Neutral		
1365	Disagree		
1366	Neutral		
1367	Neutral		
1368	Neutral		
1369	Neutral		
1370	Neutral		
1371	Agree		
1372	Neutral		
1373	Agree		
1374	Neutral		

1375	Disagree		I am against the guarantee of any Secondary School placement on the basis of 'sibling' in any schools admission criteria. I do not feel nor understand why a sibling should be guaranteed a secondary school placement. It is clear why the sibling rule exists in primary schools (parents can not logistically be taking and collecting children from different schools at the same times), but children aged >11years should be travelling to school independently, so siblings at different schools should not be of significance. The current sibling rule is already widely abused, in that families move to rent property in an area, secure one child's place at preferred secondary school, then move back to original address or completely out of local area, knowing that all subsequent children will automatically secure a place at that Secondary School, again at the expense of local children with an established life in the local area. Extending the sibling criteria will inevitably lead to even more abuses of the sibling rule.
1376	Agree		Sensible
1377	Disagree		A sibling usually lives at the same address.
1378	Neutral		
1379	Agree		this is a fair policy and I agree with this definition
1380	Neutral		
1381	Disagree		i do not believe the consultation clearly outlines the reasons, nor the anticipated impact of the proposed policy clearly enough for stakeholders to make an informed decision. For this reason, i do not believe the consultation has provided data of sufficient clarity to enable stakeholders to make an informed decision therefore the view has to be that this definition should remain unchanged until this is better presented.
1382	Agree		
1383	Neutral		
1384	Neutral		
1385	Agree		
1386	Neutral		
1387	Neutral		
1388	Disagree		
1389	Disagree		
1390	Disagree		
1391	Disagree		
1392	Disagree		
1393	Agree		
1394	Agree		
1395	Agree		
1396	Agree		
1397	Not Applicable		
1398	Agree		Of course siblings should get priority.
1399	Agree		
1400	Agree		
1401	Agree		
1402	Agree		
1403	Agree		as long as all documentation and guardianship is checked all family arrangements should be given fair access.
1404	Agree		
1405	Neutral		
1406	Disagree		
1407	Agree		
1408	Agree		
1409	Agree		
1410	Neutral		
1411	Disagree		The current sibling policy should just be extended to include schools on the campus only.
1412	Disagree		
1413	Not Applicable		
1414	Neutral		
1415	Disagree		
1416	Agree		
1417	No Response		

1418	Agree		As long as the family still live in the catchment.
1419	Agree		
1420	Neutral		The main purpose of sibling priority is build relationships with families to make it easier for parents to manage taking children to and from primary schools, and for older children to support younger siblings. So long as these are from the same address the purpose is served. This is not the same for secondary schools where the case for sibling priority is much less strong as children become more independent and, if there is a high level of oversubscription can act unfairly.
1421	Agree		
1422	Agree		
1423	Disagree		
1424	Neutral		
1425	Agree		
1426	Agree		
1427	Neutral		
1428	Agree		
1429	Neutral		
1430	Agree		
1431	Disagree		
1432	Agree		
1433	Neutral		
1434	Disagree		
1435	Neutral		
1436	Agree		
1437	Agree		
1438	Agree		
1439	Disagree		
1440	Neutral		
1441	Disagree		
1442	Agree		
1443	Disagree		
1444	Disagree		
1445	Agree		
1446	Neutral		
1447	Disagree		
1448	Neutral		
1449	Neutral		
1450	Neutral		
1451	Disagree		
1452	Agree		it is fair that children that are natural siblings, step siblings, foster siblings etc living at the same address should all be given the opportunity to attend the same school. It would encourage a more balanced home life, helping with wellbeing.
1453	Agree		
1454	Agree		
1455	Disagree		
1456	Not Applicable		
1457	Neutral		
1458	Neutral		
1459	Neutral		
1460	Disagree		
1461	Agree		
1462	Disagree		
1463	Neutral		
1464	Neutral		

1465	Disagree		
1466	Neutral		
1467	No Response		
1468	Agree		
1469	Disagree		
1470	Neutral		
1471	Neutral		
1472	Neutral		
1473	Agree		
1474	Neutral		
1475	Neutral		
1476	Neutral		
1477	Agree		We agree to a girl In LPGS counting as a sibling for her brother wanting to enter LPBS and vice versa.
1478	Agree		
1479	Agree		
1480	Neutral		
1481	Neutral		
1482	Neutral		
1483	Neutral		
1484	Agree		
1485	Agree		
1486	Neutral		
1487	Disagree		
1488	Disagree		
1489	Agree		
1490	Agree		
1491	Agree		
1492	Disagree		
1493	Agree		
1494	Neutral		
1495	Neutral		
1496	Agree		
1497	Neutral		
1498	Agree		
1499	Agree		
1500	Agree		
1501	Neutral		
1502	Agree		
1503	Not Applicable		
1504	Neutral		
1505	Neutral		
1506	Disagree		Is this the norm as it now stands or a proposed change? If a change it will affect the parameters of fair access For local children
1507	Neutral		
1508	Agree		
1509	Disagree		
1510	Agree		
1511	Disagree		
1512	Agree		
1513	Neutral		
1514	Disagree		

1515	Neutral		Agree in principle but may be open to potential abuse of system - what checks are going to be in place?
1516	Neutral		
1517	Agree		
1518	Agree		
1519	Neutral		
1520	Neutral		
1521	Disagree		You (attempt to) make a strong case for the proposed changes by citing how beneficial connections between all schools in your trust are. You take every opportunity to explain how closely the schools are linked. _x000D_ _x000D_ And yet, you have not proposed that siblings of children who go to the 'other Langley school should have priority. Why not?
1522	Disagree		
1523	No Response		
1524	Neutral		
1525	Neutral		
1526	Agree		
1527	Agree		
1528	Not Applicable		
1529	Neutral		
1530	Disagree		It is too broad.
1531	Neutral		
1532	Neutral		
1533	Disagree		
1534	Neutral		
1535	Neutral		
1536	No Response		
1537	Neutral		
1538	Neutral		
1539	Agree		The definition of family in modern times is changing and the school admissions practices should keep up with this. This is a step in the right direction.
1540	Neutral		
1541	Neutral		
1542	Disagree		
1543	Neutral		
1544	Neutral		
1545	Neutral		
1546	Neutral		
1547	Not Applicable		
1548	Disagree		
1549	Not Applicable		
1550	Agree		
1551	Agree		
1552	Neutral		
1553	Agree		
1554	Disagree		
1555	Neutral		
1556	Neutral		
1557	Agree		
1558	Disagree		
1559	Agree		
1560	Disagree		I feel that the changes to the sibling rule could potentially be open to abuse, potentially leading to an increase in dishonest applications.
1561	Agree		

1562	Agree		
1563	Neutral		
1564	Agree		The make up of families is changing and this should be taken into account.
1565	Disagree		
1566	Disagree		
1567	Disagree		
1568	Disagree		
1569	Disagree		
1570	Neutral		
1571	Agree		
1572	Agree		
1573	Neutral		
1574	Agree		It is obviously sensible that children living in the same household as siblings should be able to go to the same school. It would appear to be discriminatory if too narrow a definition of sibling meant that this could not take place
1575	Agree		
1576	Disagree		<p>I emailed [redacted] at LPLT with my concerns on this point, but as yet have had no reply. It was also not referenced in the FAQs which were published several days after my email. I have checked both the LPSB and LPSG admissions criteria published on their websites and a comparison of the current and proposed documents for each school suggests they are both removing the restrictions around siblings of 6th formers. These changes (potentially relating to hundreds of pupils who may not already have siblings at the school and may also live far away), are not mentioned anywhere in the main consultation which only references 'definition' of sibling. In the absence of any clarification to the contrary I have to assume my observations are correct.</p> <p>The other effect relating to siblings which is not flagged is that the feeders would create an extra layer of disadvantage to non-trust primary pupils because the LPLT schools would effectively have a sibling policy across all schools if the feeder proposals went ahead, yet other students would not.</p> <p>I imagine most people will not object to this point given it sounds uncontentious on the face of it. Regardless of my feelings on the changes themselves, I have strong objections to the utter lack of transparency around the way the changes have been presented and the likely impact on catchments when considered in conjunction with the primary feeder proposals.</p>
1577	Agree		
1578	Neutral		
1579	Not Applicable		
1580	Disagree		
1581	Neutral		
1582	Agree		
1583	Neutral		
1584	Neutral		
1585	Agree		
1586	Agree		
1587	Neutral		
1588	Neutral		
1589	Disagree		
1590	Agree		
1591	Disagree		
1592	Agree		
1593	Agree		
1594	Agree		
1595	Neutral		
1596	Neutral		
1597	Neutral		
1598	Disagree		
1599	Not Applicable		
1600	Neutral		
1601	Disagree		

1602	Disagree		
1603	Agree		
1604	Neutral		
1605	Neutral		
1606	Neutral		
1607	Agree		
1608	Disagree		
1609	Disagree		
1610	Neutral		
1611	Agree		
1612	Agree		Suggestion is more modern and in keeping with family set ups.
1613	Agree		
1614	Neutral		
1615	Neutral		This is the most fair point if a sibling already attends.
1616	Neutral		
1617	Agree		
1618	Neutral		
1619	Disagree		
1620	Agree		
1621	Disagree		
1622	Agree		
1623	Disagree		
1624	Disagree		Having a brother in Langley has to be a priority for safety, tranquility and equal education and opportunities
1625	Agree		
1626	Agree		
1627	Agree		
1628	Not Applicable		
1629	Agree		
1630	Disagree		
1631	Neutral		
1632	Neutral		
1633	Agree		
1634	Disagree		
1635	Agree		I agree that there should be a sibling policy between the Langley Girls and Boys secondary schools.
1636	Neutral		
1637	Neutral		
1638	Neutral		
1639	Neutral		
1640	Agree		
1641	Agree		
1642	Not Applicable		
1643	Disagree		
1644	Neutral		
1645	Agree		
1646	Disagree		
1647	Agree		
1648	Disagree		
1649	Neutral		
1650	Agree		
1651	Disagree		

1652	Neutral		
1653	Neutral		
1654	Neutral		I don't understand what this has changed from, this needs to be clearer.
1655	Neutral		
1656	Disagree		
1657	Neutral		It is unclear to me how the definition of sibling has changed.
1658	Neutral		
1659	Disagree		
1660	Agree		
1661	Neutral		
1662	Agree		
1663	Neutral		
1664	Neutral		
1665	Disagree		
1666	Agree		
1667	Disagree		
1668	Disagree		
1669	Agree		
1670	Neutral		
1671	Neutral		
1672	Agree		
1673	Neutral		
1674	Agree		
1675	Not Applicable		
1676	Neutral		
1677	Neutral		
1678	Agree		
1679	Not Applicable		
1680	Neutral		
1681	Neutral		
1682	Neutral		
1683	Neutral		with the changing society and 'family' set up i have no concerns with the definition of sibling changing
1684	Neutral		
1685	Neutral		
1686	Disagree		
1687	Neutral		
1688	Agree		
1689	Neutral		
1690	Neutral		I would question why a sibling of the opposite gender is not given the same sibling rights as those that are the same gender (if you have a daughter at the girls school, your son does not count as a sibling who can attend the boys). This is not the case if you are a member of staff working at the girls but have a son. I feel that should the proposals go ahead, families where children are of different genders are discriminated against just because of their gender.
1691	Neutral		
1692	Disagree		If staff can have siblings at both schools regardless of which school they work, this should be the same for siblings of different genders. Therefore if your son attends the boys, his sister should come under the same sibling criteria as if they were the same gender.
1693	Neutral		
1694	Disagree		
1695	Disagree		
1696	Agree		
1697	Neutral		
1698	Agree		

1699	Neutral		
1700	Neutral		
1701	Neutral		
1702	Agree		
1703	Agree		
1704	Neutral		
1705	Disagree		
1706	Neutral		
1707	Neutral		
1708	Agree		
1709	Agree		To only allow staff children admission into the school at which they teach is to unfairly prejudice their other opposite sex children, if any.
1710	Neutral		
1711	Agree		
1712	Disagree		
1713	Disagree		
1714	Agree		
1715	Neutral		
1716	Disagree		
1717	Not Applicable		
1718	Neutral		
1719	Neutral		
1720	Agree		
1721	Neutral		
1722	Neutral		
1723	Neutral		
1724	Neutral		
1725	Neutral		
1726	Disagree		
1727	Neutral		
1728	Agree		
1729	Agree		
1730	Agree		It is fair and equitable to ensure that a broad definition of 'sibling' is used.
1731	Neutral		
1732	Agree		
1733	Neutral		
1734	Agree		
1735	Disagree		
1736	Agree		
1737	Agree		
1738	Disagree		
1739	Disagree		
1740	Neutral		
1741	Agree		
1742	Agree		
1743	Neutral		
1744	Not Applicable		
1745	Not Applicable		
1746	Agree		
1747	No Response		
1748	Not Applicable		

1749	Neutral		
1750	Neutral		
1751	Agree		
1752	Agree		
1753	Neutral		
1754	Disagree		
1755	Agree		
1756	Disagree		Unfair to local children
1757	Disagree		
1758	Disagree		
1759	Agree		
1760	Agree		
1761	Agree		
1762	Agree		
1763	Neutral		
1764	Disagree		
1765	Neutral		
1766	Neutral		
1767	Agree		
1768	Neutral		
1769	Neutral		
1770	Disagree		
1771	Neutral		
1772	Agree		
1773	Disagree		
1774	Neutral		
1775	Neutral		
1776	Neutral		
1777	Agree		
1778	Agree		
1779	Neutral		
1780	Neutral		
1781	Agree		
1782	Neutral		
1783	Neutral		
1784	Disagree		
1785	Disagree		
1786	Agree		
1787	Agree		
1788	Neutral		
1789	Agree		
1790	Neutral		
1791	Neutral		
1792	Agree		
1793	Neutral		
1794	Neutral		
1795	Neutral		
1796	Agree		
1797	Agree		
1798	Neutral		

1799	Neutral		
1800	Disagree		
1801	Disagree		
1802	Neutral		
1803	Disagree		
1804	Neutral		
1805	Neutral		
1806	Neutral		No strong views held. As long as full checks are carried out regarding council tax bills etc and proof is gained that the address is correct for children named in the admission process.
1807	Neutral		
1808	Neutral		
1809	Agree		
1810	Neutral		
1811	Agree		
1812	Neutral		
1813	Agree		This seems fair and sensible.
1814	Neutral		
1815	Agree		
1816	Neutral		
1817	Agree		
1818	Not Applicable		
1819	Agree		
1820	Agree		
1821	Agree		
1822	Neutral		
1823	Disagree		
1824	Neutral		
1825	Agree		
1826	Disagree		
1827	Neutral		
1828	Neutral		
1829	Agree		
1830	Disagree		
1831	Neutral		
1832	Disagree		
1833	Neutral		
1834	Neutral		
1835	Agree		
1836	Agree		This needs to be consistent with the children of teachers proposal. If you can get priority for your child at one school by being a teacher at the other, you should also have priority by having a sibling at the other.
1837	Neutral		
1838	Neutral		
1839	Neutral		
1840	Neutral		
1841	Agree		
1842	Neutral		
1843	Neutral		
1844	Neutral		
1845	Neutral		
1846	Agree		
1847	Neutral		

1848	Agree		
1849	Neutral		
1850	Agree		
1851	Neutral		
1852	Neutral		
1853	Neutral		
1854	Agree		
1855	No Response		
1856	Neutral		
1857	Agree		I agree with the definition of sibling, on the proviso that a child lives with their parent's 'new' partner for a defined minimum period (suggest 2 years). By not stating this period, short-term relationships could be formed and step-children gain places at the school when the relationship is not real.
1858	Agree		
1859	Neutral		
1860	Agree		
1861	Neutral		
1862	Neutral		
1863	Neutral		No comment
1864	Neutral		
1865	Agree		
1866	Agree		
1867	Neutral		No comment
1868	Neutral		
1869	Agree		
1870	Neutral		
1871	Neutral		
1872	Neutral		
1873	Neutral		
1874	Neutral		
1875	Neutral		
1876	Not Applicable		
1877	Neutral		
1878	Neutral		
1879	Neutral		
1880	Neutral		
1881	Agree		
1882	Agree		
1883	Disagree		
1884	Disagree		
1885	Agree		
1886	Agree		
1887	Disagree		
1888	Neutral		
1889	Neutral		
1890	Agree		
1891	Agree		Seems sensible.
1892	Neutral		
1893	Neutral		
1894	Neutral		
1895	Neutral		
1896	Agree		

1897	Neutral		
1898	Agree		
1899	Agree		
1900	Agree		
1901	Agree		
1902	Neutral		
1903	Neutral		
1904	Disagree		Siblings are only blood relatives, there would be no way to legally prove co-habiting siblings, it should be solely meeting the criteria of genetic, blood relatives
1905	Disagree		
1906	Disagree		
1907	Neutral		
1908	Neutral		
1909	Agree		
1910	Neutral		
1911	Neutral		
1912	Neutral		
1913	Agree		
1914	Disagree		
1915	Neutral		
1916	Agree		
1917	Neutral		
1918	Neutral		
1919	Neutral		
1920	Neutral		
1921	Neutral		
1922	Neutral		
1923	Neutral		
1924	Agree		
1925	Neutral		
1926	Neutral		
1927	Neutral		
1928	Disagree		
1929	Agree		
1930	Agree		
1931	Neutral		
1932	Agree		
1933	Agree		
1934	Neutral		
1935	Neutral		
1936	Neutral		
1937	Neutral		
1938	Agree		
1939	Not Applicable		
1940	Disagree		Children on co-habiting partners should not be allowed - that is not a sibling
1941	Disagree		
1942	Agree		Families can be complex, and this is a step to recognising the variations.
1943	Neutral		
1944	Disagree		
1945	Neutral		
1946	Agree		

1947	Neutral		
1948	Neutral		
1949	Neutral		
1950	Neutral		
1951	Neutral		
1952	Agree		
1953	Agree		
1954	Neutral		
1955	Agree		
1956	Disagree		
1957	Agree		
1958	Agree		The proposed changes seem sensible.
1959	Neutral		
1960	Neutral		
1961	Neutral		
1962	Agree		
1963	Agree		
1964	Neutral		
1965	Neutral		
1966	Neutral		
1967	Neutral		
1968	Disagree		
1969	Neutral		
1970	Neutral		
1971	Neutral		Needs further clarity
1972	Neutral		
1973	Agree		
1974	Agree		
1975	Agree		
1976	Agree		
1977	Agree		
1978	Neutral		
1979	Disagree		
1980	Agree		
1981	Agree		
1982	Neutral		No clarification on Siblings across the secondary schools has been given. Please confirm your position.
1983	Neutral		
1984	Neutral		
1985	Disagree		
1986	Neutral		
1987	Neutral		
1988	Neutral		
1989	Disagree		
1990	Agree		
1991	Disagree		Only full siblings should count
1992	Neutral		
1993	Disagree		
1994	Neutral		
1995	Neutral		
1996	Disagree		

1997	Neutral		
1998	Neutral		
1999	Neutral		
2000	Neutral		
2001	Neutral		
2002	Neutral		
2003	Neutral		
2004	Neutral		
2005	Neutral		
2006	Neutral		
2007	Disagree		
2008	Agree		
2009	Neutral		
2010	Agree		
2011	Neutral		
2012	No Response		
2013	Agree		
2014	Disagree		
2015	Agree		
2016	No Response		
2017	Disagree		
2018	Neutral		
2019	Disagree		
2020	Neutral		
2021	Neutral		
2022	Neutral		
2023	Neutral		
2024	Neutral		
2025	Neutral		
2026	Neutral		
2027	Disagree		
2028	Disagree		
2029	Agree		
2030	Neutral		
2031	Agree		
2032	Disagree		
2033	Agree		
2034	Disagree		
2035	Agree		
2036	Agree		
2037	Agree		
2038	Agree		
2039	Neutral		
2040	Disagree		
2041	Agree		
2042	Neutral		
2043	Agree		
2044	Neutral		
2045	Neutral		
2046	Agree		

2047	Disagree		
2048	Agree		
2049	Neutral		
2050	Disagree		
2051	Neutral		
2052	Agree		
2053	Agree		
2054	Neutral		
2055	Neutral		
2056	Disagree		
2057	No Response		
2058	Agree		
2059	Disagree		
2060	Neutral		
2061	Agree		
2062	Disagree		
2063	Neutral		
2064	Neutral		
2065	Neutral		
2066	Agree		
2067	Neutral		
2068	Neutral		
2069	Neutral		
2070	Neutral		
2071	Neutral		
2072	Neutral		
2073	Agree		
2074	Neutral		
2075	Disagree		
2076	Disagree		It's fairer to retain the current arrangements.
2077	Neutral		
2078	Agree		
2079	Neutral		
2080	Agree		
2081	Agree		
2082	Neutral		
2083	Agree		
2084	Neutral		
2085	Disagree		
2086	Agree		Agree that any sibling at the same address should be defined as a sibling.
2087	Neutral		
2088	Agree		
2089	Disagree		
2090	Neutral		
2091	Neutral		
2092	Agree		
2093	Disagree		
2094	Disagree		
2095	Neutral		
2096	Disagree		As far as I am aware the current definition has not caused problems in the past or they have easily been overcome.

2097	Neutral		
2098	Neutral		
2099	Agree		
2100	Neutral		
2101	Neutral		
2102	Disagree		
2103	Neutral		
2104	Neutral		
2105	Neutral		
2106	No Response		
2107	Disagree		
2108	Neutral		
2109	Agree		
2110	Agree		
2111	No Response		
2112	Neutral		
2113	Neutral		
2114	Neutral		
2115	Agree		This is fair and appropriate response to changing family make up.
2116	Neutral		
2117	Neutral		
2118	Neutral		
2119	Neutral		
2120	Neutral		
2121	Neutral		
2122	Neutral		
2123	Neutral		
2124	Not Applicable		
2125	Not Applicable		
2126	Neutral		
2127	Neutral		
2128	Disagree		
2129	Agree		
2130	Agree		
2131	Neutral		
2132	Agree		
2133	Neutral		
2134	Disagree		
2135	Neutral		
2136	Neutral		
2137	Agree		
2138	Neutral		
2139	Agree		
2140	Neutral		There have been and will always be cases where parents attempt to circumvent the system. It is therefore imperative that the Local authority / schools undertake the necessary due diligence to ensure as far is practicable the pupils are genuine siblings of children attending the school.
2141	Agree		
2142	Neutral		
2143	Neutral		
2144	Neutral		
2145	Neutral		

2146	Neutral		
2147	Neutral		
2148	Agree		
2149	Neutral		
2150	Disagree		
2151	Agree		
2152	Not Applicable		
2153	Neutral		
2154	Disagree		
2155	Agree		
2156	Neutral		
2157	Neutral		
2158	Neutral		
2159	Agree		
2160	Neutral		
2161	Agree		
2162	Neutral		
2163	Disagree		I found the old definition clearer with regards to both siblings having to attend the school together for at least a year, e.g. a sibling in Year 13 doesn't count.
2164	Neutral		
2165	Agree		
2166	Neutral		
2167	Neutral		
2168	Agree		
2169	Neutral		
2170	Disagree		
2171	Agree		
2172	Neutral		
2173	Neutral		
2174	Neutral		
2175	Neutral		
2176	Neutral		
2177	Agree		
2178	Neutral		
2179	Agree		
2180	Agree		
2181	Agree		
2182	Agree		
2183	Neutral		
2184	Neutral		
2185	Neutral		
2186	Neutral		
2187	Neutral		
2188	Agree		
2189	Agree		
2190	Disagree		
2191	Agree		
2192	No Response		
2193	Neutral		
2194	Neutral		
2195	Neutral		

2196	Disagree		
2197	Neutral		
2198	Neutral		
2199	Agree		
2200	Disagree		
2201	Disagree		
2202	Neutral		
2203	Agree		
2204	Disagree		
2205	Not Applicable		
2206	Neutral		
2207	Neutral		
2208	Neutral		
2209	Neutral		
2210	Disagree		
2211	Agree		
2212	Agree		
2213	Neutral		
2214	Agree		
2215	Agree		Of course the sibling rule should apply, otherwise where will the sibling go? If they dont get admission, this will cause a major stress to the families.
2216	Agree		
2217	Agree		
2218	Agree		
2219	Agree		
2220	Neutral		
2221	Agree		
2222	Disagree		
2223	Neutral		
2224	Neutral		
2225	Disagree		
2226	Neutral		
2227	Disagree		
2228	Disagree		
2229	Neutral		
2230	Agree		It only makes sense to have biological children and step children be able to go to the same school. _x000D_ For children who live with the other parent etc it will surely help with family dynamics, childcare options and bonding etc. _x000D_ Though I feel Foster children should be considered under the term siblings. _x000D_ I do not have step children etc but I can only see the positives here.
2231	Neutral		
2232	Neutral		
2233	Disagree		
2234	Neutral		
2235	Agree		
2236	Not Applicable		
2237	Neutral		
2238	Disagree		
2239	Disagree		
2240	Agree		
2241	Agree		
2242	Agree		

2243	Disagree		
2244	Agree		
2245	Neutral		
2246	Neutral		
2247	Agree		
2248	Disagree		
2249	Agree		If the parents wish it siblings should attend the same school for the same reasons I've stated above. Travelling to school, being part of the same school community, having things in common with your siblings is important throughout life.
2250	Agree		
2251	Neutral		
2252	Disagree		
2253	Agree		
2254	Agree		
2255	Agree		
2256	Agree		
2257	Neutral		I don't mind the new definition of sibling but again I fail to see why this has to be wrapped in with the feeder schools option.
2258	Agree		Fair.
2259	Neutral		
2260	Agree		
2261	Disagree		
2262	Neutral		
2263	Neutral		
2264	Neutral		
2265	Neutral		
2266	Agree		
2267	Neutral		
2268	Agree		
2269	Disagree		
2270	Neutral		
2271	Neutral		
2272	Disagree		I think that changes of this nature should be made across all Bromley admissions to allow a fair process for all.
2273	Agree		
2274	Disagree		Siblings should go to the same school. This gives a shared experience and it avoids difficulties for parents/carers.
2275	Neutral		
2276	Disagree		
2277	Agree		
2278	Agree		
2279	Agree		
2280	Agree		
2281	Disagree		Horrible wording has again been used and therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2282	Disagree		
2283	Agree		
2284	Agree		
2285	Neutral		
2286	Disagree		
2287	Disagree		Horrible and incorrect wording has been used and is not correct. Therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2288	Neutral		
2289	Disagree		Siblings of all cases should be given priority whether they are lucky enough to live together or not. Living arrangements are not reflective of being 'family'.
2290	Neutral		
2291	Neutral		

2292	Disagree		Should be a blood relative
2293	Agree		
2294	Disagree		
2295	Neutral		
2296	Disagree		
2297	Agree		
2298	Not Applicable		
2299	Agree		
2300	Agree		
2301	Neutral		
2302	Neutral		
2303	Neutral		
2304	Neutral		
2305	Neutral		
2306	Agree		Its good that the definition has been made clearer.
2307	Disagree		
2308	Neutral		
2309	Agree		
2310	Neutral		
2311	Agree		
2312	Agree		
2313	Neutral		
2314	Neutral		
2315	Neutral		
2316	Agree		
2317	Neutral		
2318	Agree		
2319	Disagree		
2320	Agree		
2321	Neutral		
2322	Neutral		
2323	Disagree		
2324	Neutral		
2325	Agree		
2326	Agree		
2327	Agree		
2328	Disagree		
2329	Agree		
2330	Neutral		
2331	Neutral		
2332	Neutral		
2333	Neutral		
2334	Agree		
2335	Disagree		Given the proximity of the secondary schools it would seem to make sense to extend the sibling rule to cover both schools, not doing so simply prejudices children whose siblings or of a different gender. Notably, the proposals for allowing children of staff to have priority are not limited to the actual school where they work.
2336	Disagree		Children of cohabiting partners and foster siblings should not be included.
2337	Neutral		
2338	Disagree		
2339	Agree		
2340	Agree		

2341	Disagree		
2342	Neutral		
2343	Disagree		
2344	Neutral		
2345	Disagree		
2346	Not Applicable		
2347	Agree		
2348	Neutral		It's important to record an accurate address for the child, so parents are not using the ex-partners address when the child actually lives out of area.
2349	Agree		
2350	Agree		
2351	Agree		
2352	Neutral		
2353	Neutral		
2354	Agree		
2355	Agree		
2356	Neutral		
2357	Agree		
2358	Agree		
2359	Not Applicable		
2360	Neutral		
2361	Disagree		
2362	Agree		
2363	Agree		
2364	Neutral		
2365	Neutral		
2366	Neutral		
2367	Disagree		Agree with all categories of siblings with the exception of co-habiting parents. Would need clear criteria to prove that these are genuine partnerships and not arrangements of convenience to secure a place.
2368	Disagree		The document on this web site gave a description of a change but did not give the new definition. This is not transparent and not acceptable. Full disclosure on the current and proposed definitions need to be clearly laid out, as well as the rationale and proposers of the change.
2369	Agree		
2370	Neutral		
2371	Agree		
2372	No Response		
2373	Neutral		
2374	Agree		
2375	Neutral		
2376	Neutral		
2377	Agree		This seems reasonable, provided it is in line with best practice in Bromley.
2378	Neutral		
2379	Agree		Easier for family life
2380	Agree		
2381	Disagree		
2382	Agree		
2383	Disagree		
2384	Agree		
2385	Disagree		
2386	Agree		
2387	Agree		
2388	Neutral		

2389	Agree		
2390	Neutral		
2391	Neutral		
2392	Neutral		
2393	Agree		
2394	Agree		
2395	Neutral		
2396	Not Applicable		
2397	Neutral		
2398	Neutral		
2399	Neutral		
2400	Neutral		
2401	Agree		
2402	Disagree		Too wide.
2403	Neutral		
2404	Not Applicable		
2405	Disagree		
2406	Agree		
2407	Agree		Other local schools have this arrangement and it simplifies the school run for parents.
2408	Agree		
2409	Neutral		Common sense should apply. A sibling or half sibling is in the same residence.
2410	Disagree		
2411	Agree		
2412	Neutral		
2413	Agree		
2414	Agree		
2415	Neutral		
2416	Neutral		
2417	Neutral		
2418	Agree		
2419	Neutral		
2420	Agree		
2421	Neutral		
2422	Agree		
2423	Disagree		
2424	Disagree		
2425	Agree		It is not doable or fair to have siblings in different schools.
2426	Neutral		
2427	No Response		I am not aware of the changes to the definition of sibling. However the pattern of modern families has changed to it should include step or half siblings so long as the address is the same and within catchment.
2428	Agree		
2429	Neutral		
2430	Neutral		
2431	Agree		
2432	Neutral		
2433	Disagree		
2434	Agree		
2435	Agree		
2436	Neutral		
2437	Agree		

2438	Neutral		
2439	Neutral		
2440	Agree		
2441	Neutral		
2442	Agree		
2443	Neutral		
2444	Neutral		
2445	Disagree		
2446	Neutral		Seems reasonable.
2447	Neutral		
2448	Neutral		
2449	Neutral		
2450	Disagree		
2451	Agree		
2452	Neutral		
2453	Neutral		
2454	Agree		
2455	Neutral		
2456	Agree		Sensible
2457	Neutral		
2458	Neutral		
2459	Agree		
2460	Disagree		
2461	Agree		
2462	Disagree		
2463	Neutral		
2464	Agree		
2465	Disagree		I believe that the widening of the criteria although looks well intentioned will be hard to prove and therefore monitor and ensure it is not misused
2466	Neutral		
2467	Neutral		
2468	Agree		Children of blended families should not be discriminated against because they are not the traditional definition of siblings as long as they live in the same home children should be counted as siblings. Families should be considered as long as they live in the same home.
2469	Neutral		
2470	Neutral		
2471	Neutral		
2472	Neutral		
2473	Disagree		
2474	Agree		
2475	Neutral		
2476	Agree		
2477	Agree		
2478	Disagree		
2479	Neutral		
2480	Disagree		
2481	Neutral		
2482	Neutral		
2483	Neutral		
2484	Neutral		

2485	Neutral		
2486	Disagree		
2487	Agree		
2488	Neutral		
2489	Agree		
2490	Neutral		
2491	Neutral		
2492	Neutral		
2493	Agree		
2494	Agree		
2495	Neutral		
2496	Agree		
2497	Agree		
2498	Neutral		
2499	Agree		
2500	Neutral		
2501	Neutral		
2502	Agree		
2503	Agree		
2504	Disagree		
2505	Agree		
2506	Neutral		
2507	Neutral		
2508	Agree		
2509	Neutral		
2510	Neutral		
2511	Neutral		
2512	Neutral		
2513	Neutral		
2514	Neutral		
2515	Neutral		
2516	Agree		
2517	Disagree		
2518	Agree		
2519	Neutral		
2520	Neutral		
2521	Disagree		
2522	Agree		
2523	Neutral		
2524	Neutral		
2525	Neutral		
2526	Neutral		
2527	Disagree		
2528	Neutral		
2529	Neutral		
2530	Neutral		
2531	Agree		
2532	Neutral		
2533	Neutral		
2534	Neutral		

2535	Agree		
2536	Agree		
2537	Agree		
2538	Neutral		
2539	Neutral		
2540	Neutral		
2541	Neutral		
2542	Neutral		
2543	Disagree		
2544	Agree		
2545	Neutral		
2546	Neutral		
2547	Neutral		
2548	Disagree		The current arrangement has no grey area and is less open to exploitation. The proposed sibling rule discriminates against children of NON feeder schools as it offers exclusivity to those of feeder schools by way of a sibling rule across the LPLT schools and not for NON feeder school children.
2549	Neutral		
2550	Neutral		
2551	Neutral		
2552	Neutral		
2553	Agree		
2554	Disagree		
2555	Neutral		
2556	Neutral		
2557	Neutral		
2558	No Response		
2559	Agree		
2560	Agree		
2561	Neutral		
2562	Neutral		
2563	Neutral		
2564	Agree		
2565	Agree		
2566	Agree		
2567	Agree		
2568	Agree		
2569	Neutral		
2570	Agree		
2571	Agree		
2572	Not Applicable		
2573	Neutral		
2574	Agree		
2575	Neutral		
2576	Neutral		
2577	Neutral		
2578	Neutral		
2579	Agree		
2580	Agree		
2581	Agree		
2582	Agree		
2583	Agree		

2584	Disagree		
2585	Disagree		This concerns me as this could lead to families fudging living arrangements in order to gain a place at the school.
2586	Not Applicable		
2587	Disagree		
2588	Agree		Langley boys and girls should have a sibling policy like all other schools
2589	Neutral		
2590	Disagree		Do not agree to inclusion of children of cohabiting partners -there is no official means to check the status of the cohabiting partner and this may not be a permanent arrangement but is open to abuse.
2591	Agree		
2592	Agree		
2593	Agree		
2594	Neutral		
2595	Agree		
2596	Agree		
2597	Agree		
2598	Agree		
2599	Agree		
2600	Disagree		
2601	Agree		
2602	Agree		
2603	Agree		Clearer definitions are always helpful.
2604	Disagree		I agree for primary schools this is essential for parents, however for secondary, again the admission should be based on the address at the time of applying. There is no need for siblings to attend the same the school if a decision is made to move out of the area.
2605	Agree		
2606	Neutral		
2607	Agree		
2608	Neutral		
2609	Neutral		
2610	Not Applicable		
2611	Neutral		
2612	Agree		
2613	Neutral		
2614	Agree		
2615	Neutral		Didn't see what the new definition is as it wasn't spelled out on the consultation document.
2616	Agree		
2617	Neutral		
2618	Agree		
2619	Agree		
2620	Neutral		
2621	Agree		
2622	Not Applicable		
2623	Neutral		
2624	Agree		
2625	Neutral		
2626	Disagree		
2627	Disagree		
2628	Neutral		
2629	Neutral		This probably does need to be clearly defined as not sure what the definition was before only comment would be that people could abuse they system for step children and co habiting to get children into good schools. Not sure how you would police this.
2630	Disagree		
2631	Agree		

2632	Agree		
2633	Not Applicable		
2634	Agree		
2635	Agree		
2636	Neutral		
2637	Agree		
2638	Agree		
2639	Agree		
2640	Agree		
2641	Agree		
2642	Neutral		
2643	Neutral		
2644	Agree		
2645	Neutral		
2646	Agree		
2647	Disagree		
2648	Neutral		
2649	Disagree		
2650	Neutral		
2651	Agree		
2652	Neutral		
2653	Neutral		
2654	Agree		
2655	Neutral		
2656	Agree		
2657	Agree		
2658	Agree		
2659	Neutral		
2660	Agree		
2661	Disagree		
2662	Neutral		
2663	Agree		
2664	Disagree		
2665	Agree		
2666	Agree		
2667	Neutral		
2668	Disagree		
2669	Neutral		
2670	Agree		
2671	Agree		
2672	Agree		
2673	Neutral		
2674	Disagree		
2675	Neutral		
2676	Neutral		
2677	Agree		Makes sense
2678	Agree		
2679	Agree		
2680	Neutral		
2681	Agree		

2682	Neutral		
2683	Agree		
2684	Agree		
2685	Agree		
2686	Not Applicable		
2687	Neutral		
2688	Neutral		
2689	Neutral		
2690	Neutral		
2691	Neutral		
2692	Neutral		
2693	Agree		
2694	Neutral		
2695	Agree		
2696	Disagree		
2697	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		
2699	Neutral		
2700	Agree		
2701	Neutral		
2702	Neutral		
2703	Disagree		
2704	Agree		
2705	No Response		
2706	Neutral		
2707	Agree		
2708	Agree		
2709	Agree		
2710	Disagree		
2711	Neutral		
2712	Neutral		
2713	Agree		
2714	Neutral		
2715	Agree		
2716	Agree		
2717	Agree		
2718	Neutral		
2719	Agree		
2720	Agree		
2721	Agree		
2722	Agree		
2723	Neutral		
2724	Agree		
2725	Agree		
2726	Neutral		
2727	Neutral		
2728	Neutral		
2729	Neutral		
2730	Agree		
2731	Agree		

2732	Agree		
2733	Agree		
2734	Not Applicable		
2735	Agree		
2736	Neutral		
2737	Agree		
2738	Disagree		
2739	Agree		
2740	Agree		
2741	Neutral		
2742	Neutral		
2743	Neutral		
2744	Agree		If you child spreads attends either of the Langley secondary schools they should take priority as it would be hard for parents with children attending different secondary schools!!
2745	Neutral		
2746	Neutral		
2747	Agree		
2748	Agree		
2749	Disagree		
2750	Agree		
2751	Disagree		
2752	Agree		
2753	Agree		Seems fair and supports different family circumstances.
2754	Neutral		
2755	No Response		Hawes Down & Clare House are further away & therefore will significantly affect admissions if the sibling rule continues.
2756	Agree		
2757	Agree		
2758	Disagree		At secondary school age, children make their own way to school.
2759	Neutral		
2760	Neutral		
2761	Disagree		
2762	Agree		
2763	Agree		
2764	Agree		
2765	Neutral		
2766	Neutral		
2767	Agree		
2768	No Response		
2769	Agree		
2770	Agree		
2771	Neutral		
2772	Neutral		
2773	Agree		
2774	Not Applicable		
2775	Disagree		
2776	Neutral		
2777	Disagree		
2778	Disagree		
2779	Disagree		
2780	Agree		
2781	Agree		

2782	Agree		
2783	Agree		
2784	Agree		
2785	No Response		
2786	Neutral		
2787	Agree		
2788	Neutral		
2789	Not Applicable		
2790	Agree		
2791	Disagree		Children who are at the specific school can get priority so they can travel together.
2792	Agree		
2793	Neutral		
2794	Agree		
2795	Agree		Would the trust consider having the sibling rule stretch across the girls and boys secondary schools? I.E, if a brother attended the boys school, his sister could apply for the girls school using the sibling rule? I think this is a change that would make much more sense for local families than creating feeder schools.
2796	Agree		
2797	Agree		
2798	Neutral		
2799	Neutral		
2800	Neutral		
2801	Neutral		
2802	Not Applicable		
2803	Agree		
2804	Disagree		
2805	Neutral		
2806	Neutral		
2807	Neutral		
2808	Neutral		
2809	Agree		Siblings should be allowed to go to the boys or girls school
2810	No Response		
2811	Disagree		I do not feel that there is enough information regarding this within the consultation.
2812	Disagree		I am happy with the present definition and do not feel it needs to be changed in any way
2813	Neutral		
2814	Agree		
2815	Agree		
2816	Neutral		
2817	Neutral		
2818	Neutral		
2819	Neutral		
2820	Disagree		Open to abuse under the sibling rule by non-cohabiting partners with non-related children using the address of a partner with their child already attending. Who is going to police the issue?
2821	Agree		
2822	Disagree		I am completely opposed to the proposals, so have no particular comments about siblings.
2823	Neutral		
2824	Agree		
2825	Neutral		
2826	Neutral		
2827	Agree		
2828	Neutral		
2829	Neutral		
2830	Neutral		

2831	Neutral		
2832	Agree		
2833	Agree		
2834	Neutral		
2835	Agree		
2836	Neutral		
2837	Neutral		
2838	Neutral		
2839	Disagree		This randomness creates an inequitable policy to access to school places.
2840	Disagree		
2841	Disagree		
2842	Disagree		
2843	Agree		
2844	Disagree		
2845	Neutral		
2846	Agree		
2847	Agree		
2848	Disagree		
2849	Agree		
2850	Disagree		
2851	No Response		Neutral
2852	Agree		
2853	Neutral		
2854	Neutral		
2855	Neutral		
2856	Neutral		
2857	Agree		
2858	Neutral		
2859	Neutral		
2860	Disagree		
2861	Agree		
2862	Neutral		
2863	Neutral		
2864	Disagree		
2865	Neutral		
2866	Neutral		
2867	Agree		
2868	Agree		
2869	Neutral		
2870	Not Applicable		
2871	Neutral		
2872	No Response		Neutral
2873	Neutral		
2874	Agree		
2875	Neutral		
2876	Neutral		
2877	Neutral		
2878	Neutral		
2879	Agree		
2880	Neutral		

2881	Neutral		
2882	Neutral		
2883	Neutral		
2884	Disagree		
2885	Neutral		
2886	Agree		
2887	Neutral		
2888	No Response		
2889	Agree		
2890	Agree		
2891	Agree		In light of the limited secondary school places, I find it difficult to consider (1) the consultation is clearly aimed at its owned trust network only and not the wider community who count the Langley secondary schools as their local schools (consultation should have been sent to all local primary schools, not just those within the Trust - obviously a bias audience) (2) in light of the already limited availability of secondary schools, particularly for boys, that any steps can be taken to reduce the number of places for local children (ie for children of staff, who typically don't live within a walkable distance).
2892	Agree		
2893	Agree		
2894	Neutral		
2895	Agree		
2896	Neutral		
2897	Neutral		
2898	Agree		
2899	Agree		
2900	Agree		The proposed change is in keeping with my expectation.
2901	Neutral		
2902	No Response		
2903	Agree		
2904	Not Applicable		
2905	Agree		
2906	Agree		
2907	Agree		Family dynamics are changing. The traditional family is no longer the standard. I feel it is fairer to families of all types who care for children.
2908	Agree		
2909	Agree		
2910	Agree		
2911	Agree		
2912	Agree		
2913	Neutral		
2914	Agree		
2915	Neutral		
2916	Agree		
2917	Neutral		
2918	Agree		
2919	Neutral		
2920	Agree		
2921	Neutral		
2922	Neutral		
2923	Agree		
2924	Agree		
2925	Agree		AAT
2926	Agree		
2927	Agree		

2928	Agree		
2929	Agree		
2930	Not Applicable		
2931	Not Applicable		
2932	Agree		
2933	Agree		With family dynamics changing we need to be aware and amenable to families with different circumstances.
2934	Neutral		
2935	Agree		
2936	Agree		
2937	Agree		
2938	Agree		
2939	Neutral		
2940	Agree		
2941	Agree		
2942	Neutral		
2943	Agree		
2944	Agree		
2945	Agree		
2946	Neutral		
2947	Neutral		
2948	Disagree		
2949	Agree		
2950	Agree		
2951	Neutral		
2952	Agree		
2953	No Response		There are still plenty of spaces available to those living within close proximity to the high school so as to not disadvantage them
2954	Neutral		
2955	Agree		
2956	No Response		
2957	Neutral		
2958	Neutral		
2959	Agree		
2960	Agree		
2961	Neutral		
2962	Neutral		
2963	Agree		
2964	Neutral		
2965	Disagree		
2966	Agree		
2967	Agree		
2968	Agree		
2969	Disagree		
2970	Neutral		
2971	Agree		
2972	Disagree		
2973	Agree		
2974	Agree		This seems fair.
2975	Agree		
2976	Neutral		
2977	Agree		

2978	Agree		
2979	Not Applicable		
2980	Agree		
2981	Agree		
2982	Agree		
2983	Neutral		
2984	Not Applicable		
2985	Agree		It is unclear whether the sibling rule is across both The boys and girls school or whether they will be treated separately as this will affect the equal opportunities with those with children of each sex in light of the tighter criteria to get in.
2986	Neutral		
2987	Agree		
2988	Neutral		The closest primary schools to Langley are being overlooked in favour of schools further away. These children would be in catchment for other schools. However, those who live on the doorstep of the Langley Schools will not get a place. This is not fair for many children who may then have to travel many miles to an alternative school
2989	Agree		However this can easily be open to abuse where half-siblings, and step-siblings move in just to get a particular school placement and then move back with the other parent once they have a place at their chosen school.
2990	Agree		
2991	Agree		
2992	Disagree		
2993	Disagree		
2994	Neutral		
2995	Disagree		
2996	Neutral		
2997	Agree		I think it should be based upon the sibling rule as a priority for all schools within the trust to help parents keep their children all together within the Langley Park Academy.
2998	Agree		
2999	Agree		
3000	Agree		
3001	Agree		
3002	Agree		
3003	Agree		
3004	Agree		
3005	Agree		
3006	Agree		
3007	Agree		
3008	Agree		
3009	Agree		
3010	Agree		
3011	Agree		
3012	Neutral		
3013	Neutral		
3014	Agree		
3015	Disagree		
3016	Agree		
3017	Neutral		
3018	Neutral		I fear your definition may be too broad.
3019	No Response		
3020	Neutral		
3021	Neutral		
3022	Disagree		
3023	Neutral		
3024	Neutral		

3025	Neutral		
3026	Neutral		
3027	No Response		
3028	Neutral		
3029	Disagree		The current arrangements should continue
3030	Not Applicable		
3031	Neutral		
3032	Disagree		
3033	Neutral		
3034	Disagree		
3035	Agree		
3036	Neutral		
3037	Neutral		
3038	Agree		
3039	Agree		
3040	Neutral		
3041	Agree		
3042	Neutral		Hard to give a view when this is not at all clear - what exactly are the changes? Having called LPSB, I have found out that the only sibling rule that currently applies is if I have another son, then under the sibling rule he will be offered a place at LPBS. Does your new definition mean that ? If it does, then I agree with the proposed change. If it doesn't, then I disagree.
3043	Neutral		
3044	Neutral		
3045	Neutral		
3046	Neutral		
3047	Neutral		
3048	Agree		This seems fair. As I understand it, although the definition is wider, in all cases, the sibling must live at the same premises, which seems fair on the parents or guardians.
3049	Agree		The trust should consider allowing the sibling criterion to cover both the boys' and girls' schools which you are proposing for members of staff under the staff criterion. Why is it fair for staff members and not for families who have a girl and a boy?
3050	Agree		
3051	Neutral		
3052	Agree		
3053	Neutral		If the siblings live together in the same house, which is near to the school, it is easier for the parent.
3054	Agree		
3055	Agree		
3056	Agree		This seems fair and reflects society today.
3057	Agree		
3058	Agree		
3059	Neutral		
3060	Neutral		
3061	Neutral		
3062	Agree		
3063	Neutral		
3064	Neutral		
3065	Agree		We agree with the proposals. They reflect the current ethos of today's more "open" society
3066	Neutral		
3067	Neutral		
3068	Neutral		

3069	Agree		
3070	Agree		
3071	Disagree		
3072	Neutral		
3073	Neutral		
3074	Disagree		
3075	Agree		

