

LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Tie Breaker

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		Tie Breaker	
TIE BREAKER. What is your view of the proposed new tie breaker in the admission arrangements for all schools in the Trust		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	996		
Disagree	806		
Neutral	1097		
Not Applicable	99		
No Response	77		
1	Neutral		
2	Neutral		
3	Disagree		
4	Neutral		
5	Disagree		
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	Neutral		
19	Neutral		
20	Neutral		
21	Neutral		
22	Disagree		
23	Agree		
24	Neutral		
25	Not Applicable		
26	Agree		
27	Agree		
28	Agree		

29	Neutral		
30	Disagree		Leave it by the distance as it always has been rather than using surname.
31	Neutral		
32	Disagree		
33	No Response		
34	Disagree		
35	Agree		
36	Neutral		
37	Neutral		
38	Agree		
39	Neutral		I have no issue with this.
40	Neutral		
41	Agree		
42	Neutral		
43	Neutral		
44	Neutral		
45	Agree		
46	Disagree		
47	Agree		
48	Neutral		
49	Agree		
50	Neutral		
51	Agree		
52	Not Applicable		
53	Neutral		
54	Neutral		
55	Agree		it's a harsh reality if you were the parent/child in the situation but the new proposal seems better that the existing
56	Agree		
57	Neutral		
58	Agree		
59	Disagree		
60	Agree		
61	Agree		
62	Agree		
63	Agree		
64	No Response		
65	Agree		
66	Disagree		
67	Agree		
68	Disagree		
69	Not Applicable		
70	Neutral		
71	Agree		
72	Neutral		
73	Agree		
74	Neutral		
75	Disagree		
76	Disagree		
77	Disagree		
78	Agree		

79	Agree		
80	Agree		
81	Neutral		
82	Disagree		
83	Agree		
84	Agree		
85	Agree		
86	Agree		
87	Disagree		
88	Neutral		
89	Disagree		
90	Agree		
91	Neutral		
92	Agree		
93	Agree		
94	No Response		
95	Agree		
96	Agree		
97	Neutral		
98	Agree		
99	Disagree		
100	Neutral		
101	Agree		
102	Disagree		You can't discriminate on the ground of your surnames starting letter._x000D_ It should be solely distance down to their front door.
103	Agree		
104	Neutral		
105	Neutral		
106	Neutral		
107	Neutral		
108	Neutral		
109	Neutral		
110	Disagree		
111	Disagree		
112	Neutral		
113	Agree		
114	Agree		
115	Disagree		
116	Not Applicable		
117	Neutral		
118	Neutral		
119	Agree		
120	Agree		
121	Agree		
122	Neutral		
123	Neutral		
124	No Response		
125	Agree		
126	Agree		
127	Neutral		

128	No Response		
129	Disagree		
130	Disagree		
131	Disagree		
132	Neutral		
133	Agree		
134	Disagree		
135	Neutral		
136	Agree		
137	Neutral		
138	Agree		
139	Neutral		
140	Agree		Seems fairer
141	Agree		
142	Agree		
143	Disagree		
144	Neutral		
145	Disagree		
146	Neutral		
147	Neutral		
148	Neutral		
149	Disagree		
150	Agree		
151	Neutral		Don't know what this is
152	Disagree		
153	Agree		
154	Agree		
155	Disagree		
156	Disagree		
157	Neutral		
158	Neutral		
159	Neutral		
160	Disagree		
161	Agree		
162	Neutral		
163	Neutral		
164	Agree		
165	Agree		
166	Agree		
167	Neutral		
168	Agree		This seems a fair approach to allow all access despite your location/surname.
169	Agree		
170	Neutral		
171	Disagree		
172	Disagree		
173	Agree		
174	Disagree		
175	Agree		
176	Disagree		
177	No Response		

178	Agree		
179	Disagree		
180	Agree		
181	Disagree		
182	Disagree		Due to catchment areas, these are currently driving housing market. Where a natural progression for kids to feed into a high school, kids are less likely to be stressed too!
183	Neutral		
184	Agree		
185	Disagree		
186	Agree		
187	Neutral		
188	Agree		
189	Neutral		
190	Disagree		
191	Agree		
192	Neutral		
193	Agree		
194	Agree		
195	Neutral		
196	Agree		
197	Disagree		
198	Agree		
199	Agree		
200	Neutral		
201	Neutral		
202	Agree		
203	Agree		
204	Agree		
205	Agree		
206	Neutral		
207	Neutral		
208	Agree		
209	Agree		
210	Agree		
211	Agree		
212	Neutral		
213	Not Applicable		
214	Neutral		
215	Agree		
216	Neutral		
217	Disagree		
218	Neutral		
219	Agree		
220	Agree		
221	Not Applicable		
222	Agree		
223	Neutral		
224	Agree		
225	Agree		Maybe the length of time they have lived there should be taken into account. If a child gets in who has qualified for a few months and one doesn't who has lived there for years, it doesn't seem fair.
226	Disagree		

227	Agree		
228	Disagree		
229	Neutral		
230	Disagree		This is placing a child's education to complete random risk. Totally unacceptable. Places are tight for those who are in area without making the process even more difficult.
231	Not Applicable		I had no insight on the previous/existing tie breaker process, so have nothing to compare with.
232	Agree		
233	Neutral		
234	Neutral		
235	Agree		I think the random lottery idea is fairer.
236	Neutral		
237	Disagree		
238	Neutral		
239	Neutral		
240	Disagree		
241	Disagree		
242	Disagree		I don't think either door number or alphabetical surname selection are very fair. Names out of a hat (or similar randomised method) would seem a fairer way of deciding a tie breaker.
243	Disagree		
244	Neutral		
245	Neutral		
246	Agree		
247	No Response		
248	Agree		
249	Agree		
250	Agree		
251	Agree		
252	Disagree		
253	Agree		
254	Disagree		
255	Disagree		It's not fair when the children live at the same distance to school would give the priority based on the alphabet order, which is not fair to someone's surname starts with 'Z'. It could be linked to personal discrimination due to someone's surname.
256	Disagree		
257	Neutral		
258	Disagree		
259	Disagree		
260	Neutral		
261	Disagree		
262	Neutral		
263	Neutral		
264	Disagree		
265	Disagree		
266	Neutral		
267	Disagree		
268	Agree		
269	Disagree		
270	Disagree		
271	Disagree		
272	Neutral		
273	Not Applicable		
274	Disagree		

275	Neutral		
276	Neutral		
277	Disagree		
278	Neutral		
279	Neutral		
280	Disagree		I objects to the changes to tie breaker measure as a random lottery does not enable equitable access to places in schools this is perceived to be inequitable due to its randomness.
281	Disagree		
282	Disagree		
283	Disagree		
284	Neutral		
285	Disagree		
286	Agree		
287	Disagree		
288	Neutral		
289	Agree		
290	Agree		
291	Neutral		
292	Agree		
293	Neutral		
294	Disagree		Suggest an test instead to bring diversity into the population pool. In the economics of development, clustering to similar set of population leads to a demise or reduction of skills and aptitude i.e. lowering of collective IQ and herd mentality leading to more government spends in the future for social homes, disease management and eventual antisocial behaviour.
295	Disagree		
296	Agree		
297	Neutral		
298	Agree		Yes I think a general lottery in this instance is much more fair.
299	Disagree		
300	Disagree		
301	Disagree		
302	Disagree		
303	Neutral		
304	Neutral		
305	Agree		
306	Agree		Seems fair.
307	Disagree		
308	Neutral		
309	Neutral		
310	Neutral		
311	Disagree		
312	Neutral		
313	Neutral		
314	Disagree		
315	Not Applicable		
316	Neutral		
317	Agree		
318	Agree		
319	Disagree		
320	Neutral		
321	Agree		
322	Disagree		It will be completely unacceptable for many families to have their children in different schools
323	Neutral		

324	Agree		
325	Agree		
326	Neutral		
327	Agree		
328	Neutral		
329	Agree		
330	Disagree		
331	Agree		
332	Agree		
333	No Response		
334	Agree		
335	Agree		
336	Disagree		
337	Agree		
338	Disagree		
339	Neutral		
340	Not Applicable		
341	Agree		
342	Disagree		
343	Disagree		
344	Disagree		
345	Disagree		
346	Neutral		
347	Disagree		it should be based on fact - not a lottery - distance away is an accepted option, especially when considering people move house to be within catchment areas for schools and is no small feat with house prices as they are. That means people will have spent millions of pounds on houses that will lose value and e out of pocket with no choice of secondary school
348	Neutral		
349	Neutral		
350	Disagree		
351	Neutral		
352	Disagree		
353	Disagree		Looks like a random lottery - not good
354	Neutral		
355	Disagree		Priority should always be given to those children local to the school
356	Disagree		
357	Neutral		
358	Neutral		
359	Neutral		
360	Agree		
361	Neutral		
362	Agree		
363	Agree		
364	Disagree		
365	Disagree		
366	Disagree		
367	Not Applicable		
368	Agree		
369	Agree		
370	Disagree		
371	Disagree		I don't see how this could ever be perceived as being fairer than the current definition. It's not equitable to put children's future at the mercy of a random lottery.
372	Disagree		

373	Disagree		
374	Agree		
375	Neutral		
376	Agree		
377	Agree		
378	Disagree		
379	Agree		
380	Disagree		
381	Agree		
382	Neutral		
383	Neutral		
384	Disagree		
385	Neutral		
386	Disagree		
387	Disagree		
388	Neutral		
389	Neutral		
390	Neutral		Seems contradictory and the point on random lottery and how that applies is unclear.
391	Disagree		
392	Disagree		
393	Agree		
394	Disagree		
395	Neutral		
396	Not Applicable		
397	Agree		
398	Agree		
399	Neutral		
400	Neutral		
401	Disagree		
402	Disagree		
403	Agree		
404	Disagree		
405	Disagree		
406	Agree		
407	Neutral		
408	Neutral		
409	Agree		
410	Neutral		
411	Disagree		
412	Disagree		
413	Disagree		
414	Disagree		
415	Agree		
416	Neutral		
417	Agree		
418	Neutral		
419	Not Applicable		
420	Neutral		
421	Disagree		
422	Disagree		

423	Agree		
424	Agree		
425	Agree		
426	Disagree		
427	Disagree		
428	Neutral		
429	Agree		
430	Disagree		
431	Neutral		
432	Neutral		
433	Disagree		
434	Disagree		
435	Neutral		
436	Neutral		
437	Agree		
438	Agree		
439	No Response		
440	Agree		However if your above changes go into effect Essentially this will not be the case for any students as your feeders would get preference. Also the students of teachers would also get preferential treatment.
441	Disagree		
442	Neutral		
443	Agree		
444	Agree		
445	Neutral		
446	Agree		
447	Agree		
448	Neutral		
449	Disagree		not sure that a 'random lottery' makes sense. some sort of methodology is needed as 'random lotteries' are open to questioning
450	Disagree		
451	Neutral		
452	Disagree		
453	Neutral		
454	Neutral		
455	Disagree		
456	No Response		
457	Disagree		
458	Agree		
459	Disagree		
460	Disagree		
461	Agree		
462	Agree		
463	Agree		
464	Agree		
465	Neutral		
466	Agree		
467	Disagree		
468	Agree		
469	Agree		
470	Neutral		
471	Neutral		

472	Disagree		
473	Agree		
474	Neutral		
475	Neutral		
476	Agree		
477	Neutral		
478	Disagree		
479	Not Applicable		
480	Disagree		
481	Neutral		
482	Neutral		
483	Neutral		
484	Neutral		
485	Neutral		
486	Neutral		
487	Agree		
488	Disagree		
489	Agree		
490	Agree		I believe surname use is discrimination against certain ethnic minorities.
491	Agree		
492	Neutral		
493	Neutral		
494	Agree		
495	Agree		
496	Disagree		
497	Neutral		
498	Agree		
499	Agree		
500	Neutral		
501	Disagree		
502	Agree		
503	Disagree		
504	Agree		
505	Disagree		
506	Agree		
507	Neutral		
508	Neutral		
509	Agree		
510	Disagree		
511	Disagree		
512	Neutral		
513	Neutral		
514	Neutral		
515	Neutral		
516	Disagree		
517	Neutral		
518	Neutral		
519	Disagree		
520	Agree		
521	Neutral		

522	Agree		
523	Disagree		
524	Disagree		
525	Disagree		
526	Disagree		
527	Agree		
528	Neutral		
529	Neutral		
530	Neutral		
531	No Response		
532	Disagree		
533	Agree		
534	Neutral		
535	Agree		
536	Neutral		
537	Disagree		
538	No Response		
539	Agree		
540	Agree		
541	Neutral		
542	Agree		
543	Disagree		
544	Disagree		
545	Disagree		Siblings should be before address.
546	Disagree		
547	Agree		
548	Agree		
549	Neutral		
550	Disagree		
551	Agree		
552	Neutral		
553	Disagree		
554	Agree		
555	Agree		
556	Neutral		
557	Disagree		
558	Neutral		
559	Disagree		
560	Neutral		
561	Agree		
562	Neutral		
563	Disagree		
564	Disagree		This is random, inequitable and along with the other proposed changes serves no educational benefit but again results in reduced choice for local families. _x000D_ It is underhand selection
565	Neutral		
566	Disagree		
567	Disagree		
568	Neutral		
569	Neutral		
570	Neutral		

571	Agree		
572	Disagree		
573	Neutral		
574	Disagree		
575	No Response		
576	Not Applicable		
577	Neutral		
578	Disagree		This seems to be a random lottery and therefore not at all fair as it doesn't give an equal access.
579	Disagree		
580	Disagree		
581	Disagree		
582	Disagree		
583	Neutral		
584	Disagree		
585	Neutral		
586	Neutral		
587	Agree		
588	Neutral		
589	Agree		
590	Agree		
591	Neutral		
592	Neutral		
593	No Response		
594	Disagree		
595	Agree		
596	Neutral		
597	Disagree		
598	Agree		
599	Disagree		
600	Neutral		
601	Disagree		
602	Disagree		
603	Neutral		
604	Agree		
605	Disagree		
606	Disagree		
607	Neutral		
608	Neutral		
609	Agree		
610	Agree		
611	Disagree		Pickhurst Junior Academy should remain a priority feeder school.
612	Disagree		
613	Neutral		
614	Agree		
615	Agree		
616	Agree		
617	Disagree		
618	Agree		
619	Disagree		
620	Neutral		

621	Disagree		
622	Disagree		
623	Agree		
624	Not Applicable		
625	Disagree		
626	Agree		
627	Neutral		
628	Agree		
629	Neutral		
630	Neutral		
631	Agree		
632	Neutral		
633	Disagree		
634	Neutral		
635	Disagree		
636	Neutral		
637	Neutral		
638	Disagree		
639	Agree		
640	Neutral		
641	Neutral		
642	Neutral		
643	Neutral		
644	Agree		I am not sure how this could be done in a way that reasonably reflects the fairest outcome. I think someone will always be disappointed.
645	Disagree		
646	Disagree		
647	Agree		
648	Agree		
649	Neutral		
650	Agree		
651	Neutral		
652	Neutral		
653	Neutral		
654	Agree		
655	Neutral		Didn't see that point but still closest pupils should be able to get into their local school regardless of membership of trust as parents have no control over what trust their primary school is under
656	Agree		
657	Disagree		
658	Agree		I agree this system is better than using door number or alphabetical order of surnames
659	Neutral		
660	Agree		
661	Agree		
662	Neutral		
663	Agree		
664	Neutral		
665	Neutral		
666	Agree		
667	Neutral		
668	No Response		
669	Neutral		

670	Neutral		
671	Neutral		
672	Agree		
673	Neutral		
674	Neutral		
675	Disagree		
676	Neutral		
677	Agree		
678	Agree		
679	Neutral		
680	Disagree		
681	Disagree		
682	Disagree		
683	Neutral		
684	Agree		
685	Agree		
686	Agree		
687	Agree		
688	Disagree		
689	Agree		
690	Not Applicable		
691	Agree		
692	Agree		
693	Disagree		
694	Neutral		
695	Disagree		
696	Agree		
697	Agree		Seems reasonable but if there really is a tie break between two students take them both surely.
698	Agree		
699	Agree		
700	Disagree		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	Agree		
702	Agree		Seems to be a fairer way to deal with that situation if it arises.
703	Agree		
704	Agree		
705	Neutral		
706	Neutral		
707	Neutral		
708	Neutral		
709	Neutral		
710	Agree		
711	Agree		
712	Neutral		
713	Agree		
714	Agree		
715	Disagree		
716	Not Applicable		
717	Disagree		
718	Agree		
719	Agree		

720	Not Applicable		
721	Disagree		
722	Agree		
723	Neutral		
724	Agree		
725	Neutral		
726	Neutral		
727	Disagree		
728	Agree		
729	Disagree		
730	No Response		
731	Disagree		
732	Neutral		Not really clear
733	Neutral		
734	Neutral		
735	Neutral		
736	Disagree		
737	Neutral		
738	Agree		
739	Agree		Yes this seems reasonable
740	Agree		
741	Neutral		
742	Disagree		
743	Disagree		
744	Neutral		
745	Agree		
746	Disagree		
747	Agree		
748	Neutral		
749	Not Applicable		
750	Neutral		
751	Not Applicable		
752	Disagree		
753	Agree		
754	Neutral		
755	Agree		
756	Agree		
757	Disagree		
758	Neutral		
759	Agree		
760	No Response		
761	Disagree		
762	Agree		
763	Disagree		
764	Agree		
765	Neutral		
766	Disagree		
767	Disagree		
768	Neutral		
769	Neutral		

770	Agree		
771	Agree		
772	Agree		
773	Disagree		
774	Agree		
775	Agree		
776	Disagree		
777	No Response		
778	Agree		
779	Agree		
780	Agree		
781	Neutral		
782	Agree		
783	Agree		
784	Disagree		
785	Neutral		
786	Disagree		
787	Disagree		
788	Neutral		No comment
789	Disagree		
790	Disagree		Siblings should have priority then distance _x000D_ Feeder schools should not be included
791	Neutral		
792	Neutral		
793	Agree		
794	Neutral		However if the catchment area is drastically reduced because most places have been taken up by feeder schools, distance will become almost pointless and children living nearby could well lose out.
795	Neutral		
796	Neutral		
797	Agree		
798	Not Applicable		
799	Agree		
800	Neutral		
801	Disagree		
802	Disagree		
803	Agree		
804	Agree		
805	Agree		
806	Agree		
807	Neutral		Most of the options are relatively arbitrary with no one appearing particularly better than any other.
808	Neutral		
809	Agree		
810	Disagree		Currently we live in _____ who will be attending secondary school in the year _____, does not have an option in regards to the tie breaker proposal as where we live we do not have a secondary school on offer.
811	Agree		
812	Agree		
813	Neutral		
814	Agree		
815	Neutral		
816	Agree		

817	Neutral		
818	Agree		
819	Neutral		
820	Neutral		
821	Not Applicable		
822	Disagree		
823	Neutral		
824	Agree		
825	Neutral		
826	Neutral		
827	Neutral		
828	Agree		
829	Neutral		
830	Neutral		
831	Neutral		
832	Neutral		
833	Agree		
834	Agree		
835	Neutral		
836	Agree		
837	Agree		
838	Agree		
839	Neutral		
840	Agree		
841	Neutral		
842	Agree		
843	Agree		
844	Disagree		
845	Disagree		Ridiculous suggestion that your surname can determine a school place. A lottery would be more ‘fair’
846	Neutral		
847	Disagree		
848	Agree		
849	Not Applicable		Scarcely applicable, given how proximity of residence would count for so little under proposals....
850	Disagree		
851	Neutral		
852	Agree		
853	Neutral		
854	Agree		
855	Neutral		
856	Disagree		
857	Disagree		
858	Neutral		
859	Neutral		Don’t understand what a tie breaker is
860	Disagree		
861	Disagree		
862	Agree		
863	No Response		
864	Neutral		Both current and proposed tie breakers (door number and alphabetical order of surname) are arbitrary.
865	Disagree		
866	Neutral		this change feels entirely arbitrary, as does the current policy

867	No Response		
868	Neutral		
869	Neutral		
870	Agree		
871	Agree		sounds fairer
872	Agree		
873	Neutral		
874	Agree		
875	Disagree		
876	Agree		
877	Disagree		
878	Disagree		
879	Disagree		
880	Agree		
881	Agree		
882	No Response		
883	Disagree		This is ludicrous. An improved suggestion would be to assess it based on how local the alternative schools for a child are. If, for example, the alternative to Langley Park is a bus ride away for one child, but the other can walk for 5 minutes, then this would be a simple decision. In the interest of the well-being of the child and the oval environment. I physically don't know how this idea has come to light.
884	Neutral		
885	Disagree		
886	Neutral		
887	Neutral		
888	Neutral		
889	Disagree		Please see other comments section.
890	Neutral		
891	Neutral		
892	Neutral		
893	Neutral		
894	Neutral		
895	Disagree		
896	Disagree		
897	Agree		
898	Agree		
899	Agree		
900	Agree		
901	Neutral		
902	Agree		
903	Agree		
904	Disagree		
905	Disagree		
906	Agree		
907	Neutral		
908	Disagree		
909	Disagree		I disagree on the basis that for a lot of parents who may be slightly (as in 0.1 miles) outside the catchment area, LPBS and LPGS are still their nearest secondary schools
910	Neutral		
911	Disagree		
912	Disagree		Adopting a random lottery in a tie breaker situation is not fair, and indeed appears less fair than having a set protocol (flat number/surname).
913	Disagree		There is no scope for tie break, your either eligible or not, catchment area is all encompassing, and proven by law
914	Agree		

915	Agree		
916	Agree		
917	Agree		
918	Disagree		
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 our son to attend your excellent school. I urge you to re think changing the current admission policy.
920	Agree		
921	Disagree		
922	Neutral		
923	Agree		
924	Neutral		
925	Agree		
926	Agree		
927	Agree		
928	Not Applicable		
929	Neutral		
930	Neutral		
931	Neutral		
932	Disagree		
933	Neutral		
934	Disagree		
935	Neutral		
936	Disagree		
937	Neutral		
938	Disagree		The disagreement originates from the revised oversubscription categories set out within the Admissions policy. If we ignore the oversubscription category, then the tie break appears fair if it is consistent within the borough as a whole (for consistency purposes).
939	Neutral		
940	Neutral		
941	No Response		
942	Agree		
943	Neutral		
944	Agree		
945	Agree		
946	Agree		
947	Agree		
948	Agree		
949	Agree		
950	Agree		
951	Disagree		This is inequitable.
952	Neutral		
953	Agree		again seems farer
954	Neutral		
955	Neutral		
956	Agree		
957	Neutral		

958	Neutral		
959	Neutral		
960	Agree		
961	Neutral		
962	Disagree		
963	Disagree		
964	Agree		
965	Disagree		
966	Disagree		SEE COMMENTS ABOVE on OTHER KEY CHANGES
967	Agree		
968	Neutral		
969	Neutral		
970	Disagree		
971	Neutral		
972	Neutral		
973	Agree		
974	Neutral		
975	Neutral		
976	Agree		
977	Neutral		
978	Neutral		
979	Agree		
980	Disagree		
981	Agree		
982	Neutral		
983	Disagree		
984	Agree		
985	Neutral		
986	Disagree		
987	Neutral		
988	Neutral		
989	Agree		
990	Not Applicable		
991	Agree		
992	Neutral		
993	Neutral		
994	Agree		
995	Disagree		
996	Disagree		
997	Disagree		
998	Agree		
999	Agree		
1000	Agree		
1001	Neutral		
1002	Neutral		
1003	Agree		
1004	Neutral		
1005	Neutral		
1006	Disagree		
1007	Neutral		

1008	Agree		
1009	Disagree		
1010	Disagree		
1011	Agree		
1012	Disagree		
1013	Agree		
1014	Agree		
1015	Agree		
1016	Neutral		
1017	Agree		
1018	Agree		
1019	Disagree		
1020	Neutral		
1021	Disagree		
1022	Agree		I feel that if children live equal distance from the school then it is more fair to use a lottery approach if all other things have been considered. It is unfair to use an alphabetical order/ ascending door number approach.
1023	Disagree		No clear explanation of 'random lottery' means - does this extend to all other children in borough? What happens to current 'waitlist' process. I assume this disappears. Again, not in-line with other schools in the borough
1024	Neutral		
1025	Disagree		Too complicated and open to questioning. Keep something simple and straight forward.
1026	Agree		
1027	Not Applicable		
1028	Agree		
1029	Disagree		
1030	Disagree		
1031	Neutral		
1032	Agree		
1033	Disagree		
1034	Agree		
1035	Neutral		
1036	Neutral		
1037	Neutral		
1038	Agree		
1039	Neutral		
1040	Agree		
1041	Agree		
1042	Neutral		
1043	Agree		
1044	Not Applicable		
1045	Agree		
1046	Disagree		
1047	Agree		
1048	Disagree		
1049	Agree		
1050	Disagree		
1051	No Response		
1052	Neutral		
1053	Neutral		
1054	Agree		
1055	Agree		

1056	Disagree		
1057	Neutral		
1058	Agree		
1059	Agree		
1060	Agree		
1061	Neutral		
1062	Agree		
1063	Agree		It should be a local school for local children
1064	Neutral		
1065	Neutral		
1066	Disagree		
1067	Disagree		
1068	Agree		
1069	Agree		
1070	Neutral		
1071	Neutral		
1072	Agree		Random lottery is a much fairer way to decide this - having a high number door number and my surname at the latter end of the alphabet shouldn't have any effect on whether a school place is awarded.
1073	Agree		
1074	Agree		
1075	Agree		Agreed. I will note the irony of the Board of Trustee's citing of the "Code for fairness" in relation to this topic while seeming to be oblivious to fairness while suggesting the feeder schools.
1076	Neutral		
1077	Agree		
1078	Neutral		
1079	Disagree		
1080	Neutral		
1081	Disagree		
1082	Disagree		
1083	Neutral		
1084	Disagree		
1085	Agree		
1086	No Response		
1087	Agree		
1088	No Response		
1089	Disagree		
1090	Agree		
1091	Agree		
1092	Agree		
1093	Agree		Much fairer
1094	Neutral		
1095	Agree		If I understood correctly, when 2 children live on the same block of flats, instead of being chosen based on the house number or the alphabetical order of their last names, the places will be allocated through a random lottery. If that's the case, I think that's fair, as children have no control over their house number or the first letter on their last name.
1096	Neutral		
1097	Agree		
1098	Neutral		
1099	Not Applicable		
1100	Disagree		
1101	Neutral		

1102	Agree		
1103	Neutral		
1104	Neutral		
1105	Disagree		
1106	Disagree		
1107	Neutral		
1108	Neutral		
1109	Disagree		
1110	No Response		
1111	Agree		It is very unfair to use alphabetical order as a tie breaker. There is no fair criterion I can think of, so your proposal for random seems to be the fairest, in the very limited context you have described.
1112	Neutral		
1113	Neutral		
1114	Disagree		
1115	Agree		
1116	Neutral		
1117	Disagree		
1118	Neutral		
1119	Not Applicable		
1120	Not Applicable		
1121	Neutral		
1122	Disagree		Criteria for the tie breaker should be consistent across the borough, with proximity to the school the deciding factor.
1123	Neutral		
1124	Agree		
1125	Agree		
1126	Neutral		It seems best to use the lottery system when there is a tie break situation.
1127	Disagree		
1128	Disagree		
1129	Disagree		
1130	Neutral		
1131	Neutral		
1132	Disagree		
1133	Not Applicable		
1134	Neutral		
1135	Agree		
1136	Agree		
1137	Disagree		
1138	Agree		
1139	Disagree		
1140	Not Applicable		
1141	Neutral		
1142	Neutral		
1143	Neutral		
1144	Not Applicable		
1145	Disagree		
1146	Neutral		
1147	Disagree		
1148	Neutral		
1149	Agree		
1150	Disagree		

1151	Neutral		
1152	Agree		
1153	Disagree		
1154	Disagree		
1155	Disagree		
1156	Disagree		
1157	Agree		
1158	Disagree		
1159	Disagree		
1160	Neutral		
1161	Disagree		
1162	Disagree		
1163	Agree		
1164	Disagree		
1165	Neutral		
1166	No Response		
1167	Disagree		
1168	Disagree		
1169	Disagree		
1170	Disagree		
1171	Disagree		This is an unfair and unacceptable method and would lead to speculation of corruption since how on earth are parents expected to accept this was done fairly if its their child missing out on a place.
1172	Neutral		
1173	Disagree		
1174	Neutral		
1175	Disagree		There is nothing fair about a random lottery. This proposal does nothing but add further stress to an already stressful time for parents and students due to this complete unpredictability.
1176	Disagree		
1177	Disagree		
1178	Disagree		
1179	Neutral		
1180	Disagree		
1181	Neutral		
1182	Neutral		
1183	Neutral		
1184	Agree		
1185	Not Applicable		
1186	Agree		
1187	Neutral		
1188	Neutral		
1189	Disagree		Assigning according to surname does not make a fair system
1190	Disagree		Assigning according to surname does not make a fair system
1191	Disagree		
1192	Disagree		
1193	Agree		
1194	Neutral		
1195	Disagree		
1196	Neutral		
1197	Neutral		
1198	Neutral		
1199	Disagree		

1200	Agree		
1201	Disagree		
1202	Disagree		
1203	Disagree		Not really equitable is it?
1204	Neutral		
1205	Disagree		
1206	Disagree		
1207	Neutral		
1208	Neutral		
1209	Disagree		
1210	Not Applicable		
1211	Disagree		
1212	Agree		
1213	Disagree		
1214	Neutral		
1215	Agree		
1216	Disagree		
1217	Disagree		
1218	Neutral		
1219	Disagree		
1220	No Response		
1221	Not Applicable		
1222	Agree		It is absolutely right that the allocation is done through a fairer system than alphabetical order when it comes to allocating final places. No child should be penalised because their surname begins with Z rather than A, or they live in flat 15 rather than 1.
1223	Disagree		
1224	Neutral		
1225	Disagree		This is not transparent, repeatable or measurable therefore is inherently unfair.
1226	Disagree		
1227	Neutral		
1228	Neutral		
1229	Disagree		
1230	Disagree		
1231	Agree		
1232	Neutral		
1233	Disagree		
1234	Neutral		I understand a final decision has to be made but i do not think its fair to pick based on door number or surname. It should be more of a lottery pick.
1235	Neutral		
1236	Disagree		
1237	Disagree		
1238	Neutral		
1239	Neutral		
1240	Agree		
1241	Neutral		
1242	Disagree		Should remain as previously. Just because a child is at the beginning of the alphabet or at a lower flat number this should not benefit them and could cause problems in the flats etc.
1243	Neutral		
1244	Agree		
1245	Disagree		Using alphabetical surname is random and open to fraud. It could lead to people changing name via deed pole or using the name of the partner which is early in the alphabet. Much better to use the child's birthday which is not open to fraud.
1246	Disagree		Using a random lottery system is not an equitable method of deciding.
1247	Disagree		A random lottery is not a fair method.

1248	Disagree		Random lottery is not an equitable method for deciding on places.
1249	Disagree		
1250	Disagree		
1251	Neutral		
1252	Neutral		
1253	Neutral		
1254	Disagree		
1255	Disagree		I think the admissions policy should stay as it is at present. There will be many disappointed children who will be expecting to move on to the secondary schools under the current policy.
1256	Disagree		
1257	Agree		
1258	Disagree		
1259	Neutral		
1260	Neutral		
1261	Neutral		
1262	Disagree		I think if there is a lottery-style tie-breaker in place of a clear rule (such as the current rule that the closer you are to the entrance to a block of flats, the higher the priority within those flats), the result will be an increase in feelings of "unfairness" amongst applicants, resulting in resentment between neighbours living within the same block of flats and an increase in appeals to the secondary schools.
1263	Agree		
1264	Agree		
1265	Disagree		
1266	Agree		
1267	Disagree		Surname is not a fair way to assign as we do not choose our surname
1268	Disagree		Allocation by reference to a Child's surname in alphabetical order is unfair and may be open to manipulation.
1269	Agree		
1270	Agree		
1271	Agree		
1272	Neutral		
1273	Neutral		
1274	Disagree		
1275	Agree		
1276	Neutral		
1277	Not Applicable		
1278	Neutral		
1279	Neutral		
1280	Agree		Provided this is used only where distances are exactly the same this seems fairer, than operating on door numbers or order in the alphabet. I am assuming that the cost of having to engage someone independent will be a deterrent to the system being abused.
1281	Disagree		
1282	Neutral		
1283	Agree		
1284	Not Applicable		
1285	Disagree		
1286	Disagree		A random lottery is not suitable.
1287	Disagree		
1288	Disagree		
1289	Agree		
1290	Disagree		
1291	Neutral		
1292	Neutral		
1293	Disagree		
1294	Neutral		

1295	Disagree		
1296	Neutral		
1297	Agree		
1298	Disagree		
1299	Neutral		
1300	Agree		
1301	Neutral		
1302	Agree		
1303	Disagree		
1304	Neutral		
1305	Agree		
1306	Agree		
1307	Disagree		As I said before the distance from home to school should have priority over to which primary school pupils attend. Such a major decision should be made well in advance. . If we knew there is a possibility this may happen before he started school we would have moved house and applied for another primary school. Rhis will make big negative impact on the area around the school.
1308	Disagree		
1309	Disagree		
1310	Neutral		
1311	Neutral		
1312	Disagree		I believe that children should attend their local secondary schools. If places were allocated at random it again would encourage children living large distances from the schools to apply, and if they're selected would also add to the traffic congestion.
1313	Disagree		
1314	Disagree		
1315	Disagree		
1316	Neutral		
1317	Disagree		
1318	Agree		
1319	Neutral		
1320	Agree		
1321	Neutral		
1322	Disagree		
1323	Disagree		
1324	Agree		
1325	Disagree		
1326	Neutral		
1327	Agree		
1328	Neutral		
1329	Disagree		
1330	Not Applicable		
1331	Disagree		
1332	Agree		
1333	Agree		
1334	Agree		
1335	Neutral		
1336	Agree		
1337	Agree		
1338	Neutral		
1339	Neutral		
1340	Neutral		
1341	Agree		

1342	Disagree		
1343	Agree		
1344	Neutral		
1345	Not Applicable		
1346	Disagree		
1347	Disagree		
1348	Neutral		
1349	Disagree		
1350	Neutral		
1351	Disagree		
1352	Neutral		
1353	Agree		
1354	Neutral		
1355	Agree		
1356	Neutral		
1357	Neutral		
1358	Disagree		
1359	Neutral		
1360	Disagree		
1361	Disagree		This is not fair. It should be based on proximity
1362	Disagree		
1363	Not Applicable		
1364	Not Applicable		
1365	Disagree		
1366	Neutral		
1367	Neutral		
1368	Disagree		
1369	Disagree		
1370	Disagree		
1371	Agree		
1372	Neutral		
1373	Agree		
1374	Agree		
1375	Neutral		
1376	Agree		This is welcomed, a lottery in these unique circumstances is far fairer than the use of door numbers or surnames which was arbitrary and unfair.
1377	Agree		
1378	Neutral		
1379	Disagree		Having a final lottery does not take into account the needs of each family, which need to be taken into account.
1380	Neutral		
1381	Disagree		it is unclear who will be responsible for the management of the tie breaker and what measures will be introduced to ensure the this is administered without any risk of corruption. No evidence has been presented to demonstrate that this policy has been discussed and agreed with Bromley Schools Admissions Team and yet, the Langley Learning trust would have to work with the central schools admissions team, to ensure the this policy effectively executed with 100% accuracy between both parties.
1382	Agree		
1383	Agree		
1384	Agree		
1385	Neutral		
1386	Neutral		
1387	Agree		
1388	Neutral		
1389	Disagree		

1390	Disagree		
1391	Disagree		
1392	Not Applicable		
1393	Agree		
1394	Neutral		
1395	Agree		
1396	Neutral		
1397	Disagree		
1398	Not Applicable		
1399	Agree		
1400	Agree		
1401	Disagree		
1402	Neutral		
1403	Agree		
1404	Neutral		
1405	Neutral		
1406	Neutral		
1407	Agree		This seems a much fairer approach.
1408	Neutral		
1409	Disagree		
1410	Neutral		
1411	Disagree		
1412	Disagree		
1413	Disagree		<p>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.</p> <p>The affect this would have on pollution due to extra traffic congestion into the area would almost certainly have a negative impact.</p> <p>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.</p>
1414	Neutral		
1415	Disagree		
1416	Agree		
1417	No Response		
1418	Neutral		
1419	Agree		
1420	Agree		Where there is genuinely equal distance say from the front entrance of a block of flats then a random allocation is probably the fairest way.
1421	Agree		
1422	Neutral		
1423	Disagree		
1424	Disagree		
1425	Agree		
1426	Agree		
1427	Disagree		
1428	Agree		
1429	Neutral		
1430	Agree		
1431	Disagree		
1432	Disagree		
1433	Neutral		

1434	Disagree		
1435	Agree		
1436	Agree		
1437	Neutral		
1438	Neutral		
1439	Disagree		
1440	Disagree		
1441	Disagree		
1442	Agree		
1443	Disagree		
1444	Disagree		
1445	Agree		
1446	Neutral		
1447	Disagree		
1448	Neutral		
1449	Disagree		
1450	Neutral		
1451	Disagree		
1452	Neutral		I think both the old and new tie breaker conditions seem to be fair.
1453	Disagree		
1454	Agree		
1455	Neutral		
1456	Not Applicable		
1457	Neutral		
1458	Disagree		
1459	Disagree		
1460	Neutral		
1461	Neutral		
1462	Disagree		
1463	Neutral		
1464	Disagree		
1465	Disagree		
1466	Neutral		
1467	No Response		
1468	Agree		
1469	Disagree		
1470	Neutral		
1471	Disagree		
1472	Disagree		
1473	Agree		
1474	Disagree		
1475	Neutral		
1476	Neutral		
1477	Neutral		
1478	Agree		
1479	Neutral		
1480	Agree		
1481	Disagree		
1482	Neutral		
1483	Neutral		

1484	Agree		
1485	Neutral		
1486	Neutral		
1487	Disagree		
1488	Disagree		
1489	Agree		
1490	Neutral		
1491	Neutral		
1492	Disagree		
1493	Neutral		
1494	Agree		
1495	Neutral		
1496	Neutral		
1497	Disagree		
1498	Agree		
1499	Agree		
1500	Disagree		
1501	Agree		
1502	Agree		
1503	Not Applicable		
1504	Neutral		
1505	Neutral		
1506	No Response		Not sure what this is.
1507	Neutral		
1508	Neutral		
1509	Disagree		
1510	Neutral		
1511	Disagree		
1512	Agree		
1513	Neutral		
1514	Disagree		
1515	Neutral		
1516	Disagree		
1517	Agree		
1518	Neutral		
1519	Disagree		
1520	Neutral		
1521	Neutral		
1522	Neutral		
1523	No Response		
1524	Neutral		
1525	Agree		
1526	Agree		
1527	Agree		
1528	Not Applicable		
1529	Neutral		
1530	Disagree		How can alphabet be fairer than house number?
1531	Agree		
1532	Neutral		
1533	Disagree		

1534	Disagree		
1535	Neutral		
1536	Neutral		
1537	Neutral		
1538	Neutral		
1539	Agree		Random lottery does seem to be a fairer method.
1540	Neutral		
1541	Neutral		
1542	Disagree		
1543	Disagree		
1544	Neutral		
1545	Not Applicable		
1546	Neutral		
1547	Disagree		
1548	Disagree		
1549	Not Applicable		
1550	Agree		
1551	Agree		
1552	Agree		
1553	Agree		
1554	Disagree		
1555	Neutral		
1556	Neutral		
1557	Disagree		
1558	Disagree		
1559	Agree		
1560	Disagree		The current arrangements seem fairer.
1561	Agree		
1562	Neutral		
1563	Neutral		
1564	Agree		Agree.
1565	Neutral		
1566	Agree		
1567	Neutral		
1568	Neutral		
1569	Neutral		
1570	Agree		
1571	Agree		Absolutely agree with this proposed change. Note the document says this is about *fairness*.
1572	Agree		
1573	Disagree		
1574	Agree		
1575	Disagree		
1576	Neutral		As above, I can see no reason to query this, but, given the apparent lack of transparency regarding siblings, I'm concerned that perhaps there are further underhand moves here which I just haven't spotted yet! It seems nothing can be taken at face value here.
1577	Agree		
1578	Neutral		
1579	Neutral		
1580	Disagree		
1581	Agree		
1582	Agree		

1583	Neutral		
1584	Neutral		
1585	Disagree		This is far too random.
1586	Disagree		
1587	Disagree		
1588	No Response		
1589	Disagree		I object to these changes as a random lottery does not enable equitable access to places in school. This is perceived to be inequitable due to its randomness.
1590	Disagree		
1591	Disagree		
1592	Agree		
1593	Neutral		
1594	Disagree		
1595	Neutral		
1596	Neutral		
1597	Neutral		
1598	Disagree		
1599	Neutral		
1600	Agree		
1601	Disagree		
1602	Neutral		
1603	Disagree		
1604	Neutral		
1605	Neutral		
1606	Agree		
1607	Agree		
1608	Disagree		
1609	Disagree		
1610	Neutral		
1611	Agree		
1612	Agree		Distance has always been the accepted tie breaker. It makes sense to continue with this as local schools should service local communities.
1613	Disagree		
1614	Neutral		
1615	Neutral		I agree they shouldn't be chosen by alphabetical order, however disagree that the closest address gets 1st priority.
1616	Disagree		
1617	Neutral		
1618	Neutral		
1619	Disagree		
1620	Agree		
1621	Disagree		
1622	Disagree		I disagree because of its randomness.
1623	Disagree		
1624	Disagree		I do not agree with the change because it is degrading to local schools
1625	Agree		
1626	Disagree		
1627	Neutral		
1628	No Response		
1629	Disagree		
1630	Disagree		
1631	Agree		
1632	Agree		

1633	Neutral		
1634	Not Applicable		
1635	Agree		
1636	Agree		
1637	Neutral		
1638	Neutral		
1639	Agree		
1640	Agree		
1641	Agree		
1642	Not Applicable		
1643	Disagree		
1644	Disagree		
1645	Agree		
1646	Disagree		
1647	Not Applicable		
1648	Disagree		
1649	Agree		
1650	Agree		
1651	Disagree		
1652	Neutral		
1653	Disagree		
1654	Agree		
1655	Disagree		
1656	Not Applicable		
1657	Neutral		
1658	Neutral		
1659	Disagree		
1660	Neutral		
1661	Neutral		
1662	No Response		
1663	Agree		
1664	Neutral		
1665	Neutral		
1666	Neutral		
1667	Neutral		
1668	Disagree		
1669	Agree		
1670	Agree		
1671	Neutral		
1672	Agree		
1673	Neutral		
1674	Agree		
1675	Not Applicable		
1676	Neutral		
1677	Agree		A completely random allocation when distance is tied is a fairer system than previous rules.
1678	Neutral		
1679	Not Applicable		
1680	Disagree		I object to the changes to the tie breaker measure, as a random lottery does_x000D_ not enable equitable access to places in schools. This is inequitable due to its_x000D_ randomness.

1681	Neutral		
1682	Agree		
1683	Not Applicable		
1684	Neutral		
1685	Neutral		
1686	Disagree		
1687	Disagree		
1688	Agree		
1689	Disagree		May have some influence over where you can afford to live, but very little over your name.
1690	Disagree		The random lottery nature is unfair. How would we be sure that this has been carried out completely randomly? Would it be computer generated? Who would be responsible for this?
1691	Disagree		
1692	Disagree		How will this be certified for fairness?
1693	Agree		
1694	Disagree		
1695	Disagree		
1696	Neutral		
1697	Disagree		
1698	Agree		
1699	Agree		
1700	Neutral		
1701	Disagree		
1702	Agree		
1703	Agree		
1704	Agree		
1705	Disagree		
1706	Agree		
1707	Disagree		
1708	Neutral		
1709	Agree		
1710	Neutral		
1711	Disagree		
1712	Disagree		
1713	Disagree		
1714	Agree		
1715	Neutral		
1716	Neutral		
1717	Not Applicable		
1718	Neutral		
1719	Neutral		
1720	Agree		
1721	Neutral		
1722	Neutral		
1723	Neutral		
1724	Agree		
1725	Neutral		
1726	Disagree		
1727	Neutral		
1728	Disagree		
1729	Agree		
1730	Agree		This sounds equitable and reasonable.

1731	Disagree		
1732	Neutral		
1733	Neutral		
1734	Agree		
1735	Disagree		
1736	Disagree		
1737	Neutral		
1738	Agree		
1739	Agree		
1740	Neutral		
1741	Agree		
1742	Agree		
1743	Neutral		
1744	No Response		
1745	Not Applicable		
1746	Neutral		
1747	No Response		
1748	Not Applicable		
1749	Neutral		
1750	Agree		
1751	Neutral		
1752	Neutral		
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		See above
1765	Agree		
1766	Disagree		A random lottery is not fair and leads to more uncertainty for families. The admission arrangements should stick to the status quo, which people know, understand and can factor into their decision making.
1767	Neutral		
1768	Neutral		
1769	Disagree		
1770	Disagree		
1771	No Response		
1772	Agree		
1773	Neutral		
1774	Agree		
1775	Neutral		
1776	Agree		
1777	Neutral		
1778	Neutral		
1779	Disagree		

1780	Neutral		The introduction of a 'random lottery' for no particular reason seems questionable (does it meet any test of objectivity?) and it is unclear what problem with the current system it is seeking to remedy.
1781	Neutral		
1782	Neutral		
1783	Neutral		
1784	Disagree		
1785	Disagree		
1786	Agree		This is fair.
1787	Neutral		
1788	Not Applicable		
1789	Agree		
1790	Agree		
1791	Neutral		
1792	Agree		
1793	Disagree		
1794	Disagree		
1795	Agree		
1796	Neutral		
1797	Agree		
1798	Agree		
1799	Neutral		
1800	Disagree		
1801	Disagree		
1802	Agree		
1803	Disagree		
1804	Neutral		
1805	Agree		
1806	Agree		
1807	Neutral		
1808	Neutral		
1809	Neutral		
1810	Agree		
1811	Agree		
1812	Agree		
1813	Agree		This seems fair and sensible.
1814	Agree		Random draw seems fair.
1815	Neutral		
1816	Agree		
1817	Neutral		
1818	Not Applicable		
1819	Agree		
1820	Neutral		
1821	Neutral		
1822	Neutral		
1823	Disagree		
1824	Neutral		
1825	Agree		
1826	Neutral		
1827	Neutral		
1828	Agree		

1829	Neutral		
1830	Disagree		
1831	Agree		
1832	Neutral		
1833	Agree		
1834	Agree		
1835	Neutral		
1836	Agree		
1837	Neutral		
1838	Agree		
1839	Neutral		
1840	Disagree		
1841	Agree		
1842	No Response		
1843	Neutral		
1844	Neutral		
1845	Neutral		
1846	Agree		
1847	Agree		
1848	Agree		
1849	Neutral		
1850	Agree		
1851	Neutral		
1852	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number' (in a block of flats).
1853	Neutral		
1854	Neutral		
1855	No Response		
1856	Neutral		
1857	Agree		
1858	Agree		
1859	Agree		
1860	Neutral		
1861	Agree		
1862	Agree		
1863	Agree		A fair proposal as equal chance to the children in question over an offer based on surname or door number.
1864	Neutral		
1865	Neutral		
1866	Agree		
1867	Agree		A fair way of offering.
1868	Disagree		A random lottery does not enable equitable access to places in schools.
1869	Agree		
1870	Agree		
1871	Agree		
1872	Neutral		
1873	Neutral		
1874	Neutral		
1875	Disagree		
1876	Not Applicable		
1877	Neutral		
1878	Agree		

1879	Neutral		
1880	Neutral		
1881	Agree		
1882	Disagree		
1883	Disagree		
1884	Disagree		
1885	Neutral		
1886	Not Applicable		
1887	Disagree		
1888	Agree		Seems more fair
1889	Neutral		
1890	Neutral		
1891	Neutral		
1892	Neutral		
1893	Neutral		
1894	Neutral		
1895	Agree		
1896	Agree		This seems a more fairer and equal approach
1897	Disagree		
1898	Neutral		
1899	Neutral		
1900	Neutral		
1901	Agree		
1902	Neutral		
1903	Agree		
1904	Disagree		
1905	Disagree		
1906	Disagree		
1907	Agree		
1908	Disagree		
1909	Agree		
1910	Disagree		
1911	Neutral		
1912	Neutral		
1913	Agree		
1914	Disagree		
1915	Neutral		
1916	Agree		
1917	Agree		The new proposal is fair.
1918	Agree		
1919	Agree		new proposal is fair.
1920	Agree		
1921	Neutral		
1922	Agree		
1923	Agree		
1924	Neutral		
1925	Agree		
1926	Neutral		
1927	Neutral		
1928	Disagree		

1929	Agree		
1930	Disagree		This should be taken on door to door and not but surname lottery
1931	Disagree		
1932	Disagree		
1933	Disagree		
1934	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more_x000D_ appropriate.
1935	Neutral		
1936	Disagree		
1937	Neutral		
1938	Neutral		
1939	Not Applicable		
1940	Not Applicable		
1941	Disagree		
1942	Agree		
1943	Neutral		
1944	Disagree		
1945	Disagree		Entirely inequitable
1946	Agree		
1947	Neutral		
1948	Neutral		
1949	Neutral		
1950	Disagree		
1951	Neutral		
1952	Disagree		
1953	Neutral		
1954	Disagree		
1955	Neutral		
1956	Disagree		
1957	Agree		
1958	Agree		The new tie-breaker rules based on random selection is much fairer than the existing system.
1959	Disagree		
1960	Agree		
1961	Disagree		
1962	Agree		
1963	Disagree		I don't believe there is anything wrong with the current system
1964	Neutral		
1965	Agree		
1966	Neutral		
1967	Neutral		
1968	Neutral		
1969	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is fair.
1970	Disagree		
1971	Disagree		
1972	Disagree		
1973	Agree		
1974	Agree		
1975	Disagree		
1976	Agree		
1977	Agree		

1978	Disagree		
1979	Disagree		
1980	Agree		
1981	Agree		
1982	Neutral		
1983	Neutral		
1984	Agree		For me personally, I moved to the area with a view that _____ would be able to walk to our local school. If these proposals go ahead, its unlikely that _____, and therefore its very likely that he will have to travel some distance, either by public transport or driven by a parent, to school. Which will be the case for many families in our community. At a time when we are all trying our best to reduce our carbon footprint, it seems outrageous to deny children access to their local school to which they could walk or cycle.
1985	Disagree		
1986	Disagree		
1987	Neutral		
1988	Neutral		
1989	Neutral		
1990	No Response		
1991	Agree		Living close to the school should be the priority
1992	Neutral		
1993	Agree		
1994	Neutral		
1995	Agree		
1996	Disagree		
1997	Neutral		
1998	Neutral		
1999	Agree		
2000	Neutral		
2001	Neutral		
2002	Neutral		
2003	Neutral		
2004	Agree		
2005	Agree		
2006	Neutral		
2007	Disagree		
2008	Agree		
2009	Disagree		
2010	Agree		
2011	Neutral		
2012	No Response		
2013	Agree		
2014	Disagree		
2015	Agree		
2016	No Response		
2017	Agree		
2018	Neutral		
2019	Disagree		
2020	Neutral		
2021	Neutral		
2022	Neutral		
2023	Neutral		
2024	Agree		This seems fair.

2025	Neutral		
2026	Agree		
2027	Disagree		
2028	Disagree		
2029	Agree		
2030	Agree		
2031	Neutral		
2032	Disagree		
2033	Agree		
2034	Agree		
2035	Agree		
2036	Neutral		
2037	Neutral		
2038	Neutral		
2039	Neutral		
2040	Disagree		
2041	Neutral		
2042	Neutral		
2043	Agree		
2044	Agree		
2045	Neutral		
2046	Agree		
2047	Disagree		
2048	Disagree		
2049	Neutral		
2050	Disagree		
2051	No Response		
2052	Agree		
2053	Disagree		I think if there is a lottery-style tie-breaker in place of a clear rule (such as the current rule that the closer you are to the entrance to a block of flats, the higher the priority within those flats), the result will be an increase in feelings of "unfairness" amongst applicants, resulting in resentment between neighbours living within the same block of flats and an increase in appeals to the secondary schools.
2054	Agree		
2055	Neutral		
2056	Disagree		
2057	Not Applicable		
2058	Agree		
2059	Disagree		
2060	Agree		
2061	Disagree		
2062	Neutral		
2063	Neutral		
2064	Neutral		
2065	Neutral		
2066	Agree		
2067	Agree		A draw seems more appropriate and fairer than the extant methods of deciding which child gets a place in the event that two children are in competition for one space because they live the same distance from the school.
2068	Neutral		
2069	Neutral		
2070	Neutral		
2071	Neutral		

2072	Neutral		
2073	Neutral		
2074	Neutral		
2075	Disagree		
2076	Disagree		It's fairer to retain the current arrangements.
2077	Neutral		
2078	Disagree		
2079	Agree		
2080	Agree		
2081	Agree		
2082	Neutral		
2083	Agree		I think it is fair, all other items being equal that distance is used.
2084	Neutral		
2085	Disagree		
2086	Neutral		I am not sure what the fairest way is.
2087	Disagree		This assumes that LPPC can properly be in a tie-break situation. I strongly object to that mistaken premise.
2088	Agree		
2089	Disagree		
2090	Neutral		
2091	Agree		
2092	Agree		
2093	Agree		
2094	Disagree		
2095	Neutral		
2096	Neutral		As above
2097	Agree		
2098	Neutral		
2099	Agree		
2100	Agree		
2101	Agree		
2102	Disagree		
2103	Agree		
2104	Neutral		
2105	Neutral		
2106	No Response		
2107	Disagree		
2108	Neutral		
2109	Disagree		
2110	Disagree		
2111	No Response		
2112	Agree		
2113	Neutral		
2114	Neutral		
2115	Agree		Fair and just
2116	Neutral		
2117	Neutral		
2118	Agree		
2119	Neutral		
2120	Neutral		
2121	Neutral		

2122	Agree		
2123	Agree		
2124	Not Applicable		
2125	Agree		
2126	Agree		Positive - Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or door number' (in a block of flats)
2127	Neutral		
2128	Neutral		
2129	Agree		
2130	Disagree		
2131	Agree		
2132	Disagree		
2133	Agree		
2134	Disagree		
2135	Agree		
2136	Neutral		
2137	Agree		
2138	Neutral		
2139	Neutral		
2140	Neutral		
2141	Agree		
2142	Agree		
2143	Neutral		
2144	Agree		
2145	Neutral		
2146	Neutral		
2147	Neutral		
2148	Agree		
2149	Agree		
2150	Agree		
2151	Neutral		
2152	Not Applicable		
2153	Neutral		
2154	Disagree		
2155	Agree		
2156	Agree		The principle of random selection is more democratic than any of the other existing methods.
2157	Neutral		
2158	Disagree		
2159	Neutral		
2160	Neutral		
2161	Agree		
2162	Agree		
2163	Agree		A fairer way than the arbitrary method of surname and flat number.
2164	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number' (in a block of flats).
2165	Agree		
2166	Neutral		
2167	Agree		
2168	Agree		
2169	Disagree		
2170	Neutral		
2171	Neutral		

2172	Neutral		
2173	Agree		This seems to be more appropriate and democratic
2174	Neutral		
2175	Disagree		
2176	Disagree		
2177	Agree		I agree this is a fairer system.
2178	Disagree		This is not a fair system.
2179	Agree		
2180	Neutral		
2181	Disagree		
2182	Agree		
2183	Agree		
2184	Agree		
2185	Agree		
2186	Agree		
2187	Neutral		
2188	Neutral		
2189	Agree		This seem to be a fairer way for selections.
2190	Disagree		
2191	Disagree		
2192	No Response		
2193	Disagree		
2194	Agree		
2195	Neutral		
2196	Agree		
2197	Neutral		Having said that I am neutral on this I do not like the sound of a 'random lottery', but this does seem fairer than door number or alphabetical. However, I would question whether in reality this tie breaker would come into effect.
2198	Neutral		
2199	Neutral		
2200	Disagree		
2201	No Response		The proposed changes are unfair, do nothing to reduce the carbon footprint of local parents and children travelling to school and should not be allowed to be implemented.
2202	Agree		
2203	No Response		
2204	Disagree		
2205	Not Applicable		
2206	Neutral		
2207	Not Applicable		
2208	Disagree		
2209	Agree		
2210	Disagree		
2211	Agree		
2212	Agree		
2213	Disagree		Unicorn will be disadvantaged and choices taken away from pupils / parents
2214	Disagree		
2215	Disagree		There should be one criteria i.e either allocation of place is made by proximity to school or lottery. By having both option I think this will stress the parents as it is a complicate rule.
2216	Agree		
2217	Neutral		
2218	Neutral		
2219	Agree		
2220	Neutral		

2221	Neutral		
2222	Disagree		
2223	Disagree		
2224	Disagree		
2225	Neutral		
2226	Neutral		
2227	Disagree		
2228	Disagree		
2229	Disagree		
2230	Disagree		You take both children.
2231	Agree		
2232	Neutral		
2233	Disagree		
2234	Disagree		
2235	Not Applicable		
2236	Not Applicable		
2237	Agree		A random draw seems much more fair
2238	Neutral		
2239	Disagree		
2240	Agree		
2241	Neutral		
2242	Not Applicable		
2243	Disagree		
2244	Neutral		
2245	Neutral		
2246	Neutral		
2247	Agree		
2248	Disagree		
2249	Neutral		It's an impossible task. I don't have the answer or solution, sorry!
2250	Agree		
2251	Neutral		
2252	Disagree		
2253	Disagree		
2254	Agree		
2255	Agree		
2256	Agree		
2257	Agree		I think this is fairer but you could implement this without the feeder schools option which is not only divisive to the community but will cause problems with transport.
2258	Neutral		
2259	Neutral		
2260	Agree		
2261	Disagree		
2262	Neutral		
2263	Agree		A lottery is a lot fairer than picking up children by surname or door number.
2264	Agree		
2265	Neutral		
2266	Agree		
2267	Agree		
2268	Agree		This proposal sounds more fair than the current one
2269	Disagree		
2270	Agree		

2271	Agree		
2272	Disagree		I think that changes of this nature should be made across all Bromley admissions to allow a fair process for all.
2273	Neutral		
2274	No Response		My comment above applies.
2275	Neutral		
2276	Disagree		changes to tie breaker measure as a random lottery does not enable equitable access to places in schools
2277	Disagree		
2278	Disagree		
2279	Disagree		
2280	Agree		
2281	Disagree		Horrible wording has again been used and therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2282	Not Applicable		
2283	Disagree		
2284	Neutral		
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	Agree		New tie breaker is MUCH better.
2290	Neutral		
2291	Neutral		
2292	Agree		Arrangements for random draw would have to be tightly managed to ensure fair play
2293	Neutral		
2294	Disagree		
2295	Neutral		
2296	Disagree		
2297	Agree		
2298	No Response		
2299	Neutral		
2300	Agree		
2301	Neutral		
2302	Neutral		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either "surname" or "door number" (in a block of flats).
2303	Agree		
2304	Agree		
2305	Agree		
2306	Disagree		I disagree with how admission will be decided by surname / random lottery. Keep the admission to be within the catchment area only.
2307	Disagree		
2308	Disagree		
2309	Agree		
2310	Neutral		
2311	Agree		
2312	Agree		
2313	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either "surname" or "door number" (in a block of flats)
2314	Agree		
2315	Neutral		
2316	Agree		
2317	Neutral		

2318	Agree		
2319	No Response		
2320	Neutral		
2321	Neutral		
2322	Disagree		
2323	Neutral		
2324	Disagree		
2325	Disagree		Surnames should not come into it. Proximity is fair and recognised. Therefore, flat or house numbers is a fair and less emotive way to operate.
2326	Neutral		
2327	Agree		
2328	Neutral		
2329	Neutral		
2330	Agree		
2331	Agree		
2332	Neutral		
2333	Neutral		
2334	Agree		
2335	Agree		
2336	Disagree		This system is open to abuse. Will it be possible to independently verify in cases of appeal that the random lottery was indeed random? Allocating by door number in a block of flats is fair because the child living at the lower door number will live closer to the school. Likewise with surname it can be verified retrospectively in the case of appeal.
2337	Neutral		
2338	Neutral		
2339	Neutral		
2340	Agree		
2341	Disagree		
2342	Neutral		
2343	Disagree		
2344	Neutral		
2345	Disagree		Your tie breaker should mirror the local authority's
2346	Disagree		
2347	Neutral		
2348	Neutral		
2349	Agree		
2350	Agree		
2351	Agree		
2352	Agree		
2353	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number' (in a block of flats).
2354	Agree		A random lottery seems fairer than 'flat number' or 'surname' allocation.
2355	Agree		
2356	Agree		
2357	Not Applicable		
2358	Neutral		
2359	Neutral		
2360	Neutral		
2361	Disagree		
2362	Disagree		
2363	Disagree		
2364	Neutral		
2365	Neutral		

2366	Neutral		
2367	Agree		
2368	Disagree		I am somewhat neutral on this proposal, but because the Code for fairness has not been made available, I cannot support a change.
2369	Neutral		in cases of exact distance it out to be random selection
2370	Disagree		
2371	Agree		
2372	No Response		
2373	Neutral		
2374	Agree		
2375	Neutral		
2376	Agree		
2377	Agree		Lottery seems to neutralise the potential bias of using surnames (I recognise that there may well be a cumulative preferential effect on a person whose surname comes first in the alphabet).
2378	Neutral		
2379	Disagree		
2380	Agree		
2381	Disagree		
2382	Agree		
2383	Disagree		
2384	Neutral		
2385	Agree		
2386	Agree		
2387	Agree		
2388	Neutral		
2389	Agree		
2390	Neutral		
2391	Not Applicable		
2392	Agree		
2393	Agree		
2394	No Response		
2395	Neutral		
2396	Not Applicable		
2397	Agree		
2398	Agree		
2399	Agree		
2400	Agree		
2401	Neutral		
2402	Neutral		
2403	Agree		Random draw seems fairer than surname or flat number.
2404	Not Applicable		
2405	Disagree		
2406	Agree		
2407	Neutral		
2408	Neutral		
2409	Neutral		
2410	Disagree		
2411	Agree		This is more fair than current system.
2412	Neutral		
2413	Agree		
2414	Neutral		

2415	Disagree		
2416	Agree		
2417	Agree		If there is a tie breaker where children live next door to each other or the same distance there should be a draw like a raffle rather than Surname or Home Address.
2418	Agree		
2419	Agree		
2420	Agree		
2421	Agree		
2422	Neutral		
2423	Neutral		
2424	Agree		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number' (in a block of flats).
2425	Agree		
2426	Neutral		
2427	Disagree		
2428	Neutral		
2429	Agree		
2430	Neutral		
2431	Neutral		
2432	Neutral		
2433	Disagree		
2434	Disagree		
2435	Agree		
2436	Agree		This proposal is a fairer way to allocate a place where both children live the same distance from the school.
2437	Neutral		
2438	Agree		
2439	Agree		
2440	Disagree		
2441	Agree		
2442	Agree		
2443	Neutral		
2444	Agree		
2445	Disagree		
2446	Agree		Seems fair.
2447	Neutral		
2448	Neutral		
2449	Neutral		
2450	Disagree		
2451	Agree		
2452	Disagree		
2453	Agree		
2454	Agree		
2455	Neutral		
2456	Agree		Most sensible proposal.
2457	Neutral		
2458	Disagree		
2459	Agree		
2460	Disagree		
2461	Agree		
2462	Disagree		
2463	Disagree		
2464	Disagree		

2465	Agree		The proposal looks to make these rare requirements fairer
2466	Neutral		
2467	Neutral		
2468	Agree		
2469	Neutral		
2470	Neutral		
2471	Neutral		
2472	Agree		
2473	Disagree		
2474	Neutral		
2475	Neutral		
2476	Agree		
2477	Neutral		
2478	Agree		
2479	Neutral		
2480	Disagree		
2481	Neutral		
2482	Neutral		
2483	Neutral		
2484	Agree		
2485	Neutral		
2486	Agree		
2487	Disagree		
2488	Agree		
2489	Agree		
2490	Neutral		
2491	Disagree		
2492	Neutral		
2493	Agree		
2494	Agree		
2495	Disagree		
2496	Neutral		
2497	Agree		
2498	Neutral		
2499	Disagree		
2500	Disagree		
2501	Neutral		
2502	Disagree		
2503	Agree		
2504	Agree		
2505	Neutral		
2506	Neutral		
2507	Disagree		Random lottery does not enable equitable access to places in schools
2508	Agree		It is much fairer to use a random lottery to determine a space for children of equal distance than selecting on door number or surname.
2509	Neutral		
2510	Neutral		
2511	Neutral		
2512	Neutral		
2513	Disagree		Unfair and not transparent
2514	Neutral		

2515	Neutral		
2516	Agree		
2517	Neutral		
2518	Agree		
2519	Neutral		
2520	Neutral		
2521	Disagree		
2522	Disagree		
2523	Neutral		
2524	Agree		
2525	Agree		Seems like a fairer system, so agree
2526	Neutral		
2527	Neutral		
2528	Disagree		
2529	Agree		
2530	Agree		A random draw would be fair.
2531	Agree		
2532	Agree		Seems like a fairer system, so agree.
2533	Disagree		
2534	Neutral		
2535	Agree		
2536	Disagree		It should be randomly allocated
2537	Agree		
2538	Neutral		
2539	Agree		
2540	Neutral		Where two children live the same distance from school, a random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number' (in a block of flats).
2541	Agree		
2542	Neutral		
2543	Disagree		
2544	Agree		
2545	Neutral		
2546	Neutral		
2547	Neutral		
2548	Neutral		
2549	Agree		I think this sounds fair.
2550	Agree		
2551	Neutral		
2552	Neutral		
2553	Neutral		
2554	Disagree		
2555	Neutral		
2556	Neutral		
2557	Neutral		
2558	No Response		
2559	No Response		
2560	Neutral		If there is a tie breaker, I think it should be by lottery/ total chance.
2561	Neutral		
2562	Agree		
2563	Neutral		
2564	Disagree		Absolutely ridiculous that someone can miss out on a place merely because their surname starts with a letter further down the alphabet

2565	Neutral		
2566	Neutral		
2567	Neutral		
2568	Agree		
2569	Neutral		
2570	Neutral		
2571	Agree		
2572	Not Applicable		
2573	Neutral		
2574	Neutral		
2575	Neutral		
2576	Neutral		
2577	Neutral		
2578	Agree		
2579	Agree		
2580	Agree		
2581	Agree		
2582	Neutral		
2583	Disagree		
2584	Agree		
2585	Neutral		
2586	No Response		Not Applicable
2587	Disagree		
2588	Disagree		
2589	Neutral		
2590	Disagree		
2591	Agree		
2592	Neutral		
2593	Neutral		
2594	Neutral		
2595	Neutral		
2596	Neutral		
2597	Disagree		
2598	Agree		
2599	Disagree		
2600	Disagree		
2601	Disagree		
2602	Agree		
2603	Agree		Distance as final tie breaker has a clear precedent and makes sense.
2604	Agree		
2605	Agree		
2606	Neutral		
2607	Agree		
2608	Agree		
2609	Neutral		
2610	Disagree		
2611	Neutral		
2612	Agree		
2613	Neutral		

2614	Disagree		I do not agree with the concept of feeder schools. This closes off opportunities for children from other schools. The way this proposal is presented almost makes the school a club available only to those in the club (staff and those attending the connected primary schools).
2615	Agree		
2616	Agree		
2617	Neutral		
2618	Agree		
2619	Agree		
2620	Neutral		
2621	Agree		
2622	Not Applicable		
2623	Disagree		
2624	Neutral		
2625	Neutral		
2626	Neutral		
2627	Disagree		
2628	Neutral		
2629	Neutral		
2630	Disagree		
2631	Agree		
2632	Neutral		
2633	Neutral		
2634	Agree		
2635	Agree		
2636	Neutral		
2637	Agree		
2638	Agree		
2639	Disagree		
2640	Disagree		
2641	Disagree		
2642	Neutral		
2643	Neutral		
2644	Agree		
2645	Neutral		
2646	Neutral		
2647	Disagree		
2648	Neutral		
2649	Disagree		
2650	Agree		
2651	Agree		
2652	Neutral		
2653	Neutral		
2654	Disagree		
2655	Neutral		
2656	Neutral		
2657	Agree		
2658	Neutral		
2659	Neutral		
2660	Agree		
2661	Neutral		
2662	Agree		

2663	Agree		
2664	Disagree		
2665	Neutral		
2666	Not Applicable		
2667	Disagree		
2668	Disagree		
2669	Disagree		
2670	Agree		
2671	Neutral		
2672	Agree		
2673	Agree		
2674	Disagree		
2675	Disagree		
2676	Neutral		
2677	Agree		
2678	Agree		
2679	Neutral		
2680	Neutral		
2681	Agree		
2682	Disagree		
2683	Neutral		
2684	Agree		
2685	Not Applicable		
2686	Disagree		
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	Agree		
2700	Agree		
2701	Neutral		
2702	Neutral		
2703	Neutral		
2704	Agree		

Parent of
child at
one of the
Trust's
secondary
schools

2705	No Response		
2706	Neutral		I feel that it should be done on a random lottery basis as mentioned. I particularly do not feel it is fair to do it by surname.
2707	Neutral		
2708	Disagree		
2709	Neutral		
2710	Neutral		
2711	Disagree		
2712	Agree		
2713	Agree		
2714	Disagree		
2715	Neutral		
2716	Agree		
2717	Neutral		I think if you attend a feeder school you should be given preference
2718	Neutral		
2719	Neutral		
2720	Not Applicable		
2721	Neutral		
2722	Neutral		
2723	No Response		
2724	Neutral		
2725	Agree		
2726	Neutral		
2727	Neutral		
2728	Neutral		
2729	Neutral		
2730	Agree		
2731	Disagree		
2732	Agree		
2733	Neutral		
2734	No Response		
2735	Agree		
2736	Neutral		
2737	Agree		
2738	Disagree		
2739	Neutral		
2740	Neutral		
2741	Agree		
2742	Neutral		
2743	Neutral		
2744	Disagree		Children should be in radius of school end of regardless of feeder school. Which secondary school would the children of Oak Lodge attend very unfair all children deserve easy route to and from school.
2745	Agree		
2746	Neutral		
2747	No Response		
2748	Neutral		
2749	Disagree		
2750	Agree		
2751	Disagree		
2752	Disagree		
2753	Agree		

2754	Neutral		It might lead the current students to work less as external competition is less prevalent
2755	Agree		Ensure rigorous checks are made
2756	Agree		
2757	Disagree		
2758	Neutral		
2759	Neutral		
2760	Neutral		
2761	Disagree		
2762	Agree		
2763	Neutral		
2764	Agree		
2765	Disagree		
2766	Neutral		
2767	Agree		
2768	No Response		
2769	Agree		
2770	Not Applicable		
2771	Agree		
2772	Disagree		
2773	Not Applicable		
2774	Disagree		
2775	Agree		
2776	Disagree		
2777	Neutral		
2778	Disagree		
2779	Disagree		
2780	Agree		A lottery would make the allocation fairer.
2781	Neutral		
2782	Disagree		
2783	Agree		
2784	Agree		
2785	No Response		
2786	Neutral		
2787	Neutral		
2788	Agree		
2789	Disagree		
2790	Agree		
2791	Neutral		
2792	Neutral		
2793	Neutral		
2794	Agree		Can't see any way fairer than a random lottery in these circumstances.
2795	Neutral		
2796	Agree		
2797	Neutral		
2798	Neutral		
2799	Neutral		
2800	Disagree		Many of us moved our families to this area with the hope of our children attending one of the Langley Schools. It was a primary reason for this choice of location. To add additional criteria to restrict this is unjust and wrong. It will also negatively impact some primary schools.
2801	Neutral		
2802	Neutral		

2803	Agree		
2804	Disagree		
2805	Agree		
2806	Agree		
2807	Agree		
2808	Disagree		
2809	Agree		
2810	No Response		
2811	Disagree		A random lottery does not appear to be a transparent or equitable system.
2812	Agree		I agree in a tie breaker situation, where applications are equal, priority should only be given on a lottery system. This lottery system should be carried out in a witnessed and transparent format.
2813	Neutral		
2814	Disagree		The new proposal are not fair or reasonable for local families and it follows that this extends to the tie breaker.
2815	Agree		
2816	Disagree		Assigning according to surname does not make a fair system
2817	Disagree		Assigning according to surname does not make a fair system
2818	Neutral		
2819	Neutral		
2820	Disagree		The allocation of places by alphabetical order of name is no more fair than what floor you live on in a block of flats. If it is to be changed it needs to be allocated by random lottery
2821	Agree		
2822	Disagree		I am totally opposed to these proposals so have no specific comment in this section.
2823	Neutral		
2824	Neutral		
2825	Neutral		
2826	Disagree		I believe this is unfair due to a lottery system simply being randomly choosing based on address, random selection in this way is not fair.
2827	Neutral		
2828	Agree		A random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number'.
2829	Agree		A random draw is more appropriate than either 'surname' or 'door number'.
2830	Neutral		
2831	Neutral		
2832	Agree		
2833	Agree		
2834	Agree		
2835	Agree		
2836	Neutral		
2837	Neutral		
2838	Neutral		
2839	Neutral		
2840	Disagree		
2841	Neutral		
2842	Disagree		
2843	Neutral		
2844	Disagree		
2845	Agree		
2846	No Response		Neutral
2847	Neutral		
2848	Disagree		
2849	Agree		
2850	Disagree		
2851	No Response		Agree

2852	Agree		
2853	No Response		
2854	Agree		
2855	Neutral		
2856	Neutral		
2857	Not Applicable		
2858	No Response		
2859	Not Applicable		
2860	Disagree		
2861	Disagree		
2862	Neutral		
2863	Disagree		As local resident feel should be for local children
2864	Neutral		
2865	Disagree		
2866	Neutral		
2867	Agree		
2868	Agree		
2869	Disagree		
2870	Neutral		
2871	Disagree		Unfair to base it on surname.
2872	No Response		Neutral
2873	Neutral		
2874	Neutral		
2875	Neutral		
2876	Neutral		
2877	Neutral		
2878	Neutral		
2879	Neutral		
2880	Neutral		
2881	Neutral		
2882	Neutral		
2883	No Response		Not Applicable
2884	Agree		
2885	Disagree		
2886	Neutral		
2887	Neutral		
2888	No Response		
2889	Not Applicable		
2890	Agree		
2891	Neutral		
2892	Agree		
2893	Agree		
2894	Neutral		
2895	Agree		
2896	Neutral		
2897	Not Applicable		
2898	Neutral		
2899	Agree		
2900	Agree		The proposed change is indeed fairer.
2901	Neutral		

2902	No Response		
2903	Agree		
2904	Not Applicable		
2905	Neutral		
2906	Neutral		
2907	Agree		A random lottery is fairer than using surnames.
2908	Neutral		
2909	Agree		
2910	Agree		
2911	Agree		
2912	Disagree		
2913	Not Applicable		
2914	Neutral		
2915	Disagree		
2916	Agree		
2917	Agree		
2918	Neutral		
2919	Neutral		
2920	Agree		
2921	Neutral		
2922	Neutral		
2923	Neutral		
2924	Neutral		
2925	No Response		
2926	Neutral		
2927	Neutral		
2928	Agree		
2929	Agree		
2930	Agree		
2931	Neutral		
2932	Agree		
2933	Disagree		Personally I think that if it gets to a tie breaker situation the each child should be investigated on a case by case basic where a board decide which student is admitted to the school based on their circumstances and what is best for the child and not a door number.
2934	Agree		
2935	Agree		
2936	Neutral		
2937	Agree		
2938	Agree		
2939	Agree		
2940	Neutral		
2941	Agree		
2942	Neutral		
2943	Disagree		
2944	Agree		
2945	Agree		
2946	Neutral		
2947	Neutral		
2948	Disagree		
2949	Agree		
2950	Agree		

2951	Neutral		
2952	Neutral		
2953	Agree		
2954	Neutral		
2955	Agree		
2956	Agree		
2957	Agree		
2958	Agree		
2959	Disagree		
2960	Agree		
2961	Disagree		
2962	Neutral		
2963	Agree		
2964	Neutral		
2965	Disagree		
2966	Agree		
2967	Neutral		
2968	Agree		
2969	Neutral		
2970	Disagree		
2971	Not Applicable		
2972	Disagree		
2973	Neutral		
2974	Agree		This seems fair.
2975	Agree		
2976	Agree		
2977	No Response		
2978	Agree		
2979	Not Applicable		
2980	Disagree		
2981	Not Applicable		
2982	Agree		
2983	Disagree		
2984	No Response		
2985	Agree		
2986	Agree		
2987	Neutral		
2988	Agree		
2989	Agree		
2990	Neutral		
2991	Neutral		
2992	Disagree		
2993	Disagree		
2994	Neutral		
2995	Disagree		
2996	Neutral		
2997	Agree		
2998	Agree		
2999	Agree		
3000	Agree		

3001	Agree		
3002	Agree		
3003	Agree		
3004	Neutral		
3005	Agree		
3006	Neutral		
3007	Agree		
3008	Agree		
3009	Neutral		
3010	Disagree		
3011	Neutral		
3012	Neutral		
3013	Neutral		
3014	Disagree		
3015	Not Applicable		
3016	Disagree		
3017	Neutral		
3018	Neutral		
3019	No Response		
3020	Agree		
3021	Disagree		A random lottery system does not offer any kind of fair solution to a tie-breaker. The irony (of the Trust being concerned that the current tie breaker arrangements are not fair) is not lost on me, considering it is proposing to create feeder schools arrangements that are so deeply unfair for so many children.
3022	Disagree		
3023	Agree		A random draw is a fair and objective means of differentiating between applicants in a tie-breaker situation where all other criteria are equal. Implemented with the appropriate procedures and safeguards in place to ensure the draw is indeed random, this criteria should ensure places tie-breaker places are allocated without bias or discrimination (perceived or real).
3024	Neutral		
3025	Neutral		
3026	Disagree		A random lottery system does not offer any kind of fair solution to a tie-breaker. The irony (of the Trust being concerned that the current tie breaker arrangements are not fair) is not lost on me, considering it is proposing to create feeder schools arrangements that are so deeply unfair for so many children.
3027	No Response		
3028	Disagree		
3029	Disagree		The current arrangements should continue
3030	Not Applicable		
3031	Neutral		
3032	Agree		
3033	Neutral		
3034	Agree		
3035	Neutral		
3036	Disagree		Leave!as!distant!as!measured.!!This!is!at!least!transparent!to!the!families!living!in!the!block!of!flats.!A! random!system!will!not!be!transparent.! ! !would!be!ok!with!alphabetical.
3037	Neutral		
3038	Disagree		
3039	Disagree		
3040	Not Applicable		
3041	Disagree		
3042	Agree		
3043	Neutral		
3044	Neutral		
3045	Agree		

3046	Agree		
3047	Neutral		
3048	Agree		
3049	Agree		
3050	Agree		
3051	Agree		
3052	Neutral		
3053	Agree		
3054	Neutral		
3055	Agree		
3056	Agree		This is a fair system.
3057	Neutral		
3058	Neutral		
3059	Neutral		
3060	Neutral		
3061	Neutral		
3062	Neutral		
3063	Agree		
3064	Neutral		
3065	Agree		The proposal seems logical and fair.
3066	Neutral		
3067	Neutral		
3068	Neutral		
3069	Not Applicable		
3070	Agree		
3071	Disagree		
3072	Disagree		
3073	Disagree		
3074	Disagree		
3075	Agree		

Parent of
child aged
2+ years
who has
not yet
started
school