



**Below is a themed summary of responses provided in the October 2024 engagement exercise into school admission arrangements**

**Question 1: There are disparities between schools in different areas of the city. Do you think that we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city?**

### **1. Travel and Transportation**

- Yes I do, but not at the expense of children who have to take long journeys to get to school when they have others on their doorstep.
- leading question - of course yes, but not by forcing children to travel for unreasonable time to get to school
- , all children deserve to have a school accessible to them within a max of 40 minutes by simple public transport that is free for those who need it. But artificially maintaining schools which are not doing well should is not the answer.
- All children should be able to walk to school where they live. There are other ways to improve school performance that doesn't involve additional bureaucracy to limit the choice of parents.
- A good geographic spread of schools is essential to enable students to walk or cycle to school.
- All children in the city should have roughly the same distance to travel to a secondary school. Losing a school across the city will mean that journeys will be considerable longer for some children in the city.
- but not by making pupils travel long distances to school
- But not by forcing children into lengthy commutes.
- But through investment in schools to improve all institutions rather than bussing kids over long distances.
- But not at the expense of creating commuters
- But sending children on journeys that could take over an hour to get to school is ridiculous. Children should be able to do to their local school
- By improving the schools, not bussing children around the city.
- By investing in those struggling not shipping pupils across city
- For community purposes and for reasons of sustainable transport
- I agree but not at the expense of children being able to safely walk or short public transport to get to school
- Each child should have a local thriving school that they can go to. Children should not be expected to travel across the city to get an education.
- However, I do not want my 11 year old child, who lives on the doorstep of Stringer and Varndean, to have to travel across the city to another area just because the council has arbitrarily redrawn school boundary areas.
- I do think we should but not at the detriment of children in existing boundaries where they will have to travel excessively and unnecessarily so. Especially when the schools are 100 m away and you want to send them on a one hour round trip to another school!!!

- I absolutely agree that thriving schools should be maintained. I think the definition of thriving needs to be clarified. I am not sure a school could be described as thriving if children were being forced to travel over 45 minutes (when they have schools significantly closer to them) in an effort to maintain a school and an attempt to improved attainment based on zero evidence to suggest this might be the outcome.
- I agree but not if it means kids will have to travel longer distances.
- I agree that improvements need to be made but it doesn't make sense to remove schools from a catchment which are within 0.3 miles (8 minute walking distance) from a property. I am referring to Varndean and Dorothy Stringer which should both be accessible for houses within 0.4 miles of the school. Options B and C would mean that the closer school Varndean is not in the catchment a for many despite being closer than Dorothy stringer.
- If you reduce the number of schools the city will be skewed further, with more pressure on pupils in terms of travel.
- It all depends on whether the changes will require pupils to travel to schools that are no longer local to them in order to prop up an ailing school elsewhere, if so then I disagree with the statement.
- I think all children in the city should have access to a good school within their community that they can walk to or take one short bus journey to.
- Being made to travel over 5 miles to school which is below standard, when they have 2 schools within walking distance is unacceptable. Struggling schools should be funded better and brought up to standards. Then those living close to the schools will have a great education to and will also have less travelling time.
- , I think shipping kids out of their local communities and making them travel to schools miles away from their homes when they have a school they can walk is not the way forward.
- It makes perfect sense to be able to go to a school choice which is in your local area. As we regularly help out with our two grandchildren taking and collecting from school, which is approximately 300 yards from our house where we have lived for the past 48 years. It is also a similar distance from where they live. Being in our mid seventies we are able to walk that distance. It seems ludicrous to have to make a car or bus journey when there are local safe walking distance schools nearby
- Not by busing children across the city when there are schools in close proximity
- Yes but this can not be to the detriment of the other thriving schools, so making children travel further out of catchments to attend other schools.
- Yes, but not to the detriment of the city's population with increased pollution due to increased commutes and extremely negative impact on the welfare of young people and their families with long travel times.
- Yes but not the the detriment of pupils having to travel long distances to school out of area.
- It's better for the kids that they don't have to travel too far from home.
- Leading question to support the councils narrative. Of course everyone should access to a school, but they should attend a local school, not spend an hour on a bus to get there!
- minimize transport time with more local schools, having to travel over 1h to and from school cannot be good for students, who are already very tired simply going into secondary school
- All children deserve to have access to education and to be well within walking distances. It unreasonable to expect them to leave home an hour before the school day starts
- not if a child is forced to travel miles away from home despite there being a school with capacity on their doorstep just to prove a failing school is "sustainable" and "thriving".

- Obviously, we want all schools across the city to thrive and be of a good standard but I feel that expanding the catchment areas as in proposition B is the very opposite of a sustainable solution. I wouldn't feel comfortable putting an 11 year old girl on public transport to cross the city alone and I know that many parents are in agreement. How do you propose to counteract the inevitable rise in traffic and pollution generated by more parents choosing to drive their children to school vs. children being able to walk to school in their local area?
- However I think travel time is very key for children still, and travelling out to rottingdean for example from an area such as fiveways would be a very long and awkward journey. I think this would do more harm than good for a large portion of children.
- However children should not have to travel miles across Brighton to get to school. This travel will be a barrier for them to access education. Puts children in danger being further away from home especially in the winter months when it's dark earlier.
- Older children can travel via school buses, within a reasonable distance from home
- Only if it doesn't mean children travelling long distances to and from school creating additional costs for parents & limiting the ability of vulnerable children participating in after school activities in the winter when it is dark if they can currently walk a short distance to school
- People should not have to travel long distances to go to school
- Pupil travel time has an impact on both their energy and more widely on the climate. Shorter distances are better for both.
- Pupils should not travel long distances to school
- Safety and extensive travel for students should be a priority. Some children have 2 or 3 buses across the city in the dark just to get to school on winter months. Transport can be a challenge and buses are not always reliable. The schools need to be spread across the city.
- Schools should be filled by catchment areas not by bussing across the network to average out opportunities.
- We can see two secondary schools from our house, the proposals would mean my son would have to get a bus to the other side of the city instead. Makes zero sense and bad for the environment.
- Yes but not by forcing children travel miles to under performing schools away from their community.
- Of course we should. But it's about how you achieve that and the consequences for children and families that need to be consulted on. Long travel times are not a proportionate consequence
- I agree with that statement but if you say yes it leads you to supporting catchment areas which means local children potentially having to travel big distances when they live next door to a local school.
- Some travel is fine if it allows a better configuration
- For a child to have a 2hr walk to school when they live 5 minutes from 2 other schools just to get funding into the school 2hrs away is a disgrace.
- Weirdly phrased question. Surely you would want all schools to be thriving and sustainable. I do think the focus should be on Rottingdean/saltdean as no one can get into PCS due to limited capacity and no one wants to go to Longhill due poor performance so kids are having to travel far and wide which ridiculous!
- Yes, but not where this results in transfer of students across the city, removing them from friendship groups/extra-curricular groups and increases traffic throughout city without full assessment and modelling.
- It's important to have good, local schools that students can walk to, without having to catch several buses across the city.
- Not necessarily if this in effect means more travel to schools families do not want to travel to

- Yes I want all parts of the city to have thriving schools, but NOT at the expense of children who would have to commute long distances, away from their local school.
- Yes, but not at the expense of making children spend too much time travelling long distances between their home and school. Schools should be accessible at a comfortable distance to the child's home for everyone to thrive.
- Local schools enable pupils to walk and cycle, which is critical to get to net zero asap. Conversely, having to travel further increases the likelihood that that travel will be conducted by a mode of travel with a higher carbon footprint.
- Yes, but this should not be achieved by making children from communities across the city being made to attend any secondary school that is not within walking distance. Children should not be made to commute for over an hour to go to school when there are schools within 10 minutes walk from their home
- Yes, if this means that children can safely get to school (without multiple buses) and maintain the community in which they are growing up.
- Aside from other disadvantaged pupils in the city, the proposed changes could also mean that some pupils may end up having to travel across the city to a different school when they may be within 10 minutes walk of another secondary school by their home. This does not make any sense in a city that already experiences severe traffic congestion during rush hour and goes against several initiatives that promote walking or cycling to school. Such long journeys to school would likely be detrimental to pupils' wellbeing that would have a negative impact on their ability to learn. It would also remove a child from their local community and place them in an unfamiliar area of the city at age 11 which is just not a sensible idea in the society we live in today.
- Children should not face long commutes that negatively impact their day, tiredness, ability to play and relax, connection to friends and activities in their local communities
- Yes I think there should be thriving schools in all areas but I do not think the way to do this is to move children from their home area to a far away school, causing them to have to use buses / trains, which are stressful for them
- Yes. All children in the city should be able to easily access a secondary school, Preferably by walking.
- Yes - thriving schools should be maintained. Oversubscribed schools should not have their PAN reduced in order to rescue failing schools. 11 year olds should not have to suffer the consequences of over hour long commutes to school to ensure all schools are sustainable. Brighton is already a congested city so children should be given opportunities to attend their local schools within walking distance. The council needs to ensure all schools are desirable in order to minimise the disruption caused by children travelling long journeys.
- Yes but there are benefits for secondary school children to be able to walk to school
- you should also provide better transport for kids
- Yes. However not by making young kids have to travel across the city just to improve underperforming schools such as Longhill. The lack of investment in this school is the main problem, not creating a biased class war with the unfair terminology being used by particular member of the council.
- Yes but not at the expense of students having to travel long distances.
- We should prioritise protecting places at oversubscribed well performing schools, and children being able to attend schools within a reasonable walking distance.
- We should make all schools better by improving them not to force kids to travel miles and hope they will improve schools
- Travel is a nightmare as it is!
- I agree with this but there are different ways to improve schools. Children should go to a school that is close to them without having to travel long distances. If lots of children live close to a school then it should NOT be forced to reduce in PAN number

- then children living near the school will be forced to travel long distances to another school.

- The schools should still operate around the city as they need to be in these areas so kids don't have to travel for miles and hours
- While of course it would be important to ensure that all schools are thriving and sustainable - but just re-distributing pupils across the city, some with long levels of travel, and increasing traffic and stressful journeys does not feel like the solution to this.
- I do not support a solution which prioritises use of social engineering as a method temporarily improving school performance, at the expense of large numbers of children who would be required to travel long distances to a school outside of their community, impacting their mental health, the environment, and their local community (which is currently being considered by the council).
- Vastly increasing the amount of children who have to travel by bus or car to school, is not the answer. The added pollution and traffic on Brighton's already over-congested streets is sending the wrong message to our children that the older generation do not care about the planet that they will inherit.
- The narrow metric of looking at FSM places ignores the large varieties of other factors including impacts of children having to travel long distances and the more localised effects some of the boundaries being suggested
- To avoid some pupils having to travel really long distances.
- Thriving and sustainable schools is, of course, desirable, however in pursuing this goal, children should not be forced to travel long distances to schools (potentially away from friends) because they are unable to attend their local, closest school.
- Students shouldn't have long journeys to get to school, the day is long enough as it is.
- Forcing children to commute one hour plus to their local school represents the wrong solution to a real problem and suggests that the impact on all groups of children has not been properly thought through.
- I do believe in this, yes. However I do not believe the answer lies in children commuting half way across the City to go to school.
- Not if it means my child having to get two buses alone to travel to an underperforming school nowhere near where we live (sometimes in the dark in winter). My child's safety is priority over anything else
- I think we need to be logical about transportation of the children to school and the burden traveling longer distances puts on children and/or parents.
- I feel it is unreasonable to expect secondary school age children to travel long distances to get to school. Not good for the environment as travel will likely be by car or bus which will also add to congestion on roads. Not good to live far from school friends and school community.
- But, children should not be travelling hours to get to school.

## **2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation**

- Please focus on investing in under performing schools so all children can attend their local school.
- You increase funding and support to bring all schools up to same standard across the city.
- "Maintain" might be incorrect framing here, some schools are definitely not thriving and need a clear plan of improvement.
- A failing school should not be supported at the expense of students

- I think that we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools that meet the needs of all the students across Brighton. However, I do not believe that consistently failing schools should be kept open to provide local options for students. Especially as there is little evidence to suggest that the changes in the catchment will improve the situation
- I think the council should provide more support for school that are struggling and maintain PAN at popular schools.
- I think we should maintain things as there are and support the schools that need more funding.
- Currently some of our schools are massively undersubscribed, and failing. These schools require targeted intervention to enable them to serve their communities better. They also require PAN reductions
- Cutting down the number of schools causes unnecessary stress for pupils and families, increases size of other schools and disrupts lives of people that have to rely on proximity to school
- I think we should focus on ensuring the maximum number of places at schools that are highly rated and over subscribed rather than focusing overly on geographic spread.
- Aiming to maintain all schools when pupil numbers are falling is not realistic
- By improving individual schools where required to improve standards and not by making changes to well established and understood catchment areas.
- Both BACA and Longhill are both making changes to improve. The focus needs to be on driving this forward, not bussing in kids who live far away. They are kids, not numbers.
- By giving extra funding and support to under performing schools
- During the 'bulge' years, a new school was proposed (intake 2019). This did not happen due to certain schools raising intake numbers. Those schools have continued to maintain a higher intake, even though this is no longer necessary to meet demand in the city. Furthermore, the schools with a raised intake have a significantly lower percentage of students eligible for pupil premium funding.
- I think that option B doesn't solve the issue of under performing schools. Focus on improving under performing schools in other ways which doesn't disrupt young peoples lives and the communities we live in
- I feel really strongly that redistributing students through catchment changes will not address underlying issues in schools that are already struggling, such as Longhill High School. We should 100% be supporting a thriving and sustainable city for school children, but this needs to be better considered than any of the options suggested. Rather than focusing on catchment changes that could burden schools still improving, like Longhill, the council should focus on directly addressing these disparities by investing in improving resources, teaching quality, and infrastructure at schools needing support
- While it is important to maintain thriving and sustainable education, Don't change the cstchment areas, improve the schools which are failing
- I think we need to address the issues of why schools aren't thriving and do everything in our power to make staff, administration and management incentivised to create a happy and healthy school environment where learning can thrive. I am not sure sending different children to this school will solve that problem, just diversify who is in receipt of less satisfactory education.
- The more important question would be to ask if all schools should meet the same standards to provide quality education for all students, and if they don't (eg, are lagging behind), would you support measures to improve those schools. To that, I would say yes.

- I think we should maintain sustainable schools so long as they are secure, improving and serve the interests of their cohort, which I am unsure is the case with the current distribution of schools and the potential flaws of the proposed options
- Improve failing schools
- Not at the expense of schools that are thriving and sustainable
- Thriving schools need to be maintained so these schools continue to thrive otherwise more money will be needed to support these schools along with the other schools too.
- According to Councillor Jacob, everyone not having access to good education is a 'stain on our city'. The stain is about to become the ill thought through actions of a council, who are delivering such huge changes without the due research. The stain is that ALL schools are not thriving throughout the city. I find it quite appalling that there are two schools that are continuing to perform badly time and time again. Any investment from changes to catchment areas (and it would need to be extensive to provide the additional bus transport and offset the enormous carbon footprint) should be spent on improving the schools that are not performing well. Invest in them to allow them to reduce class sizes in those schools, better engage with pupils and bring in teachers from those socio economic backgrounds who understand the challenges that some of those children are facing. Make the schools something the City and most importantly those children are proud of. That is how to make a name for yourself. Not this current mess which has done nothing but divide cities and potentially push families further out of Brighton
- I think we should seek to improve schools that are currently underperforming. I disagree with reducing PAN at Varndean and Dorothy Stringer though. Reducing PAN at over subscribed good schools goes against government policy. It also makes sense to have more places at central schools with better transport links.
- schools should not be closed down, as this would be shortsighted
- Smaller schools (eg Kings School) can thrive with PANs at 150
- To be achieved through appropriate investment in the schools that need it rather than a social experiment
- It makes no sense to disrupt thriving and sustainable schools.
- Oversubscribed schools should be kept with same PAN rather than keeping undersubscribed failing schools open
- Some schools are allowed to expand their PAN whilst others are not full
- Yes but I don't agree with the proposal s as they won't work since it doesn't address the problems that some school need more help- it just changes who goes to which school.
- Poor performing schools should be supported by OFSTED to raise standards. See BACA
- It's more important to have fewer good schools and lots of poor performing schools
- Rather than investing large amounts of money in consultants and modelling catchment areas, why not invest that money in the schools instead
- Schools should be maintained on a demand and performance basis
- Schools should be maintained through funding and support not through changing catchment areas
- If they are thriving then do not jeopardise that
- If thriving and sustainable I fail to see why one would want to to risk such schools?
- Yes all areas of the city should have thriving school , sadly this isn't the case at the moment.
- If you can not raise standards you should not automatically sustain
- Maybe if the council helped failing schools to be better , rather than cause chaos for children who live in areas near schools that are not failing .

- Yes absolutely, this should be a priority for the council, but each school should be given careful attention and support to be successful and well supported by their immediate local community so that all children can have a great school close to where they live.
- It does not include any background info about what is prompting the discussion - ie that Longhill could close unless pupils numbers across the city even out and PAN is reduced at what are considered popular schools - Stringer and Varndean
- I also do not agree it's a given that no schools should be closed.
- Invest in the underperforming schools.
- Yes but sustainable is a loaded word all schools can be both descriptors with the correct support
- We should of course seek to ensure all schools in Brighton and Hove are sustainable and thriving, and we should do this by ensuring that schools which are not thriving (i.e poor or requires improvement), are given the financial and human resources necessary to improve outcomes for local children and thereby ensure long-term sustainability.
- Fund / support the 'not so thriving ' schools
- more needs to be done to ensure all schools are actually "thriving" as BACA has been ranked "inadequate" by ofsted
- Funding and expertise should be put into those schools not currently performing as well.
- More support should be given to those Schools that are not thriving.
- Most schools are oversubscribed in the city so closing a school is a bad idea. We may have lower numbers temporarily but it doesn't mean that they won't go up in 15 years time. What would be a plan with the site that is closed? Would it be sold? And then bought back in 15 years time for lots more money? What would happen to the teachers? Currently most classes have 30 children in them, which is quite a lot and possibly the main reason why many children under achieve, there is simply not enough individual attention they can get. Has anybody calculated what is the minimum number of pupils per class that is sustainable? Can class sizes be reduced to 25? Or even lower? It would be hugely beneficial for everyone.
- Please consider more innovative ideas to enhance the popularity of the unpopular schools that consequently serve some of our most disadvantaged areas in the city. If we want to address inequality - and improve preference of all schools, why can't we engage with the local talent we have to offer exciting opportunities for kids alongside their curriculum at schools. We have an immense opportunity to harness talent unique to this city and incentives could be offered to entice admissions via exciting curricular or extra curricular learning
  - Music - Brighton Institute of Modern Music, Audio Active
  - Art - an endless list of local artists
  - Academia / science - Brighton University
  - Sport - Brighton and Hove Albion

It feels like there is work required to improve schools - this includes a PR campaign to ensure that people do not feel like they are "losing out" by not accessing the schools in the city. It was clear from the in person meeting at hove town hall that Longhill has been the victim of some extremely negative review by its own staff. Basic business initiative tells you that no one is going to be sold a school if the people who work there don't believe in its potential. The only reasoning I can see for the PAN proposals are to artificially boost student numbers in schools with lower demand - and coincidentally, presently poor Ofsted ratings in order to continue their viability. Both Varndean and Dorothy Stringer have been consistently oversubscribed for years, the schools sit in a geographical location dense with families and that is unlikely to change in the coming years. Both BACA and Longhill are located on the periphery of the city, they need to adapt to the community that they support – to

which the obvious solution would be to reduce the PAN accordingly, focus on strong performance and try to encourage children to attend based on a positive reputation. It is not an acceptable solution to force children from out of the area to attend poorer performing schools as a vehicle to maintain their viability. Further to this, forcing the PAN reduction on the more popular schools in favour of retaining viable numbers in other schools is not an effective strategy, since people who really don't want to travel, will seek alternative school options and the schools that continue to see falling admission numbers will meet their unfortunate fate. This proposal seeks to plug an issue with a catchment change that does not address the crux of the problem that is - East Brighton is missing a local school. Without a long term solution to address this and or reconsider moving Longhill (assuming it survives in the long term) to a more suitable location, people will continue to feel disadvantaged. I do not believe that PAN numbers should be kept artificially high where there is insufficient demand locally. I also believe the PAN for consistently oversubscribed schools should not be reduced.

- Yes but the better performing schools should be prioritised. Put money & resources into under performing schools, reduces spaces in under performing schools where demand is low.
- While it is important to ensure that all schools in the city are thriving and sustainable, it is equally critical to recognise that merely redistributing students through catchment changes will not address underlying issues in schools that are already struggling. Struggling schools need funding for better resources and to attract better teaching staff in order to address disparities.
- what does thriving and sustainable mean? You need to define what this means in practice and what other steps you are taking to help maintain schools.
- Rather than focusing on catchment changes that could burden schools still improving, like Longhill, the council should focus on directly addressing these disparities by investing in improving resources, teaching quality, and infrastructure at schools needing support, as recommended by the UCL Institute of Education (2021). This approach ensures sustainability without compromising the education of vulnerable pupils, particularly those affected by the pandemic, who require stability and familiar environments according to the SEND Code of Practice (2015).
- Yes but there should be a point at which failing schools should close.
- Yes but two schools really aren't thriving in the city so answering yes might mean closing BACA and Longhill, and answering no possibly means the same.
- Yes clearly more input and support is needed in the most struggling schools rather than disrupting the schools that are performing well currently.
- Yes by investing money in struggling schools
- Yes I do. Through investment and support in schools, and strong partnerships between them so they can mutually support smaller schools. Schools should be sized and supported to support the geographic locality and community they serve. Proposal B seems to propose doing so instead by moving children unnecessary distances across the city to make what would naturally become smaller schools appear larger and to try to improve their published outcomes
- Yes I do. I think schools struggling should be placed on special measures. I think more needs to be done to support the schools that are failing so that more local children want to chose them.
- Why are we not working on improving the schools that need support to make sure all kids have this without expecting any kid to have to take 2 buses and about an hour to get to school
- Of course people are going to answer yes to this question. What does it have to do with the proposed changes? The trouble is there are schools that are neither thriving nor sustainable and changing the catchment areas will not help with this.

- Yes the city needs thriving, sustainable schools in all areas but trying to achieve this should not require children to travel long distances (more than about 40 minutes whether walking or by bus) to a school when they have other schools much closer.
- Yes, but not at the expense of children having a choice of school that is convenient and close to them and in line with the catchment for their primary school. The city shouldn't be viewed as one homogeneous unit, there are ebbs and flows in the populations within it and school catchment areas shouldn't be used as a means of social engineering.
- Schools that aren't thriving need improving by funding, not by getting children from elsewhere in the city to attend.
- Yes, but not all schools are currently "thriving and sustainable". So can't be "maintained" as such. Surely the priority should be to bring all schools up to the same level as the best.
- Yes, but not at the expense of damaging those that are already satisfactory or better.
- Yes, but not at the expense of reducing existing thriving schools through social engineering. Those schools not at the levels of others need support to also thrive.
- Yes, but that means investing more money in the schools not doing well, rather than changing catchment areas. If kids have to travel further to school, you need to invest in better transport links to make it possible
- Yes, I do think we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city which you should do so by providing funding to help school that are not performing or address the issue of affordable housing across all parts of the city. Your proposals do not address these fundamental issues, but will cause additional issues.
- Instead of shuffling pupils from one area to another, it would be much more beneficial to invest in improving the schools that require improvement to bring them in line with the standards of schools in other areas of the city.
- You should maintain thriving schools in areas of the city where there is demand.
- You should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city that need schools.
- Yes, as long as other parts of the city or schools that are already doing well are not affected. Any measures taken should level up all schools, and children, so changes do not impact negatively children and schools already doing well.
- Yes. Doing so means investing in schools in all parts of the city. Changing catchment areas masks the failure to lift up parts of the city that require help and greater investment.
- Yes, which is why I'm surprised and disappointed that no information has been shared by the council as to how they are going to support the schools that currently 'Require improvement' to actually improve. I've seen data that suggests simply attempting to change the demographic won't make the improvement necessary.
- Yes. But not by forcing pupils living closer to higher-performing schools to go to ones further away and under-subscribed to try and lift these schools' standards, or vice versa giving those people living in areas more likely to using FSMs a chance to go to a "better" school further away from them - can you not see the problem with this?
- Yes, but your question is clearly leading. We should be striving to improve all schools independently, not penalise some areas in order to benefit others.
- Yes there are BUT simply shuffling the catchment boundaries won't solve the issues. The struggling schools need investment and funding. Making some children who live in the centre parts of Brighton have to go further to secondary school will be damaging to their mental health as well as the environment.
- We need to give better funding to failing schools Higher teacher numbers and ensure children can attend schools close to where they live
- While maintaining the standard of good schools and improving others

- Why penalise the better performing schools - I agree that it should be fair across the city but the LA knew the PAN numbers were dropping years ago - why did they open another Secondary school (Kings). Those students could have made up the missing places for Hove Park and PACA - they should have put the money in to improving the school's we already had. The LA have now put jobs at risk for staff in the schools and the well performing schools are going to be penalised.
- Yes this should be the objective, but it should not be done artificially by redefining catchments to level out free school meal ratios. Policies and plans should be made based on the best available data, including but not limited to: pupil opinions, pupil welfare, pupil health, carbon emissions, attending local school, attainment, etc
- Yes there should be thriving schools in all areas of the city. This seems to be lacking in the east of the city, and the standard of schools also varies significantly over the city. Rather than reducing choice or making children travel further with the the new proposals it surely would be better to improve the standard of schools across the city and make sure all children have easily accessible high quality secondary education.
- What disparities exactly are they and what constitute thriving and sustainable school?
- We should try to do this and invest in schools.
- We should strive for all schools to be good.
- Unsure of answer as I think is not always an achievable objective and can lead to more underperforming schools.
- Underperforming schools should be given additional attention and resources to ensure we maintain good schools regardless of area.
- This should be the aim of educational provision but places offered should match demand of populations in different areas of the city.
- This should be done by investing in the schools that are struggling to improve the standards not gamble with my child's education by placing him in an under achieving school in hopes that will improve the results, this could mean all the schools in Brighton decline.
- This should be done by helping the under performing schools to improve
- This should be achieved by raising the standards in schools.
- Thriving sustainable schools should be maintained and the ones that are struggling should be assisted to be equal to the others.
- The key words here are "thriving" and "sustainable" what these means to Councillor Jacob Taylor and other decision makers in BHCC. In my view a thriving school that is popular and has good engagement and strong links with the community it's located in and serves. It is diverse in terms of ethnicity, socio-economic backgrounds, academic ability and pupils with SEND. The outcomes and OFSTED results of the school are good and there are lots of extra-curricular activities that pupils can take part in. In terms of sustainability, my interpretation of this is that it's financially sustainable. Where a school isn't thriving and parents/carers are choosing not to send their children there and are seeking alternative schools, sometimes a long distance away, the Head Teacher, governing board, BHCC and parents/carers need to ask the question why. Where a school is predicted not to be financially sustainable there needs to be a good and clear understanding as to why. To attempt to answer this question, I think the best answer I can give is "not sure". Where evidence-based and considered efforts have been implemented and evaluated over the short and medium term long term plan and a school is still not thriving or sustainable, I think that the city and BHCC need to be asking this difficult question and be prepared to say that a school should no longer be maintained and close.
- Yes of course schools and outcomes in deprived areas of the city should be improved, but why exactly are these schools doing so badly? Don't they need more financial input and resources rather than just spreading deprived students out around Brighton? How do we know that more advantaged students won't have lower

achievement in requires improvement schools? Won't it be the case that well-off parents whose children are placed in a failing secondary will choose to move or send their child to a private school? Your proposal doesn't seem to address actually improving these schools at all.

- The priority should be maintaining thriving schools - but we should be looking to level up, not level down. Should consider the many factors at play here. Transport / climate, mental health, communities etc.
- Things should remain as they are. If schools need to be improved then they should receive funding for that.
- They should be sustainable if they are indeed thriving, and of course all areas of the city should aim to achieve that. But sustainability for a school which is not thriving is unfair on all involved.
- I think that the schools with the best outcomes and successful track record should be supported to thrive, as with budget constraints you can't have everything
- not at the expense of damaging schools who are oversubscribed and doing well - who are also taking children with FSM provision from outside of catchment area. Surely the option of improving the schools has to be on the table.
- This might be impossible and much damage might be done to currently thriving schools in trying to achieve it. In an ideal world of course the answer would be yes.
- This makes no sense, why force pupils into areas with low numbers. The schools that are thriving should be maximised.
- This cannot be maintained as it is not the current situation. It would be great if this could be established.
- Schools that are continuing to be successful should be maintained, and reduced student numbers at state schools should be seen as a benefit to the learning environment and not a burden to the state.
- Maintaining, suggests that the current situation is sustainable. Percentages also show minimal difference across the board.
- Maintaining thriving schools by avoiding big changes would seem wise whilst finding ways to support schools in need
- Maintain is not enough we need to improve schools that are not thriving. And continue to support schools that are.
- Longhill & Baca are not thriving and sustainable, many children I know who live closeto these schools choose Lewes Priory instead
- Maintain the thriving schools like Varndean and Stringer, and improve and reduce the size of the ones not meeting good standards like Longhill. If numbers are dropping due to birth rates, expand existing catchment areas, don't exclude areas in existing catchment areas, like Porthall. Families that specifically live in these existing catchment areas have to move area in order to secure a good education at a 'good' school and avoid long commutes for their children in the next year for Sept 2026 entry year. Not to mention the impact to house prices that catchment areas have, this will leave many families struggling with negative equity.
- Maintaining "thriving and sustainable schools" is obviously a positive that nobody would object to. It's not a yes/no question that can be answered without more detail
- Maintaining the current number of schools is a good idea. But it's too soon to touch catchment areas which would have wide-ranging unintended consequences, undermine the aims of this engagement. Wait for:  
The impact of the private school VAT increase effect, and the Child Wellbeing Bill which will likely mean academies and faith schools will need to comply with local authorities in PAN.  
By the council's own projections, PAN numbers are not due to decline much in the next 2 years so wait for the effects of the above before changing catchments.
- Schools will need to close at some point. It is burying head in the sand to ignore this.

- I do think we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city but I do not think this should be at the expense of children who already live close to thriving schools. I do not think that children who are in the catchment for a good school should be punished and bussed across the city to attend a failing school. Money should be put into the failing school to bring it up to the standard of thriving schools so that all children have a good school that is close to where they live. If that is not an option that is on the cards then it would appear that the council feel that it is children and families that attend the schools in a particular area that have an impact on its efficacy.
- I agree with trying to save Longhill but not at the expense of the greater community . Perhaps Longhill should be downsized.
- I am unsure, for a number of reasons. I feel there is a huge need for sustainable and thriving schools located across the city for all children. However I am concerned about the way the three options are looking at doing this. A concern is that Longhill has a reducing number of students year on year and it seems a lot of parents who live in that catchment send their children to other schools outside of Brighton and Hove such as the Priory in Lewes and the secondary school in Peacehaven due to its Ofsted rating. I believe that schools like Longhill need huge investment from government (it sounds like from conversations I have had the building is no longer fit for purpose and takes a lot of funding to fix constant issues alongside such a tight budget to deliver the actual educational element)- however I understand that this funding is not available. I therefore worry that these proposals are a quick plaster for a very complex issue that goes so deep into societal issues. I am also concerned that there hasn't been enough data and research pulled together for people to really understand the options, the reasons behind them and whether they are in fact feasible options that could work.
- That may not be possible. I think schools that are thriving should be encouraged to thrive and those that are not thriving should be supported or if necessary, closed
- The ability of a school to thrive shouldn't be dependent on its catchment. Poor management needs addressing.
- Support schools but if you give them money to spend on lunch facilities and toilets ensure the money is spent on this not on fencing!
- Some schools are not doing well and should look at schools in the city that are performing well and have good Ofsted ratings. I do not see the point in closing schools because birth rates are dropping because they could go up again
- Some schools are not thriving and changing population numbers in the school will not address this. You need to address the root cause at these schools. Moving pupils from further seems such a lazy and environmentally unfriendly way of dealing with this.
- Of course we want everyone to thrive. But mixing up deprived children in with those who are more fortunate isn't the answer. Where is the climate agenda thought process in making kids commute far to schools. This doesn't make any sense. The focus should be improving the schools near to each child, not diluting the issues. Address the issues and give the support under privileged children need. Moving the issue doesn't resolve it, it will temporarily mask and subsequently create new issues. Children need to attend local schools where they can see their friends on foot, not have to commute miles in polluting cars and buses. Also these children are likely to feel more deprived when they are moved into environments where children have very different lives. Who is going to cover the cost of commuting, surely this money needs to be spent on their actual education.
- Schools are the foundation of society.
- I think if some schools are unpopular then they should close.
- I think it completely matters that local secondary schools are maintained so that they thrive, I dislike the word sustainable as that implies cost cutting and closures

- Not if there are schools that are not sustainable
- Of course we want to see thriving and sustainable schools in the city but not at the expense of our children. The problem with the current suggestion is the lack of research and evidence that the proposals will actually support schools to thrive. Even more concerning is that there is little evidence anyone has thought of the impact of the lives of the children that this will affect negatively. Lastly, the meetings that have been set up to voice those concerns makes it very clear that those concerns are not being taken seriously.
- I imagine very few people disagreeing with this principal in general. I guess it boils down to what the alternative is? Is it closing a school to reduce PAN in that way?
- Of course we should have thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city - but having looked through proposed options A, B & C, I can't see how these options would deliver - especially since children on FSM can apply (and have priority) to go to schools outside their catchment areas. But some of the options (especially B) reduce the secondary school choice for my child and would potentially require having to drive across the city instead of her being able to walk to school - adding to traffic on the roads, increased pollution and loss of community.  
Also, it's not clear if the reduction of spaces at some of the schools translates to the actual areas which have falling pupil numbers - for example, Hove Park is keeping its PAN the same in all models... is that because there isn't a reduction in pupils in its catchment area? The Options are not clear as to the distribution of the falling pupil numbers and how the different Options address this.
- Perhaps by actually investing more in underperforming schools instead of bussing in kids from miles away to polish up results
- Schools need funding, they need support to all be the best they can be, not just changing PAN numbers and catchment areas
- Schools need proper funding and support so all pupils have a chance to thrive in their local school and not be shipped around the city to schools considered 'good'. Especially given the impact that commuting time has on school aged children.
- The Council has an obligation to provide great education
- The schools shouldn't be devalued. The schools need funding and help to improve. That shouldn't be determined by bringing in pupils from other areas of Brighton.
- Surely the most obvious/easiest/cheapest solution will be to close Longhill, spread the catchment area between stringer, Varndean (and baca if necessary for numbers) to even up deprivation? Provide decent, reliable and free school buses for children in these areas to reach school. The harsh fact is that parents do not want their child in Longhill, its been in decline for years and would take so much money, investment and time to improve, you'd also need the community to be on board and that won't happen. It's a failing school with ridiculously low numbers, trying to save it is pointless and a waste of everyone's time and money
- Resources and PAN should be increased at the good schools and smaller ones closed or more funding given to them to improve them.
- It is more important to ensure that all of the secondary schools are excellent. The focus on keeping all schools open is wrong, schools that have lower standards and outcomes should be closed. Students all deserve to attend an excellent school.
- It is not possible to determine whether the proposed plan meets this objective as insufficient information has been provided. There are numerous questions. One that immediately springs to mind is how such a scheme affects all children and not just disadvantaged children. Also, blaming the children for an Ofsted rating of "requires improvement" is ridiculous. How about getting the right people in the right place to fix the schools rather than taking a view that the children should fix the problem by mixing disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children.
- If one area is unviable it should close, rather than pulling down others.

- If a school is doing well and meeting ifsted reports they should be kept open. Any school closures should be minimised due to the unrealistic knock on affect it would have to remaining schools
- If a particular school is failing that school should close and the children be redistributed
- However worst schools should be better supported not at expense of schools doing better.
- I believe that schools which have high demand should not have their PANS reduced so that children who live locally to that school are forced to travel long distances to increase the PAN of a school with low intake numbers. The schools which are failing should be brought up to standard rather than bussing kids around the city to try to fix a bigger problem.
- think all the schools should be thriving and sustainable but don't agree Option B (which seems to be the frontrunner despite the Council's suggestions that you want our opinions and are not imposing your own views) will do it. I think the well meaning intention could actually make the "good" schools worse as there is no evidence that engineering the movement of children around a city to create a mixing between demographics will have the same effect as it does in cities like London where advantaged and disadvantaged kids live cheek by jowl. The lottery system and FSM initiative are already good measures to stop people buying into a school by simple proximity. They need to be replicated nationwide (not the Brighton Council's responsibility) otherwise you'll find the advantaged families won't want to live down here which will in turn make the schools worse.
- If 'maintaining thriving schools' means reducing their PAN, no. Should the council be Maintaining schools that are clearly not thriving and not sustainable, no. Please provide more data and evidence on what thriving and sustainable actually mean.
- I think it is our moral obligation to try and maintain thriving and well-funded secondary schools, particularly in more deprived areas. Whilst the issue of falling pupil numbers is difficult to tackle - closing a school in the east, west, or north of the city would be a strategic mistake
- Absolutely agree that all schools should be thriving, but this needs to be done through focused infrastructure investment, strong leadership, clear school priorities and shift in culture within the school (through innovative teaching and excellent leadership)
- I do think that we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas, but this need not be through removing disparities as evidence shows that nationally and locally schools with low PANS can thrive (eg Kings school). School places should be kept high in areas of high population density and not artificially inflated elsewhere, which creates excessive levels of travel, increases costs, dislocated children from their communities.
- I do not think you should cut admission places for areas of high demand such as Dorothy stringer and varndean. It would be more plausible to reduce pupil admission numbers to areas with lower demand such as The Brighton Aldridge Catchment which has significantly more places available than demand would suggest.
- I do not think maintaining a bad school is a good idea and keeping all current schools should be put above other considerations.
- I do not believe that schools should be maintained at all costs. Unfortunately there is a perfect storm of long term underfunding and a fall in the birth rate which means that some schools may become unviable
- I believe all schools should be performing. If some are inadequate the answer is to invest in those schools , not shuffle children around the city . Children will not fix the problem, the council and schools must.
- Creating thriving and sustainable schools requires a holistic approach that considers multiple factors beyond any singular initiative. First, effective school leadership plays

a pivotal role in setting the vision, culture, and expectations for success. Strong leaders foster collaboration among staff, engage with the community, and prioritise the well-being of students. They also create an environment where both teachers and students feel supported and motivated to excel. Second, the school's improvement priorities must be clear and focused on addressing the diverse needs of the student population. This involves setting goals related to academic achievement, social-emotional development, and equity. Schools that succeed in these areas often have tailored interventions, continuous professional development for staff, and robust mechanisms for tracking and responding to progress.

- Council should close unviable schools like Longhill instead of trying to force kids there
- If this question is about reducing PAN in oversubscribed schools and busing children long distances to artificially increase pupil numbers at schools with declining pupil numbers, then no, I do not agree.
- Failing schools should be closed, not propped up at cost to the tax payer. Attempting to solve the problem by getting other kids to travel from afar is not a viable solution and risks negatively impacting the health and education of those being forced to travel.
- Closing schools is short sighted and will defer the elevated costs for the next bump on student numbers
- Close longhill
- All schools should be thriving. The council should prioritise schools over waste of money ideas such as widening pavements and then narrowing them again!
- All schools should be asked to reduce PANs in a fair and equitable way, because the education system is a public service
- But I do not believe the current PANs in the proposals particularly the reductions in the the high achieving schools in the centre of the city should be reduced. The population data would also suggest that reducing PANs in these areas is purely being proposed to force pupils to schools which do not have the local student numbers to support their over inflated PANs (eg Longhill)
- All schools in the city should be maintained, and further improvement should be imperative for those schools which are not considered to be thriving or sustainable. Some schools in the city are not seen as 'thriving and sustainable'. This narrative must change and investment needs to be made in those schools so that all children in our city have equal opportunity to an education which will enable them to thrive in their childhoods and into adulthood.
- But also put extra money into schools with high PP such as Longhill and Baca
- Better performing schools should be allowed to expand and worse performing schools shrink. Public transport is pretty good in Brighton & Hove.
- BACA is not adequate for anyone. Moulsecoomb and Bevendean families need the opportunity to break the cycle of deprivation
- BACA is not a thriving school and should be abolished.
- Baca and longhill should be shut
- Although this will only work if schools are all good

### **3. Survey Design, Methodology and Implementation Concerns**

- You should be ashamed to include leading questions in a questionnaire. That's against the RSS code of conduct.
- I am answering No as this is a leading question and therefore any statistical outcome of this question is not valid. I'm sure everyone would agree thriving schools are good.

The response to this question should not be used to support any action on this topic, as it leading and meaningless.

- Couldn't select yes
- closed question
- And the process of doing this needs done in a considered way with a slower timeframe to ensure it doesn't create further issues and disadvantages
- Although I think this is a very leading question ie surely mixing pupils up is only one way of achieving this aim.
- I do think this but answered no because the question is disingenuous and skewed to elicit a certain response. This clearly indicates that the council has already made up its mind and this consultation is not being done at a formative stage.
- This is an absurd, rhetorical question. How is 'sustainable' defined? Who thinks schools should not 'thrive'?
- I do NOT trust that you will use my answer in a fair and balanced way, therefore refuse to answer this
- I do not feel able to respond as I think it is a leading question.
- Please consider pausing this engagement exercise and starting again without leading questions such as this - wouldn't it be far more useful to ask people rank their priorities and concerns around schooling?
- This is a totally ridiculous question!! Who has written this?!! Please do not post questions which are obviously structured to produce a confected statistic on a nebulous aspiration.
- I think this question framing is problematic - if you needed to maintain thriving and sustainable schools for everyone then there wouldn't be disparities between the schools. The framing of the question encourages the reader to put 'yes' despite the contradictions explained before.
- I think this question is highly biased and sets this survey up to suggest that changing catchment areas will address this disparity
- This is a terrible leading question. I refuse to answer it so you can misconstrue my opinions.
- Please define thriving and sustainable, meaningless buzz words
- pointless survey
- Leading question that I will not answer
- How is this a fair question? No one is going to say no to this when they want the best education for their children.
- How incredibly unethical to start a survey like this. It biases the rest of responses through cognitive dissonance.
- Question is leading...who could say no?
- Question is very leading and biased
- Question is leading and overly simplified
- Question too complex for yes or no
- Not sure what this question means. Thriving and sustainable schools within a short distance in every part of the city sounds like a no-brainer. What would the alternative even be?
- not sure of the point of this question
- Obviously we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas. There is no detail around what this actually means though, making this a poor opening question.
- Not sure what's meant by this
- Not sure, depends on what other factors achieving this would impact.
- Obviously yes but this feels like a strange question to ask. It fools some into thinking that the proposals are focussed on this but leaves out any initial explanation. If

people don't read up they will essentially vote for their kids having a god awful commute to school!

- Obviously, but this doesn't mean I agree with your proposals - there are other ways to achieve this.
- Surely this is what everyone wants! Seems like a ridiculous question.
- Terrible leading question. Shame on the person who devised this.
- That depends on so many factors - the birth rate, numbers of children in each area, access to effective public transport. Not a Yes or No question
- The consultation hasn't set out any evidence that any of the options provided will provide thriving and sustainable schools.
- Ridiculous survey - designed for a preconceived outcome
- The way the question is framed, is to get you to put yes to agree with the bizarre reasoning to save longhill at the expense of the greater community ..
- This a highly leading question and inadequate information has been provided by the council to respond to this question in a meaningful way. No data has been provided to confirm the statement in the briefing materials that closure of a school would be a strategic failure (due to population growth) - in fact all the data sources available from council meetings indicate that the student numbers are projected to decline across the vast majority of existing catchment areas across the city raising the question of the viability of schools at the geographic extremities of the City. As such a robust assessment should first be undertaken to confirm whether school closure / consolidation / relocation should be considered prior to playing about with catchment areas / PANs based on the existing schools
- Of course I want to see thriving and sustainable schools. Feel that this question is poor and leading.
- Of course I do. However, the plan the council has to address this problem is completely flawed.
- This answer does not indicate acceptance as to how this is best achieved
- This answer is obvious - i've just looked at the main page (<https://yourvoice.brighton-hove.gov.uk/en-GB/projects/secondary-school-engagement-exercise>) telling me to look at background information and there's no link to take me to background information - the link to the department dealing with this returns a 'page not found' - what's going on here? we can hardly make informed choices with this
- This consultation offers limited options which poorly address the problems, likely to make them worse.
- Flawed question as the answer relies on your definition of thriving and sustainable.
- This appears to be a leading question to which who wouldn't answer yes
- This appears to be deliberately geared to elicit a positive response. I do not believe this type of question is helpful to the process
- This is a flawed and very leading question that shouldn't be asked
- This is a horribly leading question that can only be designed to garner support for the plans but do not seek any sort of proper consultation on them. If these figures are used to suggest X% of respondents support the plans to change the catchments then this would be extremely duplicitous...
- This is a leading question - entirely depends on evidence and context.
- This is a leading question (any reasonable parent would want thriving schools in all areas). However, you clearly intend to leverage such an answer to advance an agenda that will ultimately disadvantage my child.
- This is a leading question and a dangerous, disingenuous way of getting people's views. I want questions that allow me to assess the facts and interrogate each of the 3 options proposed.
- This is a leading question and a loaded question, and arguably not the right question. If you asked "should we try to maintain good health for adults across the city" most

people will want to answer yes, or indeed feel that the only acceptable answer is yes, but that's not what you need to ask people. Maintenance would be status quo, Maintaining the successful schools might mean not interfering with them. It doesn't reference the unsuccessful schools. Poorly worded question and biased.

- This is a stupid question - have you asked so you can say we want whatever you put in place?
- Such a loaded question - does make me think this survey has been designed to elicit specific answers which is not the same as asking for views
- This is a leading question and has no place in a survey where a genuine opinion on catchment areas is the wanted result. No one is going to say they do not want schools to thrive. However, the options put forward by the council are not necessarily the best options to allow this, so therefore, I will not be answering this question.
- This is a leading question and I refuse to answer it!
- This is a leading question and has no subjective benefit to the decisions being made
- this is a leading question and I therefore feel it has no empirical value
- This is a leading question
- This is a leading question!
- This is a leading and coercive question. I don't really understand the question
- This is a leading question and is not neutral
- This is a ridiculous question.... Who would say no???
- This is a silly question as no one in their right mind would answer no, plus you do not define what is meant by thriving or sustainable or what the trade offs are for different decisions - which is the entire problem
- This is a silly and very loaded question, who would answer no?
- This is a stupid, leading question with only one possible answer and not a proper consultation.
- This is a ridiculously leading question, of course everyone wants this but doesn't necessarily mean the changes you have proposed are right- will not be answering this so as not to provide you with a data point you'll use later
- This is a stupidly worded question who in their right mind would say no
- This is a superfluous question
- I feel concerned about how a yes/no answer could be misinterpreted or used out of context, and so I won't be answering. But of course, I believe every child in the city should be able to access a good education. To do this I believe schools should be appropriately sized to their local communities to ensure they are sustainable for the long term, and to enable them to thrive and effectively serve and enhance their local communities.
- I don't trust that my answer will be used in a fair and balanced way.
- I feel concerned about how this data could be used out of context, and so I won't be answering. But of course, every child in the city should be able to access a good education, and schools should be able to serve their local communities.
- This is a leading question I don't want to answer
- This is a very leading question - any decent human being would agree with this point but a 'yes' answer can easily be used to support and back up the council's preferred plans. A person can agree with this question without agreeing with any of the consultation options.
- This is a leading question!
- This is a leading question designed solely for you to misrepresent the data and the intent of the community. I work in research and you should never design a survey in this way- which, I am sure you are more than aware of.
- This is a leading question and so I answered no as it's not a question that gives a genuine choice.
- This is a leading question and your response data will be meaningless

- This is a leading question as the opening question of the survey: there is no explanation as to why disparities exist. I obviously want every school in the city to be 'thriving' across the whole city. I do not necessarily believe your proposals will result in thriving schools and hope that the reductive 'yes' I have provided to this question will not then be used to support your proposals.
- This is a leading question that doesn't really discuss the proposed catchment area changes. Of course I think the schools should be thriving and sustainable, who would argue otherwise? It's not going to tell you anything useful and, cynically, could be used as evidence for support for changing the catchment areas as proposed.
- This is a leading question which doesn't address the major changes in catchment areas and will just be used to force through a decision rather than consult purely on the catchment zones themselves.
- I'm not sure what this entails
- I'd like help maintain thriving schools across the city but I don't think enough evidence has been given or research undertaken as to how these proposals will improve the system. On the contrary, I am very concerned about the potential negative impact of these proposals.
- This is a leading question that you can use to support any conclusion.
- I'm not ticking yes here if the comments aren't considered properly. It is effectively a leading question. Of course I agree that all schools should be thriving and sustainable. Most parents would. But changing catchment areas to address this is not the answer and there is not currently sufficient data to back this up.
- This is a leading question to create a high percentage of agreement
- This is a leading question where any reasonable parent would naturally say yes. However, it is evident that you intend to leverage such an answer to advance an agenda that will ultimately disadvantage my child.
- This is a leading question without further information provided.
- I'd like to complain about the use of leading questions in your survey such as this one
- This is a totally leading question - obviously everyone wants thriving and sustainable schools in all areas but your proposals will not lead to that happening
- What a strange question
- This is a leading question, and shouldn't be used to demonstrate support for this proposal.
- I believe the questions on this survey are geared towards soliciting answers that support the change. But none of the options seem to benefit huge parts of our community
- I believe this is a leading question, all proposals will result in significant disruption to schools and families without enough evidence to support the gain.
- This is a very leading question. Yes of course i do, but i don't think that should be at the cost of the kids
- This is a very leading question. Poorly written and untested to see how the council use it.
- I believe this is a leading question. All proposals will result in significant disruption to children and families accessing their local schools, without enough evidence to support the gain.
- This is a very leading question!
- This is a very leading question, I am unclear what value this brings to the consultation.
- This is a very leading question and borders on being unethical. No meaningful information will be derived from this question.
- This is a very leading question and really poorly worded

- This is a very leading question, I can't imagine anyone saying they don't want thriving and sustainable schools. If you really are trying to illicit views do so but this looks like just reaching out for responses that will justify what you want to do.
- This is a very leading question, it depends on a lot of different factors.
- This is a very loaded question and from a research perspective I fail to understand what data it will provide. What parent is going to be against thriving schools in the city? It's if these are fair and equally distributed which is the issue. The current issues at stringer, many parents of which tell me their concerns are being sidelined, demonstrates that parents don't really have a choice over the education provided as it is. Further curtailing that is extremely concerning
- This is an absolute no brainer of a question, and strikes me as very leading.
- This is an admirable and fair objective which I agree with in principle. But I do not agree with that the options provided will ensure this. And I do not believe that the council has provided sufficient evidence or indeed analysis that any of these options will deliver on the above objective.
- This is an unhelpful question. Of course I want thriving schools - who doesn't. It's a leading question and incredibly unscientific.
- I don't think this is a useful question, it feels like it's worded to drive yes answers to validate the proposed changes.
- I don't think anyone would answer 'no' to this question! If it was as simple as that then I doubt this survey would exist.
- I don't think anyone is going to answer no to that!
- This is an utterly idiotic question. Who's going to answer "no" to that?
- This question is very leading and a clear attempt to gather biased data that will support your statements. While I do of course agree with the statement above, I do not want my answer to be included as evidentiary support. Can I suggest you get help from social researchers next time you draft a survey. Yes and no are not appropriate response options for this question, it should at the least be a scale or a ranking.
- I don't like these leading questions - I think it's hugely unethical. I imagine lots of parents have said "yes" to many if not all the questions because who wants children to be treated unfairly but saying yes doesn't mean we necessarily agree with the proposals. Also they might have carried on saying yes because they thought they might get to a non-misleading bit!
- I don't see what the Council can learn from asking leading questions that seem designed to make it harder for people to engage with the complexity of the issue.
- This is evidently a leading question. Anyone would answer yes... I don't want this to be used in order to push an agenda where my child would have reduced options and ultimately be disadvantaged.
- This question is pointless.
- Of course the answer to this is yes, but it seems a pointless leading question that allows you to do whatever you want with a positive response.
- Of course there should be good schools across the city, but this is a meaningless leading question.
- This question is redundant. Who is going to say know? What does it mean? What actions are attached to it
- This question is so leading it should not be allowed in this survey.
- This question is too leading and manipulative
- This question is too vague. And definitions of 'thriving' or 'sustainable' should be clear within this. The question feels like it is directing you to support a predetermined theme or agenda.

- This is a leading question. Thriving and sustainable schools are of course desirable however I strongly believe that the proposals put forward by the council will not achieve this goal.
- This question is unclear, both in its focus and measures so I cannot answer it in good faith but I have tried.
- This is a leading question. Yes of course but the options included in this proposal do not support this. This plan needs to be scrapped and a new plan created.
- Weird question.
- This is a loaded question, as obviously everyone wants thriving schools but that doesn't imply the plan you're suggesting
- This is a loaded question, who would answer no?
- This is a meaningless word salad that couldn't be disagreed with by a reasonable person.
- This is a loaded question. Of course all schools should thrive, provided there are sufficient pupils wanting to attend, but there is no evidence provided that your proposed solutions will achieve this
- This question feels leading
- This is a misleading question - you have already established that not all schools are thriving and sustainable, so you would not be "maintaining" this through your adaptations of the catchment areas.
- This question is leading and so I will provide an answer instead.
- Unfortunately this is such an awful survey question so I've chosen not to answer this. I'm surprised that these questions form the basis of a survey on such a delicate and important matter and they seem designed to support a particular approach rather than an attempt to gather useful information.
- What a misleading question. I don't think you should expect any children to be travelling any further than they do not just to suit a minority.
- What a stupid question, who is going to answer no to this, please make survey questions purposeful and useful!
- Usual rigged questions rather than asking us whether we agree to any of the proposed models
- unsure, it depends whether they can be "thriving and sustainable". A bit of a biased question!
- What a ridiculously loaded question. Of course you should be that should mean raising standards in others not taking from those doing well.
- What does this question mean? Of course we are going to answer yes to this... Why would anyone say "No, we should not have thriving schools" ?
- What's the point of this question? Surely noone would answer 'no'
- Wow what a leading question, clearly designed to justify whatever course of action you decide to take later! I'm not clicking yes to this so that you can use it as ammunition!
- Weird question which implies answer. Very professional survey indeed
- With respect, the wording of this question is biased. There's neither enough qualification of "thriving and sustainable", nor would any reasonable person suggest that schools shouldn't be maintained...
- Your question is leading and manipulative.
- Your question is leading ... who wouldn't say no. It wouldn't stand up in court if your consultation was challenged.
- Yes of course, but it's a leading question and doesn't mean I agree with the current proposals.
- This is a leading question. Of course everyone wants thriving and sustainable schools across the city.
- Very misleading question! Very poor questioning.

- Very leading question, who would say no!
  - I am not answering this question, as it is not fit for purpose and whoever wrote it needs to consider what data exactly they are looking to collect.
- Very leading question
- Very badly worded opening question - who is going to say no?
  - This unfortunately feels like a leading question without much needed context as to how it would be used to support options that might in spite of this very positive aim have detrimental effects in other areas.
  - This question is leading and poorly worded.
  - This question is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles
  - This question is leading and seeks to manipulate responses to provide justification for the council's suggested changes to school catchment areas.
  - This survey is based extremely leading and is using what seem to be totally logical questions in a disingenuous way. Nobody would seriously answer no to this question which leads me to believe that there is a ulterior motive to this survey
  - This statement is very simplistic and does not allow for the complex challenges of meeting this noble ambition.
  - This reads like an intentionally emotive leading question.
  - This questions is really annoyingly skewed to an answer the council wants and makes me concerned this isn't a genuine and open consultation. As a long-term aim, of course, you would be mad not to want the above. However, the ill thought through proposals will not achieve this and will really heavily and unfairly impact some families.
  - This is a leading question.
  - This is a leading question. And absolutely inappropriate for the survey.
  - This question is worded poorly. It sounds like if I answer "yes", which seems like the obvious answer, then the logical continuation is that you shouldn't maintain or assist the schools that are struggling. Which I disagree with
  - This questionnaire is biased and leading
  - This question seems too leading.
  - I don't see the point in this loaded question.
  - The framing of this question is biased and leading.
  - Ridiculous question! Disgraceful.
  - This question makes no sense. Are you asking whether schools should be shut if they are not thriving and not popular?
  - This question is worded quite weirdly. With a negative in the intro and negative in the end, so hard to know what to answer.
  - This question is leading and masks some deeper issues.
  - This question is leading and appears solely designed to gain general agreement from respondents.
  - This is a misleading question unrelated to how your models have been created.
  - This is a poorly/unfairly worded question as it leads you to answer yes (because who wouldn't agree!) but without taking into consideration other options for achieving it to that which the council are proposing.
  - These opening questions are incredibly leading and designed with the sole intent of being able to pull out nebulous stats that underpin the rationale to execute the council's clear stated plan of option B.
  - This is an extremely leading question
  - The question is framed binary when the issue has actually far more considerations. This questions reads more like we will do as we want and if you answer no you have no sympathy.

- i'm answering No because this is a leading question which seems engineered to garner responses in support of your proposals. The proposals appear to seek to achieve equity by levelling down which I do not support.
- I am not willing to answer this question as it is far too leading.
- Im cautious about answering this question as I feel it might be used to push through changes that families do not want. The question needs to be more direct.
- I'm concerned that my support of access to education across the city will be seen as tacit support for the council proposals. It is also a leading questions that will by design or not frame questions later in the survey.
- Misleading question. As an epidemiologist I know this type of questioning without any context should never appear in any type of questionnaire.
- The proposal doesn't explain how this question is addresssd by proposal or why school pupil numbers need to be spread more than by geography alone? You can have a thriving community schools with less than current student numbers.  
Nb. I have not answered the question because it is a loaded question not directly relative to the proposal.
- The question is meaningless as 'thriving and sustainable' is subjective. Please provide more information (demographic, financial and educational) to justify reducing places at all maintained secondary schools. Please also justify the assumption that non-maintained schools will stay the same size.
- This is a leading question, I will not answer it
- This is a leading question, which I imagine few people will tick 'no' to . If you are actually asking whether people agree/disagree with particular schools being closed then please be explicit in asking this - then people will have a more informed idea of what you are actually asking about. I have chosen not to answer this question as I fear doing so could lead to my answer being used to support a narrative I might not agree with.
- The question is poorly worded and not a fair question
- THIS IS LEADING QUESTION WITH NO CONTEXT
- These questions are leading, I will therefore not answer them
- This goes without saying and is a leading question. Who in their right mind would not want all children thriving in school?
- I don't know what to say here.
- I do, however i do not think the proposed changes to catchment areas will provide this. I feel this question is very leading.
- I don't feel this is a yes or no question , it is also worded poorly. The first sentence you say there are disparities the next you want to maintain. If the schools Are thriving and sustainable then there wouldn't be disparities
- I refuse to answer such a poorly-worded, leading question. We need as many schools in the city that can be sustained by the school population.
- The way the question is worded, it's very difficult to disagree with it.
- I don't like the way this question is posed. Of course it's a good idea to provide a thriving school system but this can be accomplished in many other ways by investing in services and support in those areas where pupils are not attaining similar results.
- The wording of this question is so leading that it renders the response invalid. It would not stand up to scrutiny and so in my view should not be considered evidence.
- This is a badly conceived question as no one is going to answer No
- I refuse to answer yes to this question as it is a ridiculous question to answer
- The statement lacks enough evidence or specificity to be objective.
- This is a bias leading question, that needs to be re- addressed.
- I have not answered this as I feel it is a very leading question and feels inappropriate for a council survey

- I have clicked no as I disagree with this whole idea and question is a leading one. Resources should be put into schools in the city that are not thriving and break up communities.
- I have opted out of this question as it is a leading question. Obviously, ideally all schools would flourish – but this shouldn't be at the cost of disadvantaging other pupils by making them travel unreasonable distances when there are already very good schools much closer to their homes. If a school is not thriving and pupil numbers are low, perhaps that school should be closed.
- This is a leading question, we maintain all school so that they thrive.
- This is a ridiculous leading question and therefore I shall abstain from answering it. You might consider speaking to research committees about how to frame questions in a more open and fair manner!
- This is a confusing question. What disparities are you referring to? I think we need a thriving and sustainable school system that is accessible from all areas of the city
- This is an incredibly leading question and suggests that your proposals seek to do this which is in fact not the case.
- This is a ridiculous and leading question. You should not be allowed to start a survey this way.
- I am very surprised this kind of question was put in the survey. This is, of course, a leading question. This reminds of instances when free speech is bought up to support deeply offensive comments being made.
- I assumed it was a rhetorical question?
- This is a leading question. This may be desirable but it can't be the only objective.
- This is a really leading question.
- This question is impossible to answer, what are you asking? It's non specific, do you currently view all the schools as thriving or not? What is the alternative being considered? What is thriving defined as?
- This question is highly leading and not appropriate for a quantitative survey so i'm not answering.
- The council's proposals do not achieve this on any level.
- This question is far more complex than the binary options you've provided.
- This question is extremely leading at not at all fair. It's quite shameful the way it's written.
- Speaking as a professional market researcher this question is an inappropriate question to put in a survey seeking an unbiased response
- This feels like a very loaded / leading question - having thriving and sustainable schools is surely, indisputable
- Sorry, this is such a leading question. It's like asking do I think people should go hungry.
- I will not answer as this is a leading question so will refrain from giving an answer
- Sorry if I miss-understand. This sounds like, if answering yes, you are saying the failing ones should be closed? The failing ones need help
- This is an outrageous and leading question
- I have answered yes to this question as nearly anyone would. However, a majority of residents answering yes to this question provides the council with no useful information as it provides no further context of how this might be achieved, how attempts to achieve this might be damaging to children's education in other respects and have negative unintended consequences that run counter to the aims of those attempts. Sadly, this poorly designed question has caused many parents I have spoken to to believe that this engagement exercise included attempts to lead residents towards particular answers. I have faith that the question designers would not do something like this but poorly phrased questions that could be interpreted as leading, are not helpful.

- This is such an odd question and looks like you're engineering responses to fit your narrative. Not okay at all.
- This feels like a very leading question to start with...
- This is not a "yes" or "no" answer. Why isn't a option for "Not Sure" here. There should be as it may skew the results.
- The council has not provided enough detail of the statistical analysis or data used to inform these proposals and therefore it is impossible for key stakeholders to make an informed decision. The abject lack of transparency and miniscule amount of time given in which to review and respond is, to me, deeply troubling.  
I think the council need to respond to the broadly unsupportive public feedback and redraw proposals, with more transparency of what evidence was used to reach these conclusion.
- This is not an appropriate question. It is leading and Insufficiently well defined, please design an appropriate questionnaire and repeat the excercise after having done so. Some schools may not be viable . Depends on many factors.
- This is quite a leading question. Of course everyone wants their schools to thrive. This feels like a statistical justification to push through a poorly thought out plan.
- Of course I agree with this - this question feels leading though. I agree with this statement, but I do not agree with the current proposals.
- Of course everyone will agree to that incredibly loaded statement - it is not a question of 'if' but 'how'that is achieved
- I have answered all the questions in this survey in good faith but I must agree with some of the views on the online engagement events, some of the questions within it are leading in my view
- I have answered no to this because the leading questions in this survey are clearly engineered to give justification for the proposals. You present leading statements that no one would object to, and then present three proposals as if they are related to the problems previously mentioned in the survey. This survey is clearly designed to link the two things together - but it is more complicated than that and you know it. There is no convincing evidence that you have presented that suggests the proposals put forward will address the issues.  
Not answering this, feels a loaded question!
- Not answering this silly question
- I have answered no because this is a leading question. Please read report by professor Adam Dennet and act responsibly.
- Not answering this one. Nebulous statement followed by a loaded question. Who devised this survey and who authorised it?
- As I think this is a leading question I've put no. But I do believe we should aim for all schools in the city to be high performing.
- Leading questions in surveys can be dangerous because they can:  
Bias results- Leading questions can skew data and lead to inaccurate measurements of public opinion. This is because they can guide respondents to a particular answer, which may not reflect their true opinions or experiences. - Damage credibility  
If stakeholders recognize that leading questions were used, it can undermine the credibility of the research or the integrity of the interviewer. - Make respondents feel uncomfortable. Leading questions can make respondents feel manipulated or uncomfortable, potentially damaging their willingness to participate honestly.
- Leading question. I do but not by penalising the schools that are over achieving
- Leading question. Disagree strongly with proposals and don't think this question is relevant
- I am answering no to this question because it is a leading question and isn't related to the stated aims of the proposals
- I've clicked no because there currently aren't schools in all areas, and they aren't thriving, so we aren't able to 'maintain' anything.

- I've answered no because this is a leading question and requires a more nuanced response than simple yes or no.
- It is unfair of the council to frame this survey in this way. These questions are leading and aimed to set the frame for the options.
- I think the question is vague?
- I find this question leading, it is clearly driving the answer to suit the agenda of the proposal.
- I find the above yes/no questions really disappointing and an unethical way of gathering information.
- I don't understand the phrasing of this question- how does this relate to catchment area proposals?
- I don't think this question has been worded very well. Obviously all schools should be thriving but there is no evidence to suggest the councils plans would lead to this ( which is what the question implies.
- I find this question inappropriate and leading
- I find this question both leading and misleading. It assumes that we do have thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city, when in fact this is an aspiration. There are some serious issues with some of the school in the city and these need to be addressed rather than simply glossed over.
- I think the question is misleading. Everyone wants good school but I think the answer is to invest in the schools rather than move the children around
- I disagree with the format of this question. Obviously no one will put 'no' sort what is the point of it?
- I cant image many people have chosen no... this doesn't seem relevant to the consultation
- Bit of a leading question! But yes I feel the city is very divided currently and that needs to change
- The question is foolish - everyone would surely agree that we need thriving and sustainable schools
- Absolutely awful leading questions. Of course we all want thriving and sustainable schools. This is not a simple yes or no issue. Context matters. Costs and benefits should be transparent and for all to see.
- A very leading question. Not appropriate to begin the survey with this. A hugely complex situation needs more open discussion.
- A stupid binary question. It's a complex issue that needs more than a simple answer.
- (This is such a leading question. Please amend the questioning when official proposals go out.)

#### **4. Community and Social Impact**

- We are against any changes that will undermine local communities... and all of these proposals are likely to do this. As such we are against the proposed changes.
- To ensure disadvantaged families can access local schools and not have to pay bus fares, or have their children travel long distances to school. Plus keep communities together.
- all areas need local options
- Access to schools that are close to pupils homes and understand the communities they serve are essential for good outcomes for the pupils they serve
- All areas of Brighton and Hove deserve good schools that are accessible to their children
- 'Thriving' includes being able to attend a LOCAL school

- a secondary school is the heart of the community - every community deserves a good local school
- A community needs a school as its hub so all areas should have school(s).
- I think that it would be ideal for all children to be able to attend a good school that is local to them.
- All schools should be supported in providing the best education and facilities to their local community. Increasing numbers in any one particular school, to the exclusion of pupils wishes and to the detriment of their families m, is not the right way to support a school.
- All schools should be thriving but then children should have access to a school which is close to their home.
- All schools should have good funding and facilities and teachers, so that all children are able to go to a thriving local school in their community
- Catchment areas worked well and it is also postive for communities
- Children need to attend locally to where they live to reduce travel.
- Children should be able to make connections within their local community
- I believe that all children should have access to good schools, I also believe that in the state system keeping communities together and therefore geographically considerations into admissions is critical
- Having access to your local school is important for the environment and sense of community and friendships.
- Being able to walk to school and have a school in your local community is better for community cohesion and the environment
- But the answer is not splitting up existing school communities where the children have built strong relationships and rely on each other for their mental health
- But this doesn't mean moving catchment for people who have worked hard to ensure there children can go to a particular school. Furthermore, what about sibling priority ?! 2 of the proposed changes means my son 9 in year 5) will not be able to go to school with his sibling which he has been looking forward too.
- Excellent education should be available for all and those lucky enough to live in a catchment of a good school should not pay the price for inclusivity. Inclusivity should be ALL schools being good schools
- I do agree children should have the same opportunities despite their backgrounds but the options being considered will affect all children and will only artificially level attainment by bringing down the average and prob not bring the average up in those conurbations where equal opportunity isn't available.
- I do but I think there are other ways to achieve it that mixing up pupils and causing disruption to families, communities and addition significant additional travel for people to get to school
- All areas need a secondary school for social cohesion
- I believe that everyone should have the opportunity to attend a good school within the community that they live in
- Everyone should ideally have a school near them they can easily get to, whether that is bus or by walking.
- I do want to maintain thriving schools in all area of the cities. I do not think we should damage the current landscape by expecting some children to travel long distances away from their local communities to attend a school they are not familiar with.
- I think all areas of the city should have their own local school, to which children can travel easily on foot or by bike. However I don't agree that all means of keeping an individual school viable are justifiable, including compelling children from outside the local area to take a long journey to school in order to distribute children throughout the city when there could be a better option for individual children. Essentially, I feel children should have access to a good school close to their own home.

- I think catchment areas are crucial meaningful community and people choose to live in certain parts of the city to ensure their children have community and are schooled in the area close to home.
- I think schools should be provided locally even if they are not considered thriving.
- I think this needs to be worked from the ground up. Currently there is no local school serving some of the most deprived areas in Brighton. The bigger picture should look to providing schools imbedded within the communities which need them most.
- I think there should be minimal change and disruption to the current system to help children settle more easily and reach their local schools safely without having to travel too far across the city
- I would advocate for children to have access to thriving schools within their local community. This question is leading as a large number of children would not thrive under proposals to travel two hours per day to school when they have a school they can walk to within their own community
- I'd in regards to your need to keep the sibling preference to second children within your criteria
- It is important schools are close to where people live rather than ghettoising some areas
- It is important that children attend good LOCAL schools without long and potentially unsafe commutes.
- It is important all children can access high quality education close to their homes and friends
- If numbers are declining, then why not have less schools with more focus on each school rather than trying to keep more schools open by making more kids have to travel outside of their local communities?
- If some schools are 'failing' and not serving the community I do not feel that places at successful schools should be sacrificed to save them. This could also mean pupils travelling huge distances across the city as 'unpopular' schools have such huge catchment areas to keep them going as more families will choose schools out of the city such as Lewes Priory or Peacehaven
- It is paramount that children all attend school near to home
- It is so important that community schools exist across the city. It is unfortunate that kings and CNCS create so much inequity
- Instead of bussing children across B&H you should ensure all schools have the same standards. Community schools, where the majority of children live locally, have a better chance of engaging more fully with parents. Families feel a sense of loyalty to their local schools. There will be a huge sense of loss for children who go to their local primary school but will be unable to go to their local secondary school. Looking at the proposed changes, it seems madness for those living in the Friar and Varndean areas will be excluded from attending Varndean or DS - within a stone's throw. My children are grown up now so it won't affect me personally but I'm really aware of the anxiety this is causing to many in my area.
- Kids from poorer areas deserve great schooling in their communities
- Local children should go to their local school, to support their communities
- My child should be able to go to a school in their local area. Not the other side of Brighton
- Need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- No at the cost of breaking already formed sub-local communities - which form via school parents mainly. And not by ill-informed, over ambitious, against social science and data - totalitarian social engineering. It never works and examples are abound here and in other countries.
- No not of the expense of dividing communities

- Of course I agree with this, but to suddenly bring in a sweeping change that disadvantages a whole new set of children is not solving the issue. It's just pushing it around. The underperforming school see more resource and funding. And, from a personal point of view, in a family that has one child in a school, it will create inequality in a family if the second child is denied entry to the same experience and level of education. The implications for development of second (or third or fourth) children having what you are, by definition defining as a poorer experience, could have emotional, educational and life changing issues for those losing a sibling link.
- Of course we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in our area - how could that not be acceptable?
- People want schools which children can walk to safely. And that provide a good education for all. This should cater for demand, and not necessarily all areas of the city.
- I fundamentally disagree with making children who live close to a school in their area go to a school that is in no way close to where they live
- It is best for children to have good school in their community and not to travel long distances for their education.
- Maintain the schools which are thriving and popular in areas of the city where there are primary schools which feed into the secondary schools so that you can be sure the children/teens can safely walk to/from school with their friends and go to school close to where they live
- Not at the expense of the children and families themselves
- Obviously. But children should go to their nearest school above anything else. Community is so important.
- If there is a local community for all current secondary schools then yes, they should be maintained. But I do not agree about keeping schools open if not the demand, and at the cost of children that could attend other schools locally to them.
- Of course - schools should serve the local area they are in, and serve them effectively. Focus for the council should be on improving schools so that they all offer a good level of provision to all pupils regardless of background or location
- Only where it is relevant to the local demand. For me, the important thing is that all schools are right-sized to the community they serve and don't rely on hitting numbers over and above the local community demand and therefore needing to split communities and introduce long and stressful travel for children all over the city.
- people should have a choice of schools near home
- Schools are a vital part of local community
- But not at the expense of local communities and the children within them.
- Schools should be maintained based on need (to serve the local area)..
- schools should support their local community. They should be financially supported to enable them to thrive, but if the population in that area drops significantly and it is no longer viable to run, it is not a justifiable solution to artificially populate schools with children outside of the area, against their will.
- Several secondaries are not doing enough to be truly reflective of their local community.
- School should reflect the demands of the local area and yes all 'thrive' but there should be larger schools with larger PAs in the areas where there are most children NOT distributing children from high density areas to fill schools which have low intake in other areas
- Schools should belong to their community, not be huge factory-like environments where children travel from long distances.
- Students should be educated as close to their local communities as possible
- The aspiration must be good local schools within local communities.

- We should maximise the effectiveness of the schools based on their current location, and the locations of population hubs.
- Schools need to improve their education in order to be popular to attract pupils. Wherever possible pupils should be able to go to schools close to their homes. How can this be equitable if some schools can select pupils on religious grounds
- Local schools with local communities.
- Though in trying to do that we should not disadvantage areas of the community that are thriving.
- Good schools are important in all communities. Children from all areas have the right to a good well funded local school. All schools do not need to be the same size.
- Every school should be supported to stay open for every community
- But not at expense of destroying community cohesion
- But not at expense of communities and relationships
- All children should have access to thriving schools without restrictions due to their residence location.
- All children should have access to a school which is close to their home.
- All children need to be given easy access to a local school that reflects their local community
- All children deserve to go to a good school close to their home

## **5. Equity and Access**

- Yes, unless you were going to completely mix them up and close the less good schools, which isn't being proposed.
- Every Brighton child deserves it
- All schools should be thriving
- A variety of educational options and opportunities is vital for all pupils.
- All children have an equal right to access education. We have already seen the impact in our city of closing a secondary school, making access to education harder for children in parts of the city. We cannot see those mistakes repeated.
- ALL children have the right to a good education
- All children in the city should have access to a good school and not have to travel.
- all schools should be equal
- All children should be able to access good schooling facilities no matter their living or financial situation
- All children deserve to have access to good schools with the same amount of resource and a good socio economic mix. This should not be decided on the postcode you happen to live in and how wealthy your family is.
- All children should have access to good education
- All children should have accessibility to the same level of education wherever they live within the city
- All children should get same choices
- All children should have the opportunity to attend a thriving school
- All of Brighton's communities deserve a good local school
- All schools in Brighton should be good.
- All school children should be given the opportunity to attend the best school to meet their needs, to mix with children from different backgrounds across the city and obtain the best education to ensure they get off to the best start in life
- All schools need to be fit for purpose
- All schools of the city should get the same funding but sadly it looks not all of the schools are thriving

- All schools should be appropriately resourced and supported to thrive regardless of the demographic of pupil it serves. Children should not be held responsible for whether a school thrives or fails.
- All schools should be supported in improving as opposed to dishing out the poorer children more evenly. This only makes the schools look better while providing no extra support to children from difficult backgrounds.
- FSM Quotas should NOT take preference over travel distance.
- All schools should be thriving, but I think a bigger priority is to give parents and children the choice of primary schools that are right for them.
- All schools should provide safe, positive, engaging and supportive teaching
- All Schools should be a good standard, help the schools more
- All young people need to have a good local school.
- Brighton needs to live up to its reputation of being an inclusive area. This should start with its children.
- All schools that come under Brighton and Hove Council should have the same rules apply in terms of sustainability. Schools that are lacking in this should be given extra needs/training to bring them up alongside others.
- All the schools should be of a high standard and each child should be able to go to a school that is close by to them. I don't see how the current proposal and changes in catchment areas deals with the root cause of the problem
- Brighton and Hove currently ranks poorly in terms of social integration in our school system. We need to live up to our values as a progressive community and improve equity in experience and life chances of our young people to the benefit of all. This means rethinking our current school selection system to create integrated, balanced and diverse school cohorts, to the benefit of all our young people.
- But not at the detriment of the quality of education
- Definitely. a key purpose of the council schools should be diverse and prepare children for life. While being aspirational
- Disparity in schools are to do with performance. If all schools performed well then they would all attract students. If you have underperforming schools that attract less students, just drafting in kids from further away doesn't solve the issue.
- Education shapes our world!
- Easy access to thriving and sustainable schools is paramount across the city. Long journeys/logistical difficulties to access a good school only on the other side of the city should not be a barrier to get a high quality education.
- Equality needs to be found throughout the City
- Everyone deserves a good education
- Children across the city should have the same equity in the schools admission process.
- Every child should have the opportunity to attend their local school and for that school to be good
- Children need equal opportunities to education in their local area
- Every child should have the option to attend a Good and thriving school no matter where they live in the city.
- Every child should have the same educational opportunities regardless of where they live in the area. It shouldn't come down to postcode or wealth.
- Every child should have to option to attend a school within a reasonable distance from their home not where a lengthy journey by bus or car is required.
- Good Schools should be available in all areas to serve their communities and those who live around them. Improve struggling schools so that all children have access to good schools in the communities that they live in rather than moving children round the city

- Good schools should be available to all children within 30 minutes commute of their home, or less. This is currently not the case within Brighton and Hove. So the question about whether thriving, sustainable schools should be maintained is misleading. You can't maintain something that is not currently available. Yes, there should be thriving schools available to all. Yes, they should be sustainable, drawing in enough pupils and supporting their local community. But the current school system is not providing that for children across the city.
- However, fair and balanced treatment should be offered to all schools especially as there are fewer secondary than primary schools.
- I am in support of the council aims to make schools more equitable. I live in the surrenden road area and I know that my neighbours are mobilising to stop this and encouraging everyone to fill in the survey to express their opposition. They mainly refer to « falling house prices « and are scaremongering that their children will have to go to failing schools 1.5 hours away. This is objectionable to me as I believe all children should have better access to good education.
- This is of course what families would want to support, all children should have equal access to great education.
- Of course children should have equal access to education and I know that the council is trying to resolve a mess made by the Tories, however sending children all over the city (which I doubt wealthy parents would do - they will just reduce pupil numbers further by sending to private schools) is not the answer.
- Different school have different needs and therefore require alternative levels of support.
- I believe every child should have access to a good local school, with priority given to those who are within reasonable walking distance to the school, FSM, SEN and sibling links.
- I believe we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city where there are enough children who want to attend them. Not all areas of the city have a school at present so the question is not clear. All children should be able to attend a thriving and sustainable school within a reasonable walking distance (less than an hour). This does not equate to having a school in every area.
- I do, but not to the disadvantage of any children or if it means children can't go to a good school near where they live because children from further afield are suddenly given priority. Be careful not to just consider the disadvantaged children. Also consider that people have bought properties to be near certain schools and with the current cost of living levels it's not easy to just move.
- I am supportive of this for schools within brighton and hove but do not agree with children in the city having to travel outside of the city to Longhill or Falmer
- I believe that the council should maintain schools at the size for parental choice in each area rather than trying to change the numbers in order to maintain them.
- I feel that unfortunately there are not thriving secondary schools in all areas of the city to be maintained so this is not possible. There are no secondary schools in the Whitehawk/Kemp Town/Hanover area of the city and from Ofsted reports BACA and Longhill schools unfortunately do not appear to be thriving. On principle I do think we should try and keep the secondary schools we currently have, but if schools have consistently underperformed and parents are just not choosing them then I am not sure this is possible. For example, Longhill has only had one good Ofsted rating in last 14 years and BACA without a good rating for over 10 years. Both schools having falling applications year upon year and parents in their catchments often try to send their children out of Brighton to avoid the schools. It's unfortunate but that's clear parent preference for other schools. So far I have not seen the council present any evidence that catchment changes will socially engineer a school to improve so these disparities may still exist after this disruption. As has been reported by the council funding for schools is on a per pupil basis so this makes the sustainability of BACA

and Longhill difficult given significant falling numbers of pupils admitted. Also I am not sure reducing the numbers of students on Pupil Premium that go there would help because this would also reduce funding from that. Furthermore, I am not sure if parents in the current Varndean/Stringer catchments will actually choose BACA/Longhill if catchments change, from what I have seen so far some may choose a school outside a 'new' catchment or alternative private provisions or some said they will just move home or homeschool. Therefore, if catchment change is combined with FSM policy this may result in less children attending BACA or Longhill further affecting sustainability. The only option I can see to make Longhill (and maybe BACA) thriving and sustainable is to reduce their PANs and reduce costs there by making the schools function as smaller schools (I am not sure how this is done but could they use the buildings for something else or sell land maybe). One of the reasons that the council has reported to want to maintain all schools is for future population growth, however we have seen no evidence of this, only of declining numbers of children. When questioned about this on the 16th Oct meeting Councillor Taylor did not provide evidence for future population growth.

There are so many unknowns about how secondary admissions in B&H will change following the FSM policy and then the proposed catchment changes. There has been no real projections or data presented by the council to allow parents to make informed choices. I understand this is just the engagement phase but parents are all in different situations so this is divisive, and parents need to know this is being carried out in an evidenced based way to support all pupils, not just pupils in East Brighton or those economically disadvantaged.

- I have the opinion that there are inequalities within our schools that need to be addressed, but I have seen in no evidence from the council that the changes proposed will improve the situation. For me the answer is that we have to invest the schools that are underperforming BUT NOT by busing children in and out of different areas of the city to (at best) shift a few percentage points.
- I think all schools should be maintained despite their disparities. I think there is a need and demand for the school it should be maintained.
- I think all schools should have adequate funding to help with disparities
- I think schools should have equal opportunities to thrive so all children can benefit from excellent learning conditions.
- I think the different options don't really reflect what should be done to make sure Brighton is more equitable for everybody
- I was shocked by the disparity in character among the city's secondary schools.
- It is important that all schools provide a good education for all children regardless of their background, disadvantages etc. and that children go to school in their own communities where they and their families have built up friendship and support networks. Also schools should be within walking distance not travelling on transport.
- It is important that children from all areas of the city have access to quality education setting in which they can thrive
- It is so important to make education fair and equal across the city.
- it should be equal to all
- moving catchment areas and forcing children to attend schools far further away from them is not going to solve the problem of disparities in educational experiences and outcomes. What needs to happen is an investment in the schools which are clearly struggling more than others. Investment is urgently needed in nursery and primary levels.
- I think it is more important to have good schools which provide the best outcomes for pupils than to necessarily have the same number of schools in all the same places as now.
- I would like all schools to be of a good standard that benefits children equally

- I would like all schools to do well, however is there evidence that moving children around the city promotes better education? I understand that an under subscribed school has financial challenges, but don't know how best you address this.
- Ideally all schools in the city are thriving and sustainable, merely redistributing students through catchment changes will not address issues in schools that are already struggling. Rather than focusing on catchment changes, the council should focus on directly addressing these disparities by investing in improving resources, teaching quality, and infrastructure at schools needing support
- It should be appropriate to the demand in the area, to ensure children do not have to travel far to access an excellent education.
- Should allow good schools to accept pupils from a wider area.
- Stop favouring the better off middle class who ALWAYS have more of a voice.
- I don't expect all schools to be the same and would therefore expect disparities. Yes I want to support thriving schools. Sustainable in what way? I am not sure what is inferred by 'all areas'. As many children as possible should be able to attend a good school in relatively close proximity to them.
- I think the quality of provision should be increased which does not necessitate the moving of catchment areas.
- The disparity comes from schools not having adequate resources to deal with their local population.
- Everyone has a right to education, the falling numbers in some schools should not disadvantage other schools. Disparities in education are as much a question of home life as schools, Brighton should invest in supporting families to read and support their children's education outside of the school. Instead of recommending changes that potentially disadvantage the families that do invest time and energy to make sure their kids education is progressing.
- Only if possible without detrimental effect across the school system which currently work well
- It's important that education is accessible and of a high standard across Brighton and Hove.
- It's no coincidence the more affluent areas of the city house the more sought after schools with better performance, reputations and feedback
- Not if it means impacting schools that are already performing highly. The city having good schools is more important than having schools in all areas.
- Every child should have an equal opportunity to attend a good school.
- The disparities between schools should be reduced however the method for doing so must not negatively affect other children's well-being or education.
- The disparities in schools should be helped via further funding rather than geographical changes to the boundaries. A poor performing school is poor performing due to the needs of the school rather than the catchment area.
- There should be equal opportunity across the city for children to access good secondary schools.
- The 2025 applications (with new rules for people with free school meals) hasn't happened yet but it is likely to have a significant impact on numbers and makes boundaries for the purposes proposed less relevant. That makes this process incredibly poorly timed. Where are the option to remove the boundaries entirely, retain the existing boundaries or changing the selection process another way? Almost all the options look terribly cruel ways of making proportion of families lives harder, more expensive with longer commuting distances and more traffic... for what? To force people into schools they don't want to go to, as a way to make a temporary adjustment to chronic underfunding?
- There are disparities between every school in the UK, no school. I really don't understand how the first sentence of this au relates to the second.

- There is a lot of inequality in Brighton and we need to improve educational outcomes for the poorest students
- there are less children 5-9 or younger ages where it is applicable in the areas you are proposing children will move to in options B and C. Also, free school meal children since 2024 have been placed higher in the ranking of these catchment area school and results whether the uptake has taken place is yet to be seen.
- There is a massive imbalance in the school system in Brighton with so called thriving schools being given support where others aren't. Catchment areas and over sized more "desirable" schools contribute to these problems.
- This is obvious - in an ideal world all. Schools would be good.
- Of course we should have thriving and sustainable schools - no-one would argue with that. But what does "disparities" mean? Different levels of funding? Socio-economic differences? Quality of provision according to Ofsted? Popularity in terms of number of applicants per place? Is the question asking whether non-sustainable schools should be closed?
- The Council should not be rushing through these changes without first understanding the results of prioritising FSM changes that already happened.
- Yes, there is disparity. The fact that there are schools that are exempt from this process ensures that there will always be disparity between schools. Rather than "...hope to work with academy and church schools to do what is right for Brighton & Hove's children and young people." Perhaps the rules should be reviewed and if necessary changed?
- Of course I want all children in the city to thrive regardless of their socio-economic background.
- There should be schools spread evenly based on where there are more children and families - not on the geographic area of the city
- Think children should be able to choose what school suits them and their needs best
- Yes the council should be accountable for investing adequately in all schools to ensure equitable opportunity for all children regardless of their social economic background.
- We should try to reduce disparities between schools in different areas, so there is equality of opportunity, no matter what neighbourhood children come from.
- Disparities with FSM allowance shouldn't impact locality to school.
- Yes i believe in equality. But..... Maybe maintaining the schools we currently have isn't sustainable if they are consistently failing. There could be a more radical and understanding approach to what many young people are experiencing in their lives. A more trauma informed approach would be beneficial to many. So many needs are different.
- This question is deliberately misleading in the context of the much wider debate around the new FSM policy. Catchment Area redesign, SEND provision and the suggestion that a vastly increased number of children may have unacceptable commutes to school, as many already do. We should be focussed on addressing that rather than adversely affecting an even larger group of children.
- We want a choice

## **6. Student Wellbeing**

- Yes but this is a misleading question because it presumes the proposals achieved that and I would not say yes at the expense of the environment or our children's wellbeing travelling across a gridlocked city to get to school or breaking communities of friends with impact on their social and mental health.
- We have to think what is best for our children's future and not base everything on monetary considerations.

- All schools should be good across Brighton with children encouraged to go to their nearest school. Sending children across Brighton to school diminishes their learning time and access to extra curricular after school clubs.
- I agree and do not think that this should be at the expense of individual pupil experience and at a negative cost to the environment
- And I am extremely concerned that some of the proposed changes will leave an even greater number of children within Brighton and Hove having to make ridiculously long commutes to schools, at a huge cost to their physical and mental health and well being.
- Agree but not by radically changing catchment areas and changing 0.3 mile distance to 3 miles impacting child safety, mental health and polluting further by putting huge pressure on that already over user travel route.
- I don't believe the answer to this is to enforce a change in catchment within Brighton and Hove that then bolsters the numbers for Longhill- It feels very unfair that the gap then gets filled by pupils who will need to travel long distances, who have local schools close by which are part of their community- I believe this will have huge huge effects on their mental health and attendance for instance.
- Of course but not at the detriment of all children when factors such as long travel times will be really impactful to mental health
- Of course everybody wants thriving and sustainable schools but not at any cost or by disadvantaging groups of children
- I want my child to be able to walk to school
- It is essential that public funds are spent on improving the local infrastructure throughout our city. The fundamental issue and requirement is to improve under performing and unpopular schools in all parts of the city. Children should not be asked to travel long distances to school to compensate for failures in local housing policy – there should be access to affordable housing across all parts of the city and this should be the key priority in order to tackle disadvantage, as well as an agenda to make every school in the city a school that delivers great educational outcomes. The answer to this is not dividing and eroding our community and certainly not using my children in a poorly planned and researched experiment which will put their lives and mental health at significant risk
- Of course it's important to have good schools throughout the city BUT NOT at the cost of mental health issues caused by children unnecessarily having to take on long journeys to school if they already have a school on their doorstep. The proposed travel time to some schools 'in catchment' is time which would be much better spent in extra curricular activities such as sport/music/homework and, of course, having time to unwind and relax. These are children, not commuters!!
- Only if it makes logical sense and wouldn't have a detrimental impact on a child's education and extra curricular activities
- This proposal will not help all schools thrive, it will negatively impact children. Option B, children will not be able to go to their local school even though it is a 5 min walk away but will have to travel across the city breaking up communities... Resources, time and effort should be put into schools that need improvement not this
- We should but also not jeopardise the mental health of those who are thriving at the moment. (ie long commutes and attending schools w low teaching quality not healthy for ANY child)
- We need to do what is best for children
- Kids should be able to have the same chances for an outstanding education while making home/school distances reasonable and keeping the community feel within the schools
- who wouldn't want to maintain thriving and sustainable schools across the city however the question is how this is done with the needs of students being at the heart of how this is achieved.

- While I agree on the importance of maintaining thriving schools across the city, I believe it's unfair to change catchment areas for students currently in Year 5, like my daughter. We have already prepared for secondary school applications based on the existing boundaries, and the proposed new schools differ significantly from our current catchment. Changing the catchment just a year before applying creates unnecessary uncertainty for families navigating this important transition.
- Yes - obviously. Strange question. All areas of the city want to have the option to send their child to a school which is in close proximity to home and which is as good as a school further away in terms of teaching, learning, social, emotional and mental health support and resources.
- I feel very concerned for the health, mental health and wellbeing of my children and require you to reconsider your decision making process immediately. Not only the propositions would have personal impact on families but also on pollution, employment of mothers, clubs, sports activities, and traffic.
- I think all school should be maintained and sustainable, yes, but not at the cost of children's health and wellbeing.
- I think it is a poorly planned idea that seems great on paper but in reality will have significant negative impact on communities and children's education and wellbeing
- But the proposed plans are likely to have a significant adverse impacts on the academic performance and emotional wellbeing of my own children and therefore I cannot support them.
- Yes of course all schools should be thriving and sustainable and they should be maintained in all areas of the city to ensure that children are not travelling excessive distances from home. Long travel times would greatly impact families and children - sleep, wellbeing, participation in pre or post school activities, safety, and most importantly, their attendance.
- Yes, but not at the expense of pupil's mental health by being forced to travel for hours everyday away from their community and local area.
- Yes of course, but not if the supposed solution is to disperse children to schools outside of their immediate area and friendship circle and support network.
- Yes by funding schools adequately but not disadvantaging pupils who want to work and learn. Support schools and Alternative Provision places for those pupils who can't access mainstream education because of SEMH needs

## **7. SEND**

- I think smaller specialist schools are the way to go and get rid of catchment areas for SEN kids
- Lastly, the unique context of each school is critical. Schools serve varied populations, including students with special educational needs, those for whom English is an additional language, and children in care. These students require differentiated support and resources to thrive. Any strategy that focuses solely on issues like free school meals risks neglecting these other vulnerabilities. A more comprehensive approach would address all areas of need, ensuring that no group is left behind. By acknowledging the complex and interrelated factors affecting student success, schools can create an inclusive, supportive environment that promotes long-term sustainability and helps all students reach their full potential.
- Some schools have very high levels of SEN compared to others and it is not sustainable
- Of course. But if you think this is achievable by distributing struggling students throughout the city, you're wrong. The root of the problem needs fixing. SEND

students or vulnerable students in certain areas need stability and more support. Not extra travel just to spread the “issue” evenly throughout the city.

- Yes, for all children including all the SEND children currently with no school to attend at all. This should be a priority.
- This is vital but this question is idealistic - thriving and sustainable education isn't just about who attends what school, but about funding, staffing and expertise in support students with specific learning differences.
- Yes but primarily the council need to think of schools for neurodiverse children. Currently in each school. It is estimated that 15–20% of children and young people in the UK are neurodiverse. In primary schools we are looking at larger numbers than ever. % of primary school pupils have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHC plan) and 14.1% have special educational needs (SEN) support. Let alone the long waiting list of children waiting to be assessed. Please OPEN your eyes to this massive problem this will affect overall performance of any school.
- From the information I have seen these proposals harm more children than the benefit and overall this approach feels like a levelling down across the whole city in an attempt to make one poorly located school viable. As a parent of a SEND child further or more complex travel distance could make school attendance a real issue. The Send review (2022) emphasises Localised stable and consistent support for vulnerable students - and longer travel alone would not be something we could consider as a family.

## **8. Choice and Access**

- Yes, certainly but not necessarily through changes to catchment areas. I have 2 children at school in Brighton, but their wellbeing is not my main reason for responding, as they are currently in year 10 and 6 so will be impacted not at all or little by any changes. The inclusion of the Sutton Trust report I find not entirely relevant. It focuses only on "high attaining" disadvantaged children within higher-performing schools, not ALL disadvantaged children, and obviously Brighton has no plans to separate out highest-achieving students in a kind of grammar system. As 66% of low and medium attaining disadvantaged students have special needs and other complex social issues, put more funding into the schools where they are. Eg social work intervention and support for families, therapeutic support, learning support of all kinds, smaller classes etc etc. Mixing everyone a little bit more will not address the root causes. It can also be seen as insulting to the teachers in the schools with higher proportions of disadvantaged students to say that their students need to move schools in order to achieve. Why not allocate resources to these schools within their local communities? Another important issue is travel - option B is by far the worst, as it recreates the lottery tried unsuccessfully some years ago, with unsustainable travel for many students and breaking apart local communities. I suggest strongly that changing catchment areas and systems is the wrong answer (or at best irrelevant) to the real problem of chronic under-funding in our state schools. I am unconvinced of the evidence that it will improve most children's attainment.
- All areas should have schools, and have choices of schools
- I think you should maintain high quality schools so all kids have option to attend Good/Outstanding schools
- But children and parents should still be able to choose a school local to where they live.
- Having the best schools is essential
- How do you manage that with so many private schools and church schools here?

- I think you should maintain schools in all areas of the city. Whether they're thriving and sustainable is out of your control when one of them is an academy.
- I think you should support 'thriving and sustainable' schools where that is realistic, and not make a mess of the schools and communities we have. If that means some should close and some pupils have to travel, so be it.
- I want my daughters and their peers to have a choice in schools
- Make it easy for pupils to attend a school as close to where they live as possible. Children can then join in after school activities which also enrich their experiences through this.
- Brighton schools should offer consistent and high standard education for all pupils
- Improving equality across Brighton & Hove is an important goal for anyone in public service. However, I don't think changing catchment areas and reducing PANs at the most successful schools is going to do this. The focus should be on reducing child poverty and improving ALL secondary schools – both of these could be achieved through greater investment, resources and support.
- In addition, you shouldn't be prevented access just because you live in a certain part of the city
- I'm all for maintaining thriving and sustainable schools in all areas, so long as they remain viable and children have access to a choice of schools in relatively close proximity to where they live.
- in an ideal world yes, but not if it is to the detriment of the pupils opportunities
- Only if they are viable to begin with, there is not point in reducing the size of a good and well performing school when that could provide opportunities for people out of catchment.
- Of course but all factors should be taken account. E.g. travel times, pollution cause by increased traffic if boundaries are changes and as well additional time for parents needed if current arrangements are changes
- Re two of the options-Providing Coldean with no choice of schools is making the inequality worse!
- It is unfair that more deprived areas of the city do not have a choice of school and that these schools struggle to keep up a good reputation and this thwarts their efforts at improving
- It's important that everyone had the same chance of getting the best education possible
- Something needs to be done to improve state education for all in Brighton & Hove, church schools and academies should be included in plans
- There should be thriving schools on all areas, but children should be able to go to their local school.
- it's upsetting that the only school within walking distance of the city centre is Cardinal Newman, and their admissions procedure is such that only a tiny number of local non-religious pupils are admitted. I find this an absolute disgrace.
- Not if this means reducing the spaces available at schools that have a record of providing great progress for it's students just to keep a school that is not providing as strong progress for it's students
- Of course, but not at the expense of dumbing down what is already good in the better rated schools
- Saltdean has only 1 school in special measures as an option for the large, growing and aspirational community here
- Option c and a is best. I think option B is silly for the families who live centrally to go such a long way to Longhill
- Of course I would ideally want fairness for all
- it is important to have schools where there is demand for them, and we should all aim for every school to be 'thriving' (even if in its own way)

- Only if it does not impact parent choice
- schools should be thriving but not at the detriment of parental/pupil choice
- The current system is riddled in class based privilege which is a self fulfilling vicious cycle, riddled in self preservation. It needs an approach that tackles this self preservation for the betterment of every child in the city
- The most important thing is that parents and pupils are given a choice. No one should ever be in a position where they only have one option.
- Every parent wants to send their child to the local school, and want the local school to be of good quality. The issue appears to be addressing school quality through moving pupils rather than making each school is able to provide a thriving and good quality education to its local community.
- the system should be fair and equal to all - regardless of location. There should always be a choice, never just one school as this prevents social mobility
- This gives families opportunities for their children to thrive in a school especially with smaller numbers in schools which can only be advantageous for all.
- This is a fair question. I do, but I believe this can be achieved in a less extreme way than drastically changing catchment areas.
- Schools should be thriving across the core however, more time is needed to look at solutions to current issues.
- People from more affluent areas should not be made to go to schools in more deprived areas
- Yes and we need to recognise that any change is hard. If primary schools need to close we need to provide time and support and if catchment areas change we need to ensure that travel routes esp buses are updated accordingly
- Yes, and we should include Kings and Cardinal Newman in the calculations. These two 'religious' schools account for the lowest FSM distribution percentages. Hence, they need to be included in any attempt to balance out differences.

## **9. Geographic Distribution**

- There is currently no provision for the East of Brighton with hundreds of children from Hanover and Whitehawk forced to travel long distances daily. The previously planned school for Elm Grove/General Hospital would have solved this issue and still could.
- There is inadequate secondary provision in parts of the city.
- Need more choice for residents of Portslade than just PACA
- Currently certain areas of the city do not provide a lot of choice for different schools.
- I am bringing up a child in Moulsecoomb, I would like to have the opportunity to send my child to better schools Within the city without pretending to be a Christian. Which many parents do. This is the only place we could afford to live and I am worried that my son is destined for the \*\*\*\* schools.
- Does it not give the Council more flexibility to open up the catchment areas, to give you more scope to shuffle admissions and balance numbers? At the end of the day, I need my kid to be able to travel to a local school. Geographically this would be Blatch, but one of the proposals takes that option away?!
- I believe we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city but not at any expense and not without a carefully considered and evidence based approach. I feel this question is skewed in favour of redistributing catchment zones which I am not in support of.
- I believe all schools options need to be at a reasonable distance
- Obviously everyone wants there to be good schools throughout the city but I don't see how any of the current options will achieve this aim. Changing catchments will

not make this happen. And why focus on stringer and varndean catchment and leave hove and Blatchington mill alone when their fsm numbers also need improvement. This is wholly unfair. The reason you are targeting this community is solely linked to the Fiveways/hanover area bordering areas of higher deprivation in the city.

- i think that the plan must relate to the residential area around schools. Catchment needs to be targeted at residential areas around a school and the development of schools needs to follow that plan not lead it. The plan should encourage students to walk to school and discourage the use of cars and BUSES. Greater emphasis should be promoting the safety of students (pedestrians) in areas surrounding schools. To that end traffic management and restrictions should be a prime factor to allow safe pedestrian movement around schools. Making changes to allow access to schools outside the local geographical areas will without any doubt increase road traffic, cars and buses as well as creating hardship for students. Students friends as they develop relationships will be outside their residential geographical area. This too will increase non school hours traffic. Any proposal to alter the traditional geographical catchment around a school for reasons of disparity is opposed. In areas with an excessive application for placement the proposal will disadvantage local students in favor of students outside the local geographical area.
- In principle yes, but no individual is going to want a worse situation than current, especially given the cost and stress of having to move house to change catchment areas.
- I have bought a house in the area I want my child to go to school in, my life is busy enough without taking him to woodingdean
- I think this should be done proportionate to demand, and not as a geographical rule of thumb
- I think you make schools thrive by improving the schools not bussing children from areas where parents have spent their life savings, hard earned salaries on extortionate mortgages so their kids can go to local schools. Some of these proposals are an absolute travesty.
- I think you will just have people moving to relevant catchments for the better schools
- I want a better choice of schools for my son in our catchment area
- If there are only 94 pupils per year at Longhill this is unsustainable and families should not be made to suffer stress, anxiety and long journeys to save a school that is failing and in a location with low numbers of pupils
- If there is not a sustainable level of intake from a reasonable catchment area (as exists today) then schools should be considered for closure.
- I'm not sure how to answer this question as it seems leading. While it says "do you think that we should maintain thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city, it neglects that currently schools are not located in all areas of the city. Also, catchments to some of the schools are not based on how long it takes to get to them.
- In certain areas of the city - for example Saltdean we are only in 1 catchment area. This excludes choice for our children who face either an extended commute or disparities in education. It is unfair that certain schools have a disproportionate number of students on free school meals and this demonstrates the geographical disadvantages to many children in the city with postcodes dictating opportunities. Please reevaluate to bring fair and equal access to education. Thank you
- It's disgusting that Longhill is still a school that requires improvement. This has been going on for years. It's not a viable option for us in Saltdean, hence why you have low numbers, we all desperately try to go elsewhere. But all the other schools in B&H are highly rated.
- If they are thriving and sustainable then they should be maintained. The issue is some areas do not have a secondary school in their geographic location
- I'm absolutely fed up with the lack of choice and opportunities for kids in the east in regards to free state education. Why should we be short changed with no choice and

academics who offer reduced curriculums when others in the city get the choice of 2 excellent council run schools. It's disgusting! If you want to pay for access send your kid to a private school! Otherwise share the access

- In reality everyone's answer is 'no', as all they are interested in is the benefit of their own children (as was evidenced by the first meeting that took place - with all the 'varndean NIMBYs' in attendance). It is obvious that this has been written in such a way that people will be forced to answer 'yes' as otherwise they will feel 'guilty'. The LA can then say 'you all said you wanted sustainable schools' and then implement whatever you wish, effectively having 'tricked' people. The poorly performing school Longhill, should be closed. As Jacob Taylor said, it has received lots of additional help over the last 20 years.....and yet it is still failing. Jacob Taylor also said their manifesto said they wouldn't close schools and yet within weeks of coming to power closed two primary schools (which I actually agree with). Longhill could be given additional support for another 20 years and will still be a failing school. The 'bullit' needs to be bitten now and take the tough decision to close the school, and increase capacity in the other schools and provide better transport links to facilitate those in the local area to longhill to be able to travel more easily. This is in reality the only viable option.....but politically doesn't look very good so won't happen, which is a travesty. Those in the locality to longhill deserve better than their child being forced to attend a failing school. This isn't a game, this is the future of children that you are ruining for your own political gain.
- I'm sorry but you can't ask a question like that. I live in Hollingdean and I live there for a reason and I don't want my child to go to Rottingdean when Varndean and stringer are around the corner. I feel my child would be disadvantaged
- I'm sorry this is not the answer. You need to address the root cause! Families are leaving town because housing costs and quality is poor, childcare is inaccessible, and salaries are low. The city is dying. Changing catchment areas, or opening/closing schools every few years is nonsensical, causes havoc with schools, staff and families. What about those who buy in an area and now you go and change catchment? Equally only Varndean offers the International Baccalaureate, why not more schools? EU citizens have suffered a lot with Brexit, the International Baccalaureate enabling our kids to attend European Universities should not be restricted by catchment area or limited to the few. Having catchment areas immediately segregates our communities by post code lotteries. Allow parents to make the most informed choice for their kids.
- My children go to Longhill School but it is not sustainable if parents who live locally do not continue to send their children there. At present, local families are sending their children to any school rather than sending them to Longhill because they think it is an under performing school and isn't good enough for their children. We believe that children should go to their nearest school.
- Need more secondary school options for children in Saltdean
- The current system is unfair to those living in the north east of Brighton.
- The schools are currently allocated in favour of those with higher incomes that could afford to buy in the more affluent parts of the city. The status quo is totally unfair with children in the less affluent parts having less opportunity for a good education and a decent start in life.
- It is very important that there is a Secondary school representing each area of Brighton and Hove. Removing a school on the fringe of the county will result in families feeling alienated and forced to look to neighbouring counties for support.
- schools seem to be treated unfairly with some catchments having a very difficult cohort
- It seems that families have a tendency to move to where they feel a good school is, pushing prices up and forcing less affluent students out of the area and many schools seem to want the richer students as they feel results may be better

- It's a postcode lottery! And the better the school the more expensive the surrounding houses. It shouldn't be like this.
- It's essential that children in ALL parts of the city have access to secondary education. Simply closing schools in the East (eg Longhill) will do nothing to increase equity and attainment. It would simply leave generations at further disadvantage educationally.
- Odd phrasing as obviously everyone wants thriving schools but changing boundaries will not help disadvantaged children.
- Odd question. This situation doesn't currently exist. What does all areas of the city mean. I think you should move school provision to facilitate a new east Brighton school and close Long Hill. I think there needs to be an independent look at the competence of the education team at the city council. This is the latest in a long time of flawed consultations.
- Not in ALL areas of the city - there are not enough children in all areas of the city to sustain a thriving secondary school. Longhill, in particular, is not well located for the current distribution of children. It needs to be supported to improve so that children who live near it want to go there, rather than forcing those who live much further away to attend. Catchments should be based on reasonable travel time to school as a primary aim.
- The city is growing, more housing, more flats, so it's essential we have the school places.
- More affluent areas have more desirable schools within, often families buy in to areas to secure the school placement where ofsted is very good which can come at a huge cost not achievable for all families, especially those in disadvantaged areas.
- No one should have to receive sub standard education based on where you live
- Of course but I am unconvinced that catchment area changes are the answer
- Of course that is the ideal outcome, but if there are 2 schools near each other, such as Blatch and Hove Park, it could be argued that they are both not required if one is thriving and one not.
- Sufficient school places need to be maintained in areas with the highest demand.
- The city benefits from the continuity of uses demanded by being lived in. The maintain a healthy balance, this should include a mix of ages and include families. So the provision of schools goes along with the availability of suitable housing and health services.
- Schools should be local where they are needed. If necessary move one
- The question is unclear. I believe we need a new secondary school on the eastern side of the city.
- Of course, but tinkering with catchment boundaries and setting parents up to argue with each other based on the interests of their own kids is not the answer
- Of course, it would be great if there were thriving schools in all areas of the cities. Sadly this is not the case and I do not feel that the proposed changes to catchment areas will help to rectify the problem.
- The city should be aiming for an equitable family of successful schools across the city. This will mean more blended catchments for all schools
- The Coombe Road area isn't sufficiently served by schools, only one academy.
- There will always be disparities between schools in different areas of the city. The options proposed do not solve them. They are amateur solutions. Moving affluent children to schools in poor areas and poor children to schools in affluent areas is too basic a solution and will create unintended consequences.
- To provide better choices for all in the city.
- Secondary schools are siloed in bhcc at present and it is an inequitable unfair and eugenics approach to schooling our city's children.

- The current location of secondary schools does not provide 'thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city'. There is a large area of Brighton east of the Lewes Road and south of Bear Road where there is currently no secondary school until as far as BACA to the north and Longhill to the east, neither of these schools are generally regarded as 'thriving'.
- The east of the city has a very poor secondary school offering compared to the centre. Lewes, Peacehaven and Seaford are oversubscribed as a direct result. There is no viable secondary school option for BN2 residents in BN2.
- The schools need to be close to where children live. If large areas of the city have student or elderly populations they do not need large schools to be maintained shrinking schools that are walking distance to where the majority of children live
- There are already limited options in the city in terms of Secondary schools so I don't think we should be closing any of them.
- There is currently no provision for the East of Brighton with hundreds of children from Hanover and Whitehawk forced to travel long distances daily. The previously planned school for Elm Grove/General Hospital would have solved this issue and still could.
- There is inadequate secondary provision in parts of the city
- There should be good school provision in all areas of the city. If one of the schools were to close it should be stringer or varndean but I don't believe any of the schools should close.
- There is not enough funding to go around and spread across all schools
- There needs to be better school management through the City to improve standards generally. None of the data is good.
- There needs to be good school facilities in all areas of the city maintained.
- There should be schools in areas where children of school age live. To maintain schools in locations which cause young children to have to make dangerous, unhealthy and environmentally damaging journeys every day is unreasonable.
- my understand of this today is that there are some areas which do not have thriving schools (longhill and BACA for example). What we want is all children to be able to attend a local secondary that performs well to support that cohort of students.
- it's important to look at the numbers / proportions of children living in localities
- This is an extremely leading question. I agree - however not without a systems thinking approach that addresses the problems of transport and housing for families in the city that is causing these disparities.
- They should be closer to child population hotspots
- Our options in the east of the city are very limited.
- Some areas have poor school. To improve them needs investment, NOT shipping kids from across the city to prop up the numbers and gain the funding. Using children in this way is pretty disgusting.
- If you already had thriving and sustainable schools in all areas of the city then there would be no need for this consultation.
- I used to work for Oasis Community Learning (a large Academy sponsor) - they run 52 schools across the country, the majority of which were previously failing or are in lower socio-economic areas. They have transformed many of these schools, by changing the ethos of the school and ensuring the right leaders are in place. They have never (to my knowledge) changed catchment areas in order to raise standards etc.
- I would like all children to have access to a school in their local area.
- I would like all children to have access to a school in their local community.
- The answer to this question should not necessarily justify catchment area changes.
- The provision of school places should primarily reflect where most children live. It is important to ensure as many people as possible can get a school place near where

they live to reduce travel times, facilitate active travel and enable engagement in extracurricular activities

- This is an incredibly leading question as does not acknowledge the bigger systems at play that keep those from lower socio economic backgrounds from achieving as well academically or schools in certain areas being undersubscribed. For example lack of affordable housing, transport and funding for additional support in education
- This is an unachievable objective when looking at an area as a whole.
- This isn't occurring now. Those on the outskirts of the city have poor choice of schools that require improvement. If pupil numbers are falling then consideration for whether this schools should be open should be made and allowing a wider access to the city schools.
- This is not going to happen by displacing children all over Brighton and sending them miles away.
- This is not an easy question to answer due to the way it has been written and I feel that it might cause confusion for some. It is imperative that ALL children across the city have the option to attend a school best suited to their educational needs and not herded into poor performing schools just because of their socioeconomic backgrounds
- Unfortunately for Saltdean residents, we don't have that
- This is not an impartial question. It assumes that the fact there is a disparity between schools means that they are not able to thrive or be sustainable under the current system with adjusting catchment areas.
- This is too vague a question to answer yes to. Some geographical areas currently have no school - others have 2. As Brighton & Hove is a small city it may be viable to have areas without a secondary school provided better bus links (including free bus travel) and urgent improvements to safe active travel routes (proved to improve independence and mental health of young people).
- Information about the spatial distribution of the projected decline in the secondary school cohort across the city is not provided. High level figures shared mask important local variation within the city and the council fail to provide information about how current and projected local demand maps on to proposals to reduce intake levels in different schools under the different options presented
- To ensure kids go to their local school as many schools as possible should remain open and allowed to thrive.
- Where there are high numbers of kids living, we need schools to support them locally.
- very important but changes to catchment are not the best or effective way to make this happen. The borough should be more active in other ways to support all schools and all pupils.
- I'd love it if the catchment area became fairer
- Very leading question, Longhill is in a village and bussing city kids for hours, to prop it up until building work in the Deans has been achieved, is not healthy. Enlarge the PANS for the popular schools so kids can walk and have community. Kids in the Deans can travel, the data shows this would be less Kids travelling.
- We need inclusive, academically rigorous, supportive, challenging schools based in the places where children live
- We should maintain good quality schools that are ACCESSIBLE to children in all areas of the city. Schools that are placed in areas with less children and limited transport links to residential areas, will struggle to fill spaces and will not thrive. Children from across the city should not be forced to travel miles to try to prop up failing schools in areas that are difficult to safely access.
- We should maintain the number of schools so that there is local access throughout the city.

- We should maintain schools in all areas of the city, but currently schools are not evenly spread out geographically, which is the route of some of the issues of disparity.
- Well-performing schools are more popular, and it is better to let more students go to them even if it means closing secondary schools elsewhere in the city. Large schools like Varndean can provide a great education to a wide variety of students.
- what disparities between schools in different areas?
- What would be the benefit of having an area of the city WITHOUT a thriving and sustainable school?
- You don't do that at the moment. Are there any plans to open a school in Whitehawk?
- While it is important to ensure that all schools in the city are thriving and sustainable, it is equally critical to recognise that merely redistributing students through catchment changes will not address underlying issues in schools that are already struggling.
- Without a doubt school closures should be avoided.  
Though with the east/deans of the council area being less populated with secondary age children it could potentially make sense to move Longhill school nearer towards the city (eg to Whitehawk or Racecourse area) and possibly make BACA more accessible from Saltdean with bus routes up Falmer Rd. Or move one of the fiveways schools to one of these areas. The thriving and sustainable part is really important and it needs to be explored how to make that happen in ways other than just changing catchment areas. For example, why do only 1/3 of children in the current Longhill catchment go to that school? How can the school/council attract more local residents and inspire them to contribute to their local community school? Will changing the catchment make enough difference? Will significant numbers of residents who are concerned about the reputation of particular schools start moving based on new catchment boundaries and further change the distribution of young people across the city, defeating the purpose of the changes? Perhaps a more ambiguous/open catchment option could counter this.
- Yes but absolutely not to the detriment of existing school catchment areas which attract residents to a particular area and in turn build thriving and healthier communities.
- Yes as long as moving catchment areas to fix a problem area doesn't feed problems wider across the city
- Yes but by improving the schools, NOT by cheating by changing the boundaries
- Yes definitely. The 'best' schools are mainly stuck together in the same area. We need improved school options throughout the city.
- Yes, but not via changing catchment areas
- Yes, but you will need to level up and look at the bigger picture in Brighton and Hove this is not just in schools we do t even have a clean public swimming pool for kids to use we're a city joke
- Yes, however i believe the statement 'in all areas of the city' is vague. Rather than 'in all areas', I believe they should be 'in the areas that need it and of an appropriate size based on pupil numbers in that area without creating catchment areas that lead to long travel times'  
If some schools are really just not viable then maybe they should close and kids should have a free school bus to get them to school.
- I don't think you currently have schools in 'all areas' - perhaps you should consider moving one to the east of the city. You could possibly merge it with longhill and keep longhill as a satellite site of the main school, to serve the deans. the main school in east brighton could then serve whitehawk, Queens park, kemptown, bristol estate and the marina.

- More affluent areas have more desirable schools within, often families buy in to areas to secure the school placement where ofsted is very good which can come at a huge cost not achievable for all families, especially those in disadvantaged areas.
- I understand this is just the engagement phase but parents are all in different situations so this is divisive, and parents need to know this is being carried out in an evidenced based way to support all pupils, not just pupils in East Brighton or those economically disadvantaged.
- Odd question. This situation doesn't currently exist. What does all areas of the city mean. I think you should move school provision to facilitate a new east Brighton school and close Long Hill. I think there needs to be an independent look at the competence of the education team at the city council. This is the latest in a long time of flawed consultations.
- There needs to be better school management through the City to improve standards generally. None of the data is good.
- I don't think that's as simple as changing catchment areas as is being suggested. Instead I think it will create bigger gaps between pupils at the highest and lowest end which will create even more difficulties for teachers.
- There should be good school provision in all areas of the city. If one of the schools were to close it should be stringer or varndean but I don't believe any of the schools should close.
- I think that the school catchments should remain the same, but time and effort should be put into those which are underperforming
- I think the catchment area work how they are
- This question is flawed. There is not a secondary school in a very large area of the city so we cannot have thriving and sustainable schools 'in all areas'.
- There should be equal opportunity across the city for children to access good secondary schools.
- There needs to be good school facilities in all areas of the city maintained.
- There should be schools spread evenly based on where there are more children and families - not on the geographic area of the city
- I think that all schools should be sustainable and aim for the highest standards that they can, within reasonable geographical limitations.
- I don't think you currently have schools in 'all areas' - perhaps you should consider moving one to the east of the city. You could possibly merge it with longhill and keep longhill as a satellite site of the main school, to serve the deans. the main school in east brighton could then serve whitehawk, Queens park, kempton, bristol estate and the marina.
- I don't think it's realistic that all schools in a city will be of the same standard.
- I don't think anyone would disagree with the question, but it's not related to issues at heart of the proposed changes denying access to schools for children who live in close proximity.
- I also understand from this consultation that pupils in the East of Brighton have been facing inequality and long distances due to the closure of COMART, which I feel again is not fair and would like to see more equality for all children within the city- and I appreciate it is such a complex problem to fix. I wonder whether there has been more research or thinking in linking schools together for instance to share expertise/ funding ( I believe this happened between Varndean and another school in the city in the past and it was very successful) these are ideas that could hopefully go towards narrowing the attainment gap within the city. I also think it would be worth waiting to see how the FSM roll out goes this year which I think is a great change towards creating more equality and also to see how the new head at Longhill improves the school.
- but how is this possible with so few schools in the east and so many schools grouped close to each other

- Brighton and Hove is a small city. I don't think there need to be secondary schools in every part of the city as long as there are enough places for everyone. As long as the schools are evenly distanced, children can travel to the nearest school without it being an unmanageable journey.
- All areas need thriving schools

## **10. Alternative Solutions**

- All children deserve to have a good quality school in their local area, without the need to travel for a better education
- We need smaller local schools where staff know pupils not huge mega schools that are like factories
- If a school is that unpopular what is the point in sustaining it?
- If a schools admission is significantly lower than this needs to be reviewed rather than changing boundaries
- If children and staff are thriving then why disrupt something that is having positive outcomes and benefiting young people's lives. Even if they're smaller in number that is possibly an advantage to young people to be in smaller settings
- It depends on the costs, benefits and risks associated with any solution
- We should maintain good quality schools that are ACCESSIBLE to children in all areas of the city.
- I'm a bit confused, b and h were very happy to close Primary schools. At least it looks like they see secondary schools should be kept.
- Yes I believe quality should be maintained. Schools should be sustainable, and if they are not already (e.g. Longhill), then viable alternative solutions that positively impact on the city should be implemented, such as a PAN reduction to 165.
- Yes. Our local school is Patcham High School which I understand is the only school in B&H to have a non-exclusion policy. This is fine but obviously affects the quality of education to be offered between schools and also the overall school results
- You mention the goal of "maintaining" thriving schools, but the reality is that many schools are currently not performing well. All three of your proposals risk moving students from these underperforming areas to higher-performing schools. This is likely to lower the quality of education at schools that are already doing well, rather than solving the main problem. Instead, the focus should be on improving underperforming schools. By raising the standard of education city-wide, you can create genuinely thriving schools across all areas, and only then should the priority be maintaining them.
- It is important that children from all areas of the city have access to quality education setting in which they can thrive
- These questions are very leading and I think the quality of provision should be increased which does not necessitate the moving of catchment areas
- Smaller schools that can operate in a more creative and tailored way. Why do we put 1800 kids all together at one of the most crucial developmental times in their lives and when the landscape for children has changed so much. The system is outdated and doesn't respond the the changing world our young people face.
- It is important all children can access high quality education close to their homes and friends
- Ailing schools need investment, creative solutions and simply attention - not ill thought meddling.
- In principle, it is easy to reply 'yes' here, but we need to stick to the practicalities of your proposals.

- Need more schools, but smaller
- More schools is preferable, with smaller class sizes!
- I think it's an odd question because there are clusters of schools and then none, so you can't maintain what isn't already there. I think the city should have more smaller schools and they should be equally spaced out across the city.
- How about creating smaller class sizes which is overall better for children's learning as we have maxed class sizes to capacity because of high demand. Make the classes smaller then there will be better outcomes on those schools.
- Having schools that hold too many pupils, is too much for teaching staff. If you reduce schools, this will mean the same amount of children squeezed into smaller spaces.
- Children would actually do better with smaller school and earlier intervention, especially considering the increasing levels of violence and school refusals in secondary school at the moment.
- But not all schools should be the same size and have a high intake each year. If there are schools in areas of the city that have lower children population they should be made smaller.
- But I don't think they all need to be the same size (=huge!), would be nice to have smaller schools too with more sense of community.
- I think you need to make improvements where schools are failing - Longhill, in particular. That is the simplest and least disruptive solution.
- I think catchment areas need to be broadened
- I feel work should be done on improving secondary schools in the city that have bad reputations and high percentage of free school meals. I feel this is a very leading question and I have the impression this process isn't meaningful, impartial or evidence based.
- I feel we stay the same as we are currently
- I don't think you should shy away from closing a weaker school if the pupils could get a better education elsewhere.
- I don't think that the schools in Brighton should be sustainable or thrive...LOL
- I don't think limiting the choice of schools to one per catchment area is the way to ensure any school thrives.
- Option A appears to be the most advantageous of the options suggested but even then my belief is what you are suggesting will artificially bring schools down to a "level" by forcing children from other catchment areas into lower performing schools. Why do this? It will have detrimental impacts on those children who have great potential which might not necessarily be as a result of the school system/teaching but because of the way they have been brought up. It strikes me that investing in social support will do much more in the longer term. Children being forced away from schools in the existing catchment areas will no doubt put strain on their lives through longer commutes whilst diluting the local communities in which they live and enjoy.
- I do not agree with the changes suggested to catchment areas.
- I answered yes because I want to maintain all of the schools, whether they are thriving or not
- Of course everyone wants all areas of the city to have good schools. The question we could ask is: "Given the challenges to ensure consistent schooling provision for all areas of the city, (following the closure of schools in the east of Brighton; I.e CoMart): do you agree that more should be done to support schools which are experiencing difficulty in the East, and additional help given to the areas and communities they support?" "And if yes, what kind of support do you think this should take?" - you could even provide multiple choice to help gather meaningful data on this topic around what people might be willing to do?
- I agree that some areas of the city have worse schools than others. Is moving the catchments the answer or are there other ways to improve school performance in failing areas?

- Happy with present system
- Don't make changes as they would affect current schools who perform well
- Clearly it would be good to maintain thriving, sustainable schools but your proposed boundary changes would not achieve this.
- Changing the catchments isn't the answer to this
- But not by cheating, not by changing catchment areas, by educating parents and pupils.
- But I don't think your proposals are the best way to achieve this.
- But I don't think that's as simple as changing catchment areas as is being suggested. Instead I think it will create bigger gaps between pupils at the highest and lowest end which will create even more difficulties for teachers
- But I do not think the options proposed would mean more thriving schools.
- All schools should stay open
- All Brighton schools need to be good schools for all children who live here. We moved to our current address specifically for the local secondary school. Why should we be penalised for historic poor planning decision? Why hasn't the council delivered this already? Have they looked at what others have done in similar circumstances? E.g. the transformation brought about by the London Challenge, or City Challenge areas, and the impact on school improvement of the strongest academy chains nationally? It seems Brighton Council have only pursued an admissions-based approach on the advice of one educational academic (Professor Goddard), which is very partial. I have relocated for my children to attend a secondary school you now want to make us ineligible for. I'm devastated, losing sleep, and it's affecting my mental health. I have three children this is going to affect.