



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

Question 2: The council believes all of our children have the right to the same education and standards. Do you agree on a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive?

1. Travel and Transportation

- You need to improve the schools on the East side of town, families will not be able to afford to travel to Hove and Portslade and will not want to - the public transport isn't good enough either.
- Absolutely yes, but solution needs to be both sustainable and affordable. Mass bussing of students throughout city is not.
- Absolutely all children should be able to attend a successful local school. The current proposals will not achieve this. Forcing children to travel long distances to failing schools is not the way to make this happen
- Absolutely so we need to keep students the focus. Provide each with a well achieving school within a reasonable commute.
- A holistic view needs to be taken of the school experience, including the impact of travelling long distance to and from school
- Again, unsure as to how the new catchment areas would make a change here as there isn't enough data in the Options provided - also, I'm quite certain my child and our community would not thrive if our children had to drive across the city (instead of walking) to attend secondary school as some of the Options suggest.
- The question is really about how to achieve this and particularly whether it helps to force children to travel much longer distances than children currently travel to school. I don't want that because I don't think it helps children to achieve and thrive.
- Why should children that can currently walk to school suddenly face the option of not being able to walk and having to undertake long bus journeys across the city for social engineering.
- Again, we want all children across the city to thrive but I don't think the answer is adding a potential 2 hours of travel time onto their school days.
- Excess travel for those who live by a school is unsustainable to both the child and our environment.
- Again, yes. However I do not believe the answer lies in children commuting half way across the City to go to school
- 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.
- As long as they are not turned into commuters
- As before. Children should have access to successful schools within walking distance to their homes to enable them to thrive. Not have to commute over an hour in order to 'thrive' when there are schools on their doorstep. Better provision to ensuring all children across every school in the city is able to thrive is more beneficial.

- But is forcing kids miles across town going to achieve that. How about improving the standards of those schools you seem to think are rubbish. Then the areas will improve if the schools are better.
- But that doesn't mean sending pupils on your long commutes
- I am a good person and I want that for all children but I do think making kids out of area travel is wise
- But not at the cost of sending pupils to schools they cannot easily access, or require travel by car to attend them.
- I believe all children should have access to good education that is within easy distance from their homes
- I do, but I don't see how any children can achieve and thrive if they have to travel hours each day, away from their local communities, primary links, to get to secondary school when there are suitable schools nearby (Children in Woodingdean, Whitehawk & Saltdean as well as those in current DS & V catchments). Why should children in Woodingdean have to travel to the Priory? Why should children in Fiveways have to travel to Longhill? Why should we have to explain this illogical system to our children. Just because one particular school can't attract more numbers
- 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.
- I think you should make a school better if struggling not move kids into schools miles from their house
- I also don't think it's healthy for children to sit on buses for extended periods (2 hours per day in some scenarios) so thriving isn't just about educational standards.
- It should be a decent support system, but fix the issues with underperforming schools not by changing the catchment areas. Making children travel extra miles to and from school is not the answer.
- of course yes, again option chosen shouldn't worsen school travel times
- Of course we want all children to thrive, but if a child is forced to commute for over an hour to get to school, there is no chance of them thriving!
- No child should have to travel further than necessary to attend school, and it is unavoidable that schools in less wealthy areas will need additional investment to make up for the financial input of wealthy parents in other areas
- Not at the cost of travel, pollution, and oléicole who can't not drive. More than 6 miles to get to a school, while we got the bust stop in front of our house for V and S makes no sense
- Not if it means children have to travel way out of area to get to school
- Not if it means my child has to travel miles to get to school
- My children will not thrive if forced to take 3 busses to and from school. my family life and time is important and this will take that away. To arrive at Longhill on time my children would have to leave at 6.15am. or they could walk to varndean or stringer in under 5 minutes. This is a crazy proposal.

- Not if it means my child has to travel miles to get to school
- Please take distance into account though. Sending year 7s on 2 buses 5mins away from where they live is just unrealistic and unfair.
- The answer is yes but not to the detriment of the city with increased pollution and traffic due to longer commutes and also the extremely negative impact on families with long travel times and no opportunity for extra curricular enrichment activities. The proposed plan would not allow for children to achieve and thrive.
- This includes the right to walk to school. I fundamentally disagree with forcing children to take transport to school.
- Possibly making them have to travel for miles to go to school when we have two good schools within walking distance.
- But I don't see how making kids travel all over the city related to the q when schools need financial investment
- Yes, but bussing kids from one side of the city to another as a technical solution isn't the right way to go.
- Which is precisely why you are already providing free school bus passes to Longhill School for any child that lives in the BN2 5 area.
- Yes, but it doesn't mean make students travel long distances when they have a school on their doorstep
- Yes, but not if the changes mean the level of disruption to children in terms of travel
- Yes. However not by making young kids have to travel across the city just to improve underperforming schools such as Longhill.
- By changing catchments and making 11 year olds have to travel out of their local area, on over hour long journeys involving multiple buses does not support those children to achieve and thrive.
- Yes, I believe all children should have the right to a successful education. I do not believe they should have to travel an hour to get there.
- I fundamentally disagree with any change with uses children as social capital to be bussed around the city to try to shore up schools with institutional problems - I do not think it will work and it is not fair
- Yes, but not at the expense of kids wellbeing by making travel times longer. on those children and there must be a better way to address those problems.
- Yes but there are benefits to secondary school children being able to walk to school
- Yes but I am conscious your proposals may mean travelling further to schools. Children should attend their local school which is ideally walkable but failing schools needs to enhance their staff/extra curricular and funding to ensure more equal outcomes
- Yes but again, the distance kids are expected to travel will play a huge part in ensuring their safety and independence travelling to and from school
- Children cannot be expected to travel miles from their home to try to prop up a failing school at the opposite end of the city.
- I would actually suggest that school where more children have higher need would benefit from more resources (including resources in the community outside of school), not to simply dictate those children and others be forced to travel longer distances to access a different school. The distance a child has to travel to school must be considered as this will have an impact on the child and the whole family.
- Moving children around the city does not enable this
- By improving the standards of schools, not bussing them around town on commutes for 2 hours per day.
- However the current proposals actively disadvantage children by increasing commuting times and increasing air pollution and damaging the environment

2. School Quality, Improvement and Resource Allocation

- You have not explained how any of these proposals will improve school quality or why school quality is linked to pupil numbers. What is the council doing to ensure all schools are of comparable Ofsted rating?
- Again as my previous answer...All schools that come under Brighton and Hove Council should have the same rules apply in terms of educational standards. Schools that are lacking in this should be given extra needs/training to bring them up alongside others.
- Numbers suggest that closing Longhill is a viable option. Has this been explored? (The numbers included in the proposal suggest the Longhill pupils could be absorbed if other schools weren't to shrink). What is the rationale for taking this option off the table?
- All schools should have the same expectations and support staff to uphold them. See BACA OFSTED REPORT
- The same education should be in all schools and if children are not thriving then more funding should be placed in their local school
- All schools should be provided with the support needed to achieve the highest of standards.
- All schools in Brighton are good as results depend on the students and what they are facing
- All schools rise to highest standard not bring down to average level
- All schools should be able to give the same education and standards to children. This is completely separate to the proposal. School talent can be recruited everywhere and is not catchment area based, therefore all schools should strive to recruit the best talent teachers and assistants that can support children.
- All schools should be helped to improve and achieve good standards by sharing good practice and learning from school improvement journeys in other cities, e.g. The London Challenge.
- All schools should be supported in attracting high calibre staff, even ones in challenging areas
- All schools should be targeted and funded to achieve such an outcome
- ALL schools should be thriving throughout the city.
Any investment saved from changes to catchment areas (and it would need to be extensive to provide the additional bus transport, offset the enormous carbon footprint and SEND provision that is likely to escalate amongst young people separated from friends and communities) 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 there, 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, the children - are proud of. These catchment area suggestions are a sticking plaster over a gaping wound, that will only get bigger.
- The current schools and their current catchment areas need more investment, funding and support. Moving the catchment areas is not a viable solution to these problems.
- However schools across the city have varying standards - how will this be addressed to ensure that we have a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive rather than bringing all children down to the lowest skilled child within the class.
- However the plan should not be to drag successful schools down but to support those failing to improve.

- But this proposed change will NOT support children to thrive - look at the bigger picture.
- How do the Council's proposals achieve this? Tinkering with catchment areas and making good schools smaller. Instead, failing schools must be improved.
- However the complex challenges that a school faces can't be addressed by moving children around the city. The council should focus on addressing the root causes of struggling schools.
- I believe that if a certain school is failing it should be the focus to improve not at the detriment of children's mental and physical wellbeing by being forced to travel 1 hour journeys to school when they happen to live 7 minutes walks from two secondary schools. The whole focus feels incorrect.
- I believe this should be done by improving struggling schools, not by sending pupils across the city instead of to their local school.
- Moving children around to tick a box is just "moving the problem". Why not invest in underperforming schools?
- I believe that all schools must be supported and improved to achieve the highest level of education that is the council's fundamental responsibility. Altering catchment areas to balance to performance of schools is a lame tactic to avoid development of poor performing schools.
- I think focusing on raising standards in failing schools is a great way of doing this. Absolutely not changing the catchment areas so children are shipped around the city away from their local schools and communities to attend failing schools.
- Obviously yes. Schools that require improvement, require improvement that's not the same or as simple as taking some pupils from one area and moving to school in another. Sure, you might get more evenly balanced 'good schools', but does that change the attainment of kids in the city overall?
- Of course I believe all children should have access to good quality education. This should be achieved through the proper funding of councils and school and by considering curriculum changes which equip all children for the future they face.
- Schools which require improvement like BACA and Longhill should be supported to improve. Forcing children from other parts of the city to attend these schools will not help improve them. There are other ways to improve them.
- The support should take the form of allocating additional funding to all schools in Brighton and extra funding to those which struggle, rather than reshuffle the pupil population with absolutely no resources and then have the wishful thinking that outcomes will improve automatically.
- This can be best achieved through improving education at all levels from nursery through to college and supporting the needs of parents and pupils.
- Which would mean that if some schools are not thriving, you should be working to improve those schools without detriment to the others.
- Yes, but artificially imposed measures to boost failing schools should not come at the expense of thriving schools.
- Yes but by improving the schools, NOT by cheating by changing the boundaries
- Yes but by shrinking the under performing Longhill with less children in that area & expanding schools such as DS & Vardean will work better.
- Yes but the focus should be on improving the standard of the schools less in demand as opposed to penalising residents who live right next to in-demand high performing schools
- Ideologically I'd love all children to thrive, but I'm not convinced that changing the school boundaries will address the social and parental issues that cause underachievement.
- If a school is failing to provide education of an acceptable standard, all children forced to go to that school simply because they live near would be effectively condemned to fail to thrive.

- If the council believes this why is it taking so long to redress this
- If the council wants to keep all secondary schools open, then they must provide additional financial support to the schools that need it the most. E.g investing in Longhill will encourage more local parents to use the school rather than sending children all the way to Lewes Priory.
- Yes I do agree with this, but this should be done by ensuring all schools in Brighton are at sufficient standard and by ensuring all children have the chance to attend their local school.
- Yes of course so all schools need the resources and support to achieve that
- Yes. By improving standards at lower-performing schools in order to attract more students there. Not through cutting places at higher-performing schools.
- Yes. That means the schools have to be equipped to deliver the same education.
- 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, 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.
- Yes, by putting the time and effort into improving underperforming schools, not by changing catchment areas
- Yes, but this needs to be done by pulling "failing" schools up rather than putting added pressure on schools that are not struggling as much
- Yes, but that system must be funded adequately and councils should do their utmost to channel funding towards all schools , parents and support La k as a priority. This funding and choice and allocation issue should not fall on parents having to compromise . It is not fair that we may find parents having to make difficult choices around school options because of a lack adequate funding and resource
- Yes provided staff and parents are on board with any proposed changes
- Yes I agree but I don't see how these proposals will produce equitable education. Only by absolutely ensuring that each school is working to the same standard can this be achieved, which is not currently case with a few schools rated as 'needing improvement, by ofsted.
- Yes but tailored support is critical. And standards in all schools need to be improved across infrastructure, teaching consistency and behaviour mgmt.
- Yes but just re drawing lines does not give help all children as there will still be some that can't go to the good schools. You need to help the failing schools so all schools are good
- Yes but I believe this should be done within the existing schools funding them properly to encourage students to thrive rather than forcing them into other areas
- We need to improve the schools that are struggling, not reduce the size of the schools that are thriving. Policy making should be aiming to level up not bring the whole city down.
- With the current system, certain schools are far more likely to attract less pupils with free school meals and this intern makes the other schools such as BCA and Long Hill much less appealing to those placed in them.
- Why isn't the council offering additional budget to those schools that are falling behind? This is an issue due to the council's on-going negligence.
- While maintaining the standard of good schools and improving others
- We need to ensure all schools have the resources to thrive.
- Under performing schools should be assisted, to perform better rather than some pupils shifted.

- The LA should support struggling schools with expertise and school-to-school support initiatives
- Similarly, as I said in my previous answer, strong leadership is key to improved culture and attainment in a school. The new head teacher at Longhill has a reputation for turning around poor performing schools. Please give her the chance to prove herself and make fundamental changes that will see the reputation of Longhill improve. Once that turns around, parents from Rottingdean, Ovingdean and Woodingdean will stop choosing to send their children out of area to Lewes, rather than go to their own local school.
- To think otherwise would be ludicrous, this is best achieved through properly researched and properly administered strategies, not hasty changes
- To give more children a better chance of a good education, reduce PAN at underperforming schools and not good schools. All families should have the choice of good schools.
- Through investment in schools that need it rather than assuming simply shipping kids will change things
- This should be achieved by raising the standards in schools in all areas of Brighton and Hove.
- Of course people should say yes, but the council is not making clear that to even out equalities in school places in the city it may mean reducing PAN as schools perceived to be popular.
- But it should be done by sharing good practice, supporting teachers not closing schools.
- It is your responsibility to ensure all of the schools are of equal standard across the city, changing which pupils attend doesn't guarantee anything will improve
- All schools need to be brought up to good standards and good practice shared.
- The same standard can be achieved in two ways: by helping children meet higher standards, or by bringing standards down. I am definitely against bringing standards down and for more support.
- Support schools that are not achieving and therefore attract more pupils.
- Standards need to be raised without reducing the impact of the better schools in the city.
- As per question 1, I agree with this but I believe that changing school admissions is not addressing some of the root causes and helping to improve performance of all schools. Arguably it could lower the standards of the highest performing schools
- More funding of schools is what is required.
- What is the city council's strategy to achieve this? Meddling with boundaries, PAN and suggesting federation is not the answer.
- Maybe if the council helped failing schools children in those areas would flourish.
- Maybe more effort needs to be put in to spreading teachers and facilities across sites to ensure the offering is the same
- Make failing schools better - that will achieve your goals
- It would be the ideal that all schools were of a similar standard so that everyone was happy to attend their local school. At present BACA and Longhill need to improve their offering so that students are happy to attend. The schools that are doing well need to be allowed to continue to do so.
- It is Wednesday unreasonable to expect (hope) that children from more affluent areas being bused across the city will increase the standards in schools in less affluent areas. There are plenty of case studies where failing schools in deprived areas have been turned around with sufficient will and investment.
- It would be incredible to have a school system that allows all children to thrive, The new proposals would perhaps go some way to addressing the falling PAN figures,

but would unfortunately cause a lot of other issues. It would be better to invest money into the schools that are failing rather than penalise those that aren't,

- I don't think the options you are considering will do this. Funding arguments must be the primary lever pulled to get more funding per pupil.
- Give increased budget to schools that have more free schools.
- Fund long hill and help it become better.
- Focus on improving under performing schools not just changing catchment areas to try to do this.
- Failing schools should be closed and more popular schools should have a wider intake
- Can school staff move rather than the children?
- By investing in local schools. Not moving children around the city out of the communities.
- By improving under performing schools and socioeconomic conditions for poorer areas of the city
- All schools should provide a similar standard, this is not achieved by shunting children around the city.
- And the solution is to make improvements where needed, not bus kids across town to failing schools in order to increase numbers. Longhill, again.
- Although the suggestion is that changing catchment areas is the only way to achieve that instead of providing greater support and resources to the schools struggling more.
- All teachers are taught to the same standards across the City . All schools have to engage in CPD days. The quality of teaching should be the same .
- Invest in schools not doing well rather than change catchments.
- Again, supporting children to achieve and thrive is desirable. However forcing children to travel to schools far away (with potential separation from friends) will not support this goal. The council should consider other options for improving educational standards in all schools (e.g. more resources and support for struggling schools).
- Again I think this about helping schools reach the standards and questioning them when their values are mismatched with this ambition. Rather than just sending different children to receive this education.
- Less favoured schools should be improved, and deprived communities focused on from early years upwards, rather than making some 11 year olds travel around the city in some desperate hope that this might fix the problem. When there is no evidence that this will genuinely help all children to thrive in their class. Those 11 year olds could just be walking to their preferred school that they live close to.
- Nor is reducing the PAN in the schools which are already offering an education which supports children from all backgrounds and with a diverse range of needs to achieve and thrive.

3. Criticism of the question design

- 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.
- Weirdly leading question.
- Again, this is a leading question. The proposals are fundamentally about whether children should be asked to travel long distances to school, even when they have a secondary school in walking distance from their home, in order to achieve an artificial balance in the number of children on Free School Meals (FSM) in each secondary

school. Part of the justification for this is that some children are already travelling long distances. It is non-sensical to suggest that hundreds more children should travel over an hour to school in order to achieve equity and balance. The priority must be to drive up performance in the 2 secondary schools in Brighton that Ofsted has rated as requires improvement, and for the council to implement learning from the Government's research, led by the Social Mobility Commission, on achieving greater progress for secondary students facing socio-economic disadvantage. This is a huge challenge and there is no easy solution, but this must be the council's priority and the additional funding that will be required for transport under these proposals should instead be made available to those schools to drive improvements. Any reduction in PAN must be informed by the predicted numbers of children in each area so that sufficient places are available in areas where children are actually living. This may mean hard choices about the viability and location of some schools across the city, but this doesn't even feature in the proposals. It is clear that children in the East of the city are poorly served with no school close enough for them to attend without a significant journey, but the proposals don't seek to address this.

- Again another misleading question trying to suit your agenda!!!
- Again answered no as this appears to be a nonsense question looking for a positive response. This is very leading and not good questionnaire design.
- Again, of course we do. But leading and overly simplified
- Again of course but not at the detriment of my own child. Who put this questionnaire together with its biased and leading questions??
- Again this feels like quite a leading question, yes of course I do.
- Again this is a leading question seemingly aimed at influencing the results. Nobody is going to disagree with this statement, the issue is that the proposed solutions create problems for many families. They are shifting the problem not solving it.
- Again, not answering the binary questions in case it's being used to support a very rushed agenda on quantitative data alone.
- Again this is a leading question designed to demonstrate support for this process. I agree with the sentiment but do not agree with the proposed change or believe it's the only way to achieve this goal.
- Again this is a leading question designed to demonstrate support for this process. I agree with the sentiment but do not agree with the proposed change or believe it's the only way to achieve this goal.
- Again, raise the standard across all school. Fix the route of the issue, not the symptom
- Again, raise the standard across all school. Fix the route of the issue, not the symptom
- Again, realistically no one would answer 'no' to this. These seem odd questions.
- Again, ridiculously leading question
- Again, such a leading question
- Weird question.
- (see previous comment on bias within the wording of the question)
- Again this is a leading question that nobody in their right mind would answer no to. You are providing no context.
- Again, the question is fine in a way that by saying yes it will seem like I agree with the suggested plans
- Again, the question is meaningless – it's phrased in such a way that nobody would say 'no'. Clearly children will not have the same education as schools and teachers are different. Please state what you actually mean.
- Again, this is a leading question, which I refuse to answer.
- Again, this is a leading question designed to get only one answer

- Again, who will disagree with this? Very badly compiled survey. Doesn't mean anything so far.
- Again, this feels like an attempt at a leading and coercive question.
- Again, this is a very leading question so I have not answered this
- Again, this is a ridiculous question. Who wouldn't answer yes.
- Again, this is poorly worded
- Again, this is a leading question and therefore an unfair process. You cannot take majority answers of 'yes' to this as representative of parents and carers feeling that it's ok for the council to alter catchment areas. It's not ok without full and fair consultation and sufficient data to prove that this will give the desired results. I don't believe you have shared sufficient data.
- Also a leading question, the current schools and their current catchment areas need more investment and support. Moving the catchment areas papers over the cracks as opposed to addressing these issues directly.
- Again, this survey appears to be designed to support the changes the council wish to make.
- Again, this is leading in the context it's being asked in and how the data will be used once it's been collected. It's over simplifying a complicated topic.
- Again, this is unhelpfully worded.
- Again, this is another horribly leading question which isn't explicit about the underlying intent
- Again a stupid question - clearly people want a system like this, these proposals are not the answer and will not create this
- Again a very leading question.
- Again a stupid question
- Absolutely. But again, for the same reasons this question is really poor.
- Again a bit of a biased question, it would be difficult to answer "no"
- Again a hugely leading question
- Again a loaded question, what do you hope to glean from this?
- Again a very loaded question.
- Again a meaningless word salad
- Again - obviously but what are we talking about?
- Again another badly worded question nobody will say no
- Again, this question feels unfair and leading
- Again another leading question. The models proposed do not address the issue of children in certain areas getting the support needed to achieve and thrive.
- Again, this question is leading and seeks to manipulate responses to provide justification for the council's suggested changes to school catchment areas.
- By answering yes to this I do not endorse any specific system
- 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 that a system that helps children achieve and thrive is good. The response to this question should not be used as a pretext/to support any proposed action on this topic, as it leading and meaningless.
- Again, yes of course, but it's a leading question and doesn't mean I agree with your proposals.
- Again, why are you asking this theoretical question?
- Again, who would answer no!? Nothing gained yet
- Again. I'm not sure what useful insight could be gained by asking people if they support a vague political platitude.
- I am not willing to answer this question as it is far too leading

- I don't know why this is included as a question on this topic (other than to use as justification/support for whichever option is chosen). The solution should not be to 'dilute down' and undo what is working.
- Question is very leading and biased
- This is a misleading question. No one would really want something that didn't do the above.
- 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 this sentence makes grammatical sense, but I agree that all children should be supported to achieve and thrive.
- I doubt many would disagree with the above statements.
- Leading question again
- Again, I don't feel like my answer will be used in a fair and balanced way
- Leading question again. You must think parents are stupid.
- Again, I feel concerned about how a yes/no answer could be misinterpreted or used out of context, and so I won't be answering.
- 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 questions- would anyone say no?
- Pointless question , noone is going to say that some children don't deserve the same high quality as others. I find this leading question I think council will use loads of yeses here ro o justify whatever it does.
- Terrible leading question. Shame on the person who devised this.
- Terrible question. This is a loaded question, infuriatingly misleading to obtain a "yes" answer. Another reason we have lost faith in this council. Disgraceful. I've answered "No" in protest of the question.
- Leading question not sure what this has to do with catchment areas. Secondary schools are far from the only factor that determines whether a child thrives or not
- That's a very loaded question
- pointless and leading survey
- Another leading question
- Another leading question aimed at statistical justification. Appalling.
- Another leading question. Again, a desirable goal however I strongly believe that the proposals put forward will not achieve this.
- Another leading question that's only designed for one purpose
- Feels like a leading question, Please specify the system you are proposing. Education / Curriculum and Standards are one thing,
- This is a meaningless question with no context - the only logical answer is "no" without further information.
- This is a misleading question which frames the following options as solutions to the educational disparity in this city
- This is a very loaded question, I'm not sure why you ask this, there is really only one possible answer to give.
- This is a pointless question - of course everyone wants a system where every child can thrive.
- Again, This is a very leading question and for this reason I will not answer it.

- Once again I agree with the statement but if I tick yes it gives support to big catchment areas and children travelling all over the city
- Once again, a very loaded / leading question. Who on earth would be AGAINST a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive?
- Once again, this is another leading question designed to reinforce your agenda. While the natural answer would be yes, I have chosen no because it's clear you will use this to alter the catchment areas, ultimately disadvantaging my child.
- Once again, this question is leading and does not allow for an unbiased response
- This is a stupid question - pointless in fact - who is going to say no?
- This is a very loaded question. Of course I want all children in the city to 'achieve and thrive', who doesn't? Such a response does not indicate a preference or enthusiasm for any particular model of catchment areas.
- This is again a leading question. This question is quite shockingly leading!
- This question is designed to get one answer.
- Who could disagree with the question.
- Not answering. Again, not appropriate for this survey
- Wow again - 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!
- Not answering another silly question
- What does this have to do with the survey?
- What does this have to do with the survey? The council's focus should be on building up all schools' infrastructure and resources so all children thrive....obviously
- What kind of a question is that? Who is going to write "no" to this? Enough with the Donald Trump crap.
- Who wouldn't believe that? Pointless question
- Who wouldn't?!
- As above what is the purpose of this question? When parents say they believe in education for their children, this answer can be manipulated to imply we support any changes when we might not, but in disagreeing it doesn't mean we don't want children to thrive across the city.
- As before, agree but I'm these questions have been set up to engineer the result you want - that parents agree with the objectives behind the proposed options.
- As with the first question on the survey, I am cynical about the reason for including this question in the survey. As a member of the labour party, a committed socialist and a state secondary school teacher, my answer is a resounding YES to the need for an equal education for all. However, I am abstaining from completing this question as I am cynical about the way my response will be used.
- As previous question, there is only one answer to this.
- As previously, this question will provide meaningless data.
- as before, incredibly leading question- this survey seems to have been set up to lead parents to agree to your changes
- Another completely ridiculous question.
- Another disingenuous question designed to validate this exercise no doubt
- As before, this is a leading question. Everyone wants a system that allows all children to thrive and achieve. However, the answer to this question should not necessarily justify catchment area changes.
- This is also a leading question.
- As before, another leading question
- Why is this even a question?? I don't get it. Only Katie Hopkins would tick 'No'
- Why would anyone say "no" to this question?!
- Of course I do! This is a leading question!
- Why on earth would anyone say no to this?

- As per previous email although I am now thinking you are potentially trying to make sure people keep these "givens" in mind when they are responding to the proposals so maybe I get it now!
- As previous question, not answering!
- As per my previous answer, this question is also skewed in favour of the councils proposed change.
- As prev. 'All' usually means those with the loudest (or more listened to) voice.
- This is again leading and potentially misleading, what policy change is the council trying to drive and get support for by using this statement?
- Wouldn't it be far more useful to ask people what barriers their children are facing... what might stop them achieving and thriving?
- Yes but not if this means closing local facilities this is not a very useful question
- You should be ashamed to include leading questions in a questionnaire. That's against the RSS code of conduct.
- Yes, I believe this statement to be correct but I worry that as this question also comes without any context as to how a response might be used, saying clicking yes might be used as evidence to support proposals from the council that I do not believe would successfully achieve the goal of supporting all children to thrive and achieve.
- Of course I do but what a leading question. Investment in schools over bussing children around the city.
- In principle, yes of course there should be equality of education, but it's a complex objective with different possible strategies for achieving this, and i cannot agree to the question without knowing what the system you are proposing is.
- Again this is a leading and over simplified question.
- Yes - but another leading question.
- Yes I do believe this. I also think without context as to how answers to this question could be used it could be seen as a leading question to support some of these proposals that I do not believe would lead to this positive outcome for all children
- Yes I agree with this, but this is incredibly leading. I don't think any of the options presented by the council come close to delivering this and infact would significantly reduced the support of a large number of children.
- Yes - of course, again this is a completely leading question. We don't have this currently where I live as my children only have access to one school in catchment but changing this is not part of your proposals!
- We all want children to thrive. Wait for the effect of the FSM admissions change to take effect. This will for sure help close the attainment gap. As the experts said at the Scrutiny meeting, changing catchments is too much too soon. It risks alienating large groups in the city who will take action that will undermine the aims of this exercise.
- Very leading question. Obviously every parent agrees with this.
- Very leading question, who would say no to this
- Very leading question clearly designed to obtain a favourable answer.
- Very leading question
- this is a leading question and I therefore feel it has no empirical value
- This is a leading question and is phrased in such a way as to call into question the validity of this survey and it's conclusions. This is not a genuine consultation.
- This is also a really leading question.
- This is a leading question and is not neu
- This is a leading question and I do not want my response to be used to support an argument for a proposal such model B.
- This is a leading question and does not help gain quality responses.
- This is an irritating, leading question. No one disagrees with this.
- This is an irritating, leading question. No one disagrees with this.

- This is an odd question, as was the previous one. Who does not 'agree on a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive'?
- This is a bad leading question.
- This is a bias leading question, that needs to be re-addressed. Councils need to fund failing schools.
- This is an outrageously leading question and totally inappropriate
- This is another leading question funnelling people to the council's own preferred option and not allowing me to interrogate and assess the facts
- This is another leading question. And absolutely inappropriate for the survey. No one will answer that they don't want children to thrive. The option of single catchment areas is in question because it gives little or no alternative choice. That is not about allowing children to thrive or not thrive. Deeply troubling that this is posed as a question.
- This is another leading question.
- This is not a serious question and it brings into doubt whether this is in any way a meaningful consultation.
- This is not an appropriate question. It is leading and Insufficiently well defined, please design an appropriate questionnaire and repeat the exercise after having done so.. Disagree that standards should be the same if it means lowering them for some
- This survey is pointless- does not add value to the exercise other than support an outcome that has already been planned out.
- This question is pointless, who would say no? What's the point of it?
- This question is too leading and manipulative
- this question is outrageous - who will say no to that?! Are you going to use the yes answers as pretend "evidence" in support of your proposals? Incredibly manipulative question.
- Leading question. Not appropriate for a consultation. Doesn't add anything to engaging with people on options
-
- This question is ridiculous, of course everyone thinks this.
- This question is too broad to answer yes/no
- This question makes no sense. How do I know whether the "system" you refer to will make any difference?
- This is another loaded question which I will not answer.
- This seems like a vague question.
- This question is not an appropriate question to start this survey with.
- This question is leading.
- This question is leading and not compliant with the Gunning Principles.
- This question is leading and appears solely designed to gain general agreement from respondents.
- As with the first question, do not pose optional, rhetorical questions which are clearly for the purpose of furthering a socialist agenda.
- This is a leading question which again doesn't explain how it relates to catchment area proposals.
- This is a leading question and not at all helpful to the outcomes of the consultation. There is not a single parent that would not agree that every child has the right to achieve and thrive. It is a pointless question and bears no reflection on the way on which this is being proposed to be achieved.
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 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 I will not answer it
- This is badly phrased question. All schools need to be good schools, supporting all students to thrive.
- I do, however i do not think the proposed changes to catchment areas will provide this. Again, this question is very leading.
- Of course. What a strange question.
- This is a leading question and of course everyone wants all children to thrive but this has to be achieved within the parameters of sustainability and community.
- This is a leading question as of course nobody would want anything else. This is a leading question as of course nobody would want anything else.
- This is far too complex a question with no data on which I would be agreeing or disagreeing
- Once again - obviously people will answer yest to this but, once again, your proposals will not lead to this happening. The change will just mean that many children will not be able to go to their local school.
- This is a loaded question.
- This is far too leading. It's surely not that simple
- This question is leading - and should be removed
- This question is highly leading and not appropriate for a quantitative survey so i'm not answering.
- this question is a push question - who can say schools shouldn't support children to achieve?
- Same as before - leading question. Yes children deserve this but I'm guessing that saying yes means I agree to the proposals.
- Same as previous, I can't imagine anyone not wanting this and it is not addressing the real issues.
- Same as previous comment. Agree with the principle, but not clear on the methodology.
- No, I think some children should be abandoned, a bit like the council did to all the city's children during the pandemic. What kind of a question is that?
- Nobody is going to suggest that they don't want children to thrive. I feel that this question might be used to support the changes to catchment areas as people will all say yes to wanting children to thrive. This question will not generate any useful insights on suggested changes. This feels disingenuous.
- This question and survey are extremely leading and seems to be guiding people towards a preconceived outcome.
- Ridiculous question
- This is in the same vein as the first question. This is another leading question and no reasonable parent would answer no.
- This is a ridiculously leading question that doesn't actually ask for views on the models presented. Who is going to disagree?
- This is a ridiculous question that I cannot believe has been included, which makes me seriously doubt the seriousness of this consultation
- This is a ridiculous loaded question and therefore I am answering no. It's a ques5ion that suggestthat B and h have already made up their minds.. . There are many ways to do this not just altering catchment.
- This is a recidivous question of corse they should
- This is a ridiculous and learning question, I can't believe you're starting a survey like this. Shameful.

- It depends on the system. I guess everybody wants as many people as possible to 'achieve and thrive'. I think providing school places near to where children live for as many children as possible is an important part of that, which does not seem to be given sufficient priority in the current proposals.
- This is a leading question. I would expect better.
- This is a leading question. I agree with this statement but these proposals do nothing to address this.
- This closed question does not give the chance for a fair response
- This is a leading and unethically framed question that seems designed to support the council's proposals.
- This is a leading question - so will refrain from answering.
- This is a leading question (any reasonable parent would want support to allow all children to thrive). However, you clearly intend to leverage such an answer to advance an agenda that will ultimately disadvantage my child.
- This is a leading question - please see my overall comments.
- This is a leading question.
- This is a horribly leading question. I have chosen not to click on the yes or no options above because of this.
- closed question
- Again, leading.
- Again, I feel concerned about how this data could be used out of context, and so I won't be answering
- Again, I have answered no to this because the leading questions in this survey are clearly engineered to give justification for the proposals that come later in the survey. There is no convincing evidence to suggest that redrawing the catchment areas in any way will address the issues we are facing. With these upfront questions you are clearly trying to engineer some data to give justification for whatever you put forward.
- Again, I'm not sure what you hope to get from these leading questions
- Again, just an annoyingly skewed question which doesn't make me think this is genuine and open engagement
- Again, no one is going to answer No to this question
- Again, no one is going to chose no, no matter how they think this should be achieved
- Again, not a valid question
- This feels like a leading question designed to demonstrate support for this process.
- They do, but once again this is a leading question to support a narrative to force through catchment areas but this should be done through funding teachers at schools in all areas of the city.
- These questions are ridiculous!
- Not sure why you ask - surely everyone agrees to this statement?!?!?
- These questions are misleading. Of course we all want that.
- These questions are leading and therefore I will not answer them
- These questions are leading and biased. You are not robustly gathering feedback shameful.
- Leading question that I will not answer.
- Not sure what this question is all about? Do some children are limited their rights to thrive?
- These questions are incredibly leading and therefore pointless as a way of gathering genuine feedback. I'm amazed these have been sent out.
- These questions are designed to change people's responses to subsequent questions.
- Of course, nobody would want anything else. This question is quite leading.

- 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.
- These is a very leading questions and i do not agree with the way this survey is asking.
- 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.
- Of course in practice this is what everyone wants. However again your question is open to misinterpretation (and by default my answer) - It is not as easy as shipping children from one area to another. The council - YOU - need to work harder (and with) those schools and the children in those communities
- The question is poor and skewed.
- These are very leading questions
- The results of this survey question will tell you nothing and should not be used as a basis for decision making. What answer would you possibly expect other than 'yes'
- These are very leading questions
- Obviously - not sure what the point of this question is. The question is not should all children achieve and thrive, the question is how can we ensure this?
- These are loaded, theoretical and unhelpful questions.
- These are leading questions
- Similarly, this is a very leading question. It is difficult to see how anybody would seriously answer 'no'
- Doesn't everyone. I am not sure what useful insight you expect to gain from this question.
- Again, a horribly leading question that is seeking to gain support for intent of the changes but disregards any of the details that are actually being consulted on.
- Again, a leading question which does not have any bearing on the catchment area maps but is designed to emotionally blackmail.
- Again, a leading question! Lots of people will answer 'no' in protest.
- Again, I am not answering this question, as it is entirely biased and therefore not fit for purpose. I suggest that the person who wrote this survey needs to re-train and focus on how to collect meaningful, unbiased data - especially given the particularly sensitive nature of this topic. This questionnaire is again trying to lead respondents in a Single direction, when the nature of the issue at hand is incredibly complex and multifaceted.
- Again this is only going to be a yes answer for anyone answering this survey. Who came up with these questions?!
- Again, I assumed this was a rhetorical question?
- Another loaded question, of course all children should be supported to achieve and thrive.
- Again this question does not address any of the real issues and will produce nothing but skewed data.
- again very leading question
- Again, a further leading question.
- Another leading question. These questions were clearly chosen to produce responses that could be used to support proposed changes. These are not real questions.
- Another no brainer. Did you do any research or ask any local people's views before working out these foolish questions?
- Another ridiculous and leading question. Please produce a proper survey.
- Another stupid binary question for a complex issue.

- Another terrible question designed to validate whatever you have decided. Please don't waste time with questions like these. It's really transparent what you are trying to do with this question.
- Another very leading question. People will feel that they have no option but to answer 'yes', but they again may not agree with any of the consultation plans.
- Similarly I have chosen not to answer this question.
- I have answered no because this is a leading question. Please read report by professor Adam Denmet and act responsibly. Your proposal demonstrates the council does not want "all children to thrive"
- Should be considered in isolation - this is a leading question.
- Seems like an obvious/ leading question.
- Again, an intentionally emotive leading question. I agree, but think these surveys need to be better written!
- Again, an inappropriate and leading question.
- Again, a very leading question
- Again, a stupid question
- Again, another leading question to force a positive response, GCSE maths students are taught about writing questions and they would be able to identify this as a poorly written question. Schools need adequate support and funding so they are able to meet the needs of their students and communities.
- See question one, 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 question that will by design or not frame questions later in the survey.
- I have opted out of this question as it is a leading question and this is an unfair questionnaire. The system should support all children – 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.
- I don't think this question can provide you any insight into sentiment on this - of course the majority of people will instinctively respond yes to this but you are not transparent about the changes this will mean accepting and the negative implications this could have for children not from a disadvantaged background. This survey is very poorly designed to overly-simplify a complex proposal and hide the nuance of the matter.
- Again, another ridiculous question!
- I do not feel able to respond as I think it is a leading question.
- 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.
- I disagree with the format of this question. Obviously no one will put 'no' so what is the point of it.
- Again, as per the previous question the honest answer from all is 'no', I want my child to thrive. I'm not interested in other children just my own. Again, this is clearly written in a way that facilitates an answer of 'yes', but that simply isn't the reality.

4. Community and Social Impact

- And, again, from a personal family level the proposed changes will create differing standards of education within families, if the sibling link is cut and two or more children have differing standards of education. Your proposal has the potential to create inequality within families. Surely the answer is to improve the schools that you are deeming lower performing, rather than penalise children who are looking forward to having the same secondary school experience as their brothers and sisters.

- Yes, but this should be achieved by making sure that all Secondary Schools across Brighton and Hove can provide for pupils so that they can achieve and thrive at a school that is close to where they live.
- Is a school system that separates children from their local community and forces them to travel for hours each day one that supports all children to thrive?
- Yes I do agree that all children should be able to thrive, but that does not mean the only solution is shipping children across the borough to schools a long-way from their homes simply to change the demographic. This is not how failing schools in other parts of the country are turned around.
- Agree but this solutions seems to put the focus on that underperforming schools need to bring in children from much further away to improve them. The focus should be on encouraging parents to send there children to their local school and improving the underperforming schools in Brighton and hove. Increasing a childs commute from 0.3 miles to 3 miles is not beneficial for anyone.
- I believe in a school system that allows local children to attend local schools, to best ensure the attainment gap is reduced and boost all children prospects and sense of self and wellbeing. I am a teacher of over 25 years (Primary) and I have come to the sad and frustrating conclusion that you can have as much belief and will power as you like, but children are never going to have access to the same education everywhere. At least, not until the pupil funding formula is adjusted to better fund schools in under priveleged areas. This is the sorry truth.
- The council should also consider that Ofsted ratings are not everything to all parents. I sent my son to Balfour when it was RI despite having options for Downs, Hertford and Patcham. We chose Balfour as it was closest and had the most green space. Not it's Ofsted.
- But this also has to fit with local children not having to walk over 30 mins to and from school every day
- All parents want their children to achieve and thrive. However, if they are having their children attending schools that are in opposite direction to where they live means: Older sibling's school gear/uniform can no longer be used, new ones must be paid for. This may mean the difference between being able to afford extra tutorial for topics children are struggling with or not. It may mean extra curricular activities/clubs can no longer be afforded, meaning a lost of skills and more importantly relationships outside school. For siblings, rather than one school trip there is now two, if driving. If public transpoort is to be used; are there going to be more busses for the increased number of students? Will this result in children not being able to get on busses and being late and penalised for it?
- Each area needs to respond to the needs of that area.
- However, the physical sites of school locations don't always offer the same standards and equally investment into the individual schools can differ historically.
- I do agree but do feel children should be able to go to their most local school to prevent them commuting across city
- course but this means supporting all schools not distributing children a long way from their homes
- I strongly believe that this involves keeping communities together, allowing friendships to maintain and most importantly not asking children as young as 11 to travel long distances to and from their education.
- Some families need a greater level of support.
- part of thriving is attending a school nearby that is also attended by classmates from junior school
- I think the council should be supporting families and communities. This idea for the schools won't work.
- It would be great if the council were able to achieve this however I do not feel that any of the options you are proposing will work. You are just moving the problem. I

personally feel that the options you are suggesting are not being at all inclusive to the residents of Kemp town only giving us the option of a school that requires improvement. When I moved to the area I made sure I was in the catchment for 2 good schools and now you want to change that to NO CHOICE but a FAILING school with low grades and poor behaviour. I do not see this as an environment for my child to 'thrive'. And the standard of education will not be the same as other schools in the city. I do not want my child to be part of a social experiment to try and improve Longhill by bringing in children from other areas. I do not believe this will work. I went to a school like that and the disruptive pupils took all the attention of the teachers. Unfortunately, there aren't so many residents with children in Kemptown so unlike areas like Fiveways and Hanover who have lots of people to speak out about the proposals, I feel like our voice won't be heard. This may be one of the reasons Kemp town is being hit the hardest by this as there just aren't the numbers to speak out against it. Also, putting Kemptown in a catchment with a failing school may affect the property prices. If this is the case you need to also consult with the residents as this impacts them as well.

- Not if the cost of doing this is to worsen the health and being of young people across the city by asking them to do 2 hour long commutes and breaking up communities
- The system can help them thrive by investing in their local community schools, not by masking the issue by artificially tinkering with catchment areas.
- These questions are very closed and leading. I do not agree to proposals that will crush my sons right to the same educational opportunities as his brother
- I would like ALL children to have access to a school in their LOCAL community.
- It depends on the system. I guess everybody wants as many people as possible to 'achieve and thrive'. I think providing school places near to where children live for as many children as possible is an important part of that, which does not seem to be given sufficient priority in the current proposals.
- This will not support all children. How will not letting children go to their local school let them thrive and achieve?
- Need clarity around retaining of sibling link after the proposed changes.
- Artificially manipulating the social mix across schools does not lead to better outcomes for children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Investment in quality teachers, leadership, and additional support with wraparound programmes might do. Reducing the catchments around Stringer/Varndean will only result in more well off families moving closer to those schools.
- 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.
- Not making children travel across the city, away from their community and friends. My daughter would suffer so much from this being implemented and I don't see how it will help in the long run a failing school!
- While all children deserve to achieve and thrive, the underlying causes of poverty and deprivation cannot be solved by preventing children with better life chances from attending their closest school.
- Yes but it is also vital that children can go to a school near their home, to ensure they are with friends and a community to feel safe and for their mental wellbeing. Dividing areas up and forcing children to be separated from their community and travel for up to an hour before their learning day starts is detrimental to children's mental health. Children that go to primary school together should have the option to stay together to help them transition to secondary school.
- Yes but this has to be carefully considered so as not to disrupt children living in the current catchment set up.
- This is more nuanced than your presenting as there are so many inequities in education because of private schools and so many other disadvantages faced by those in lower socioeconomic families

- I do not agree with catchment areas that exclude pupils from attending schools with their friends and peer groups
- Yes of course so bring all the school up, don't force children out of their areas and making long commutes to school
- Yes, but not at the cost of displacing children from a school that is most local to them, by changing the catchment areas.
- Yes I believe all children have the right to good education standards but also they have the right to attend school within their own community where they have developed friendships. For some children change is hard to accept and through out the primary years they have been building relationships and wouldn't want to see my child placed in a school far from home and away from friends
- Yes not at the expense of children losing a seat at near nearby school options
- Yes, but that doesn't mean using demographics to do this - schools should be empowered to meet the needs of the populations they serve
- There is currently a difference the students experience due to the demographic of the city. With less affluent students predominantly placed at BACA which has become a sink school. This should not happen and needs to change.
- The way this survey has been worded is pretty poor. I believe the system as it currently stands supports children to achieve and thrive. How is this connected with the catchment area changes you are proposing?
- Children who live near a thriving school and who have been walking to school throughout their schooling should not be disrupted and made to go to schools without some of their peers
- Children should go to their local schools. Edge of city schools should be improved so that local parents actually want to send their children there . There should not be displacement of city children in preference for those on the edge of the city
- Children should be supported to thrive wherever they live and whatever their local school is. Children cannot thrive if they are over tired from a long distance travel to school and if they are unable to access extra curricular provision due to travel time home.
- But not at the expense of community cohesion. It would be wrong if a child is torn away from its community to be sent to another school away from their friends.
- Children should be able to go to their closest school. Children where at all possible should be able to walk to school
- Children also have the right to access a local school that won't split them from their peers due to where they live.
- But not at the expense of local communities and the children within them.
- Catchment areas are important so the similar socioeconomic backgrounds thrive together
- But not by taking children out of their communities.
- But all elements need to be looked at in detail and the proposal does not do this. Children thriving at school also means going to a school local enough to home so they can walk ideally, and be in the same community as their school friends. Most of the proposal ideas jeopardise this in our area.
- As long as children are able to attend their closest school if they wish.
- All schools should support children, children should also be able to walk to a school in their community.
- All communities of Brighton and Hove deserve a good local school
- All children should have access to a decent education close to their homes. More time is needed to allow for solution finding, as options a,b and c are not achieving this.

- 1) School children should feel part of a community, That means being able to walk to school with friends and family members To a good school that provides quality education for that child.
- All children should be given the right to thrive. Children not going to their local schools will not help them thrive.
- All children should be entitled to attend a school close to where they live.
- Regarding education, I believe it is just as important to create communities with added out of school activities and a sustainable journey that does not rely on cars.
- All children should have access to quality education. Schools that are not thriving need support and so do the communities they come from.
- But of course, all the schools in the city should be providing a good quality of education to the local community they serve. Both BACA and Longhill are, as I understand it, making improvements and need time for this to bed in. Given that there are socioeconomic disparities across the city this means that some schools will inevitably have different challenges, but there are schools that can and do provide amazing education where there are high proportions of children on FSM. As a local example, Whitehawk primary is currently rated Good overall, but was Outstanding in 4 out of 5 categories. There is a well documented house price increase to live close to a 'good' school, but that is not the only factor that determines the socioeconomic mix in different areas. It is far more complex and nuanced than that.
- Absolutely, again so long as the system truly does benefit all involved, including helping parents to thrive while supporting their children, careers etc.
- A system that supports children to achieve and thrive not only comes from the school environment but also a solid social network that has been established through their primary years. Changes to these catchment areas could significantly split up social networks at a very vulnerable age in a child's life.
- 'Thrive' includes being able to attend a local school

5. Broader Educational Equity Issues

- You cannot achieve the same education and standards for everyone. There are too many variables. It is not wrong to have this as a key aim but I have no faith that the limitations of such an aim will be sensibly considered.
- I think that free schools, religious schools and academies should all be council run as well.
- 100 percent. Why do the affluent areas like fiveways get the best pick of schools. When it would take my child the same commute from carden hill area to stringer or varndean
- 100% all schools should be able to support and tailor their offer to the brightest and most in need of support. Each school does have its own unique offering- pastoral, sporty, academic, creative but all schools should be able to offer an element of each. And most importantly be engaging and encouraging, relevant and accessible to all students.
- A system that supports all children to achieve and thrive (which would be wonderful) is not achieved by giving all children the same education and standards as children are individuals with unique needs.
- Absolutely. There is plenty of evidence that a rigorous approach to providing every child with the best education is achievable especially in academies etc. in deprived areas. Look at London or elsewhere where high standards have been achieved with the right leadership and investment.
- Academic and personal achievement shouldn't only be available to those in wealthier areas. Some schools currently have terrible reputations

- Again I agree but I also disagree to changing catchment areas. Students on pupil premium should get priority to schools of their choice to provide access.
- Yes all children have the right to a good education that best supports their needs. That should be about providing the right level of support for children that may have additional needs but not at the expense of other children.
- Absolutely all children deserve the same standard of education but this should be achieved by putting more resources and money into the secondary schools that are struggling rather than causing extra issues to students and families on top
- Absolutely that is the ideal. I think that we therefore need to come up with some radical solutions because the proposals don't seem to adequately solve many of the issues we have in the city and could just create more. As the parent of a child on the SEND register but not with an EHCP I am particularly aware of the impact on long journey times and routes for young people in this group, as well as the importance of having a choice of schools since different settings work for different people. Attendance is such a huge issue for many neurodivergent young people already, and I think increasing the numbers of young people in the city who have to travel long journeys to school will create a further barrier for this population in particular to attend school and thrive there, as well as being difficult for all young people. I don't think the fact that some folks already have to do this justifies making more do it, we should at the very least be making sure there are free direct buses at appropriate times when it's not geographically possible for young people to attend a local school. That is not to say I think we should keep things as they are but why I think possibly moving a school, or finding a different catchment change model/option that allows more choices for folks across the city - including for Portslade, would be helpful, as well as giving the 'just about managing' SEND population priority alongside folks with EHCPs in admissions choices.
- All children should have the right to the same education and standards. However this scheme proposes penalising certain communities and significantly impacting on the standards life of others in order to provide a so-called better education standard to others. e.g. reducing sizes of schools that have performed better by independently testers, whilst maintaining the sizes of poorer performing schools in order to drag higher attaining students into these schools.
- Academic disadvantage is not only based on socio-economic background. The vulnerability of a child to perform badly at school or drop out is an intersectional issue. My child has protected characteristics (is transgender) and thus requires a school that follows the BHCC trans toolkit, has an LGBT club and inclusive policies. We moved to an area where such a school exists and are now at risk of being taken out of its catchment area. How are these kinds of vulnerabilities being taken into account in the proposed plans? I do not think they are but they should be.
- The challenge that we currently see with educational standards in Brighton, has its root cause in the disparity of educational provision predominantly within the east of Brighton. This was caused, in my opinion because of the closure of CoMart, And the failure to replace it with a good School within that region. We are now in a situation where, a large number of children in the Eastern the city are forced to rely on a single school in Rottingdean, Which is outside the community, is a great distance away and have to take Very early buses to Get there. This situation has failed that community and entirely, And the resulting challenges we now see of low uptake at LongHill school Is the outcome. I believe in order to provide good quality education across the city the council, should deal with the root cause of these issues instead of requiring Brighton and Hove citizens to resolve it for them: Which is what you are Proposing in Option B.
- there are many different things that can help children thrive and survive on their educational journey and having the 'same' does not consider differing needs.

- Of course kids should have access to good education, that does not mean that the proposals you put forward are good solutions.
- Agree but again don't destroy others to achieve your ambition.
- All children are born equal. No other consideration should be taken into account
- All children deserve the best possible education. It is clear parts of East and West Brighton do not have access to that at present stands. However a change of leadership at Longhill is promising and needs time to be evaluated.
- The first is should all children have the right to the same education and standards? The answer is NO. Equality is "same", equity - which is needed to reduce disadvantage and inequality - is different things for different people, to try and achieve the same outcome. I do not agree all children have the right to the same education and standards. I believe disadvantaged children, including those with socioeconomic deprivation and those with disabilities, should have higher educational standards and financing. However, I do agree we would want a system that ideally supports all children to achieve and thrive.
- Of course I believe that all children deserve access to high quality education. I also believe that asking more children to travel out of area with longer journeys will reduce the quality of mental health and education for many more children in the city. As a SEND parent it is important that children have access to tailored support and schools that understand and support these needs. The council should be focussing on improving schools, improving SEND provision and personalised and localised support. Moving more pupils across the city does not address these issues and creates more disparity and more traffic. on the current proposal it would be more viable for us to travel by train out of a city to get to a school, than to travel across to the city to go to a school that is not equipped or invested to support children with SEND. It may be that is never possible for children like mine to travel alone that far.
- I think we need to see if the current plan works first - i.e. continuing to move FSM up the entry requirement list first
- I agree on a system supporting the best learning outcome for them achieved by targeted funding to areas most at need. I don't believe in compromising the outcome to the city's children on the proposed measures.
- All children deserve the right to a great education to help them become all that they can be for the future. Whether or not their parents can afford to live in an area of the city that has a great school should not take the opportunity away. Without opening up these opportunities the class divide in the city will only be maintained.
- All children have a right to an excellent education, which is not necessarily the same thing as all having the right to the same education.
- All children have right to same good quality education
- All children have the right to achieve and thrive, and schools need to be able to provide a wide variety of options and pathways for students to get the best out of each individual. This is why I like large, diverse schools at secondary level.
- All children in the city deserve a right to receive the education which our country and system is legally obliged to provide. I do not believe that all schools should necessarily be created equal, and that high performing schools should be impacted or put at risk to favour lower performing schools.
- All children should be given a reasonably comparable level of education and opportunity to achieve.
- All children should be helped to thrive. No child should be compelled to go to a school that has been assessed as "requires improvement" or "inadequate". That is where this council should be focussing its energies - improving those schools who are giving a poor service to their pupils. Either that should happen, or those schools should be closed. I would not be able to agree to my children being sent to BACA, which is where plan B could lead to them being allocated a place, when I have read

about what they would be likely to experience there. I don't think anyone else's children should have to go there either.

- All children should have access to a good school in their neighbourhood
- All children should have access to the education they need, which is not the same thing as all children having the same education.
- All children should be supported to achieve and thrive. No sound justification is given for prioritising the smoothing of the distributions of pupils in receipt of Free School Meals (FSM) across schools in the city, over and above any other reasonable considerations, which will impact the well-being of all children. A balanced assessment needs to consider the physical and mental benefits of being able to walk to school, the social and cultural benefits of attending school near where friends, family and local community activities are located, as well as a much deeper engagement with wider literature on dealing with social and spatial inequalities in the school system and educational outcomes
- All children should have equal right to a good education. All schools should be well funded, well equipped and with good teachers. Every student deserves the opportunity to thrive and to do this their mental and physical welfare needs need to be met. Attending an inspiring thriving school where they feel safe, connected to friends and their local community will help them to thrive. Traveling long distances across the city to areas outside of their community is not looking after the physical and mental health of children. It is scientifically proven that teenagers struggle to get up in the morning as they have a later chronotype than younger children and adults. Consequently their physical and mental health and academic success is better when they are allowed to sleep longer in the morning. Increasing the distance children travel will not improve their ability to thrive but will have the opposite effect.
- All children should most certainly have the right to the same standard of education and the right to achieve their full potential and thrive.
- All kids should have the same options for good school no matter where they live
- Any changes to school catchment must be accompanied by a full and comprehensive equality impact assessment. The school system in the city is already unequal - a child at one school is simply not getting access to the same support and resources as another. Steps to change catchments must seek to address this and to reduce equality gaps. Whilst the engagement exercise has a focus on children receiving FSM and that is positive, it is also essential to look at other dimensions of equality. This has to include analysis on the impact for SEND learners is essential, particularly in the context of the SEND crisis.
- apart from one or two schools which are over subscribed state secondary schools in Brighton & Hove have been poor. If you reside outside of the very narrow catchment areas for these schools there are few options.
- As a professional in HE, I firmly believe in a system where all children are able to thrive, regardless of their postcode area or socio-economic environment. However, after 14 years of assessing and reviewing university applications from applicants who fall into the 'Widening Participation' category, it is rare for LAs to use the ideology of bussing students away from their nearest school to encourage better mixing. Usually LAs focus their energies on supporting schools to improve, by making them attractive to high performing leadership teams, investing, building the community and reaching out through the earlier years of education to really embed the ideology of social mobility withing the consciousness of parents and schools. Universities play a huge part in this from year 6 upwards, but the Local Authority needs to plough energies into this too. I realise LAs were cut to the bone under the Tories, but there are so many creative and innovative ways to secure a regular investment in our communities. We're a popular tourist city, with vibrant attractions and a Premier League football club. There must be ample numbers of philanthropists in this city, why not secure community investment from them?

- As previous question. It shouldn't be dependent on where your parents can afford to live.
- Better options for SEND and other disadvantaged pupils must be part of this process. A greater number of smaller schools or Autistic schools are required.
- But I don't think you need to disadvantage pupils to elevate others. This seems to be what Brighton and Hove are doing instead of ensuring good schools exist local to people's homes.
- as before - church schools, private schools affect everyone's schooling
- But not artificially created by forcing children from more advantaged backgrounds in to schools that are underperforming. It's not just a result of teaching but also upbringing, sense of being, attitudes etc and I think have the support of an adequately resourced social system be that activities' opportunities, social clubs, access to green spaces, learning opportunities etc
- But not at the expense of other children's education - levelling down by making children attend a school over 4 miles away from home will not help any child thrive. Children should be able to attend a school within their community when this is possible.
- But not at the expense of other children's education - levelling down by making children attend a school over 4 miles away from home will not help any child thrive. Children should be able to attend a school within their community when this is possible
- But not to the detriment of other children
- But the current system does not allow this. I have only the choice of one school in my catchment area.
- Catchments should be larger and more inclusive
- children who are very disruptive should lose these rights
- Children should have equal opportunity to attend any school within the area, regardless of location or religious denomination
- Children needing extra support should get this in their school, whatever the Ofsted rating etc.
- Catchments should enable inclusive school populations
- Changing catchment areas won't mean that all children can thrive or that they have equal access to opportunities - it just means that different children will have access to schools that will help them thrive. Investment in the schools would help this. Changing catchment areas won't.
- Children in poorer areas of the City should not be denied the same opportunities as families who live in the more affluent areas especially those who have moved closer to schools who perform better in the league tables thus giving them an unfair advantage of children from poorer areas of the City. Particularly in the East of the City
- You need to look at the underlying reasons that some children do not thrive and achieve in our city. Not because of the school they are placed in but due to family/community lack of engagement in their children's education - start by supporting these families to support their children rather than bussing 'achievers' all over the city and preventing them achieving their full potential due to long travel and lack of community due to not attending a local school.
- Children who require additional support should be given this regardless of the setting. All children should get the right education for them and not be disadvantaged.
- Children with an economic advantage should not automatically achieve more, there is a glass ceiling in Brighton at the moment where only the most economically advantageous students are able to access the best schools. This is deepening the class divide and entrenching the privilege in some and resentment in others, in my mind this goes against everything our city stands for! The East needs better schools.

- However this is NOT the current educational system which is based on exams and points and doesn't teach practical skills or love of learning.
- Children should be given equal opportunity and access to education and resources, regardless of the economic situation they are born into.
- However when you have schools performing so differently inevitably many children will be failed. No child should be expected to attend a failing school.
- However, I do not believe the current system supports this. Your consultation clearly states some faith schools will keep their own criteria and boundaries. Yet only this week it was published locally that they are one of the top performing schools in Sussex. Disparity will exist in my opinion where different rules apply.
- I absolutely agree that every child deserves a good education. And one of the city's strengths is that there is a genuine comprehensive mix of backgrounds in most schools. However the schools the council has control over are limited (eg not academies) so in trying to optimise for fairness and parity in only some schools in the city of which you have control there may be unintended consequences (eg a family chooses a non LA school) and the theoretical spread of children you are hoping for does not materialise.
- Education is a basic human right. The standard of education should absolutely be equal for every child.
- currently children do not have the same access to the same standard of education. Those in the BACA catchment area are typically coming from some of the poorest and most disadvantaged backgrounds (the free school meals stats are just basic indicators of this) and yet they are expected to attend a school ranked "inadequate" by ofsted, while those living in richer areas of the city often have multiple choices of catchment area school and these schools are ranked as providing a better quality of education, furthering the disparities in the city as those from poorer areas are forced to go to a less high achieving school and thus often get less high grades which limits their future choices and continues the cycle of disparity in the city.
- Currently the educational standards of schools are very different, so this needs to be a priority that is worked on, rather than hoping this will happen by moving students around.
- Currently it is a very unfair and biased system and gives the middleclass an upper hand and the more deprived areas no choice. Disgusting by the council to draw a big line around the middleclass areas. The council are constantly bullied by the middleclass parents who usually shout the loudest. The council need to say NO to these bloody middle class twats
- East Brighton desperately needs better provision
- I agree that a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive is needed. However, the plans proposed by the council do not take into consideration other disadvantaged children in the city i.e. those with SEN. They also do not take into account the impact that these proposals would have on all pupils in the city e.g. travelling outside of their local area, extended school day due to longer travelling, and not feeling part of a local community that they may have grown up in for a long time etc.
- I agree that all children across Brighton and Hove should have the right to the same education and standards.
- But I do not see how dramatically changing the school catchment area is going to achieve this instead of just causing more disruption to many more children and parents
- I agree that all children should be supported to achieve and thrive. I don't believe a system exists that can do that for all children equally, as so many different needs exist for different children.
- But disadvantaging other students is not the way to do this.

- I agree that all children deserve access to a quality education and the opportunity to thrive. However, any system should consider existing disparities between schools. Changes to catchment areas must be implemented thoughtfully to avoid disrupting families' educational plans
- I agree that an education system should support ALL children and their needs, taking into account ALL limiting factors. Those limiting factors include geography, transport links, transport time, and their social impact on children & their performance at school. I do not believe in change to a current system which disadvantages some children over others.
- I agree that we should strive towards a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive. This may not be the same as saying all children should have the right to the 'same education and standards' as one size may not fit all.
- I agree with the need to address education standards, but I strongly disagree with your proposals, which would lower the standards at better-performing schools by overburdening them through catchment changes. Instead of redistributing students, why are you not focused on improving results at underperforming schools? Shifting catchments won't solve the issue—it will only spread the problem, leading to an overall decline in education quality. Your strategy risks lowering the standard for all children, rather than raising it for those in disadvantaged areas. The priority should be to level up education in the worst-performing schools, not dilute the success of better-performing ones.
- Having the two best performing schools only open to pupils from the most affluent area is perpetuating inequalities in this city.
- I agree with the statement but I don't believe the proposals support this as it is prioritising some children at the expense of others
- I also realise this will never be the case due to the many factors effecting the quality of schools and education
- I believe in the importance of choice. I don't believe the options presented give all children equal options
- I believe that all children should have the same opportunities and access to education. However, as it stands it isn't equal
- I believe that all children, including SEND children, have the right to the same education standards and to thrive. There is no evidence that these changes will support that goal.
- I do believe that all children have the right to the same education, I don't believe any of the proposals adequately address the issues of inequality.
- I believe in equitable education for all children and equitable standards. Equality is not enough, which is why I have answered "no" to this question. I do agree that the system should support ALL children to achieve and thrive. I.e. NO child in the city should see a fall in their education outcomes as a result of a change to school catchment areas. Some children need more resource in order to be successful for a variety of reasons. Economic disadvantage being one, but also children with SEND (with or without an EHCP), children from different ethnic backgrounds, looked after children. Essentially there are many and/or multiple ways children can be disadvantaged. From attending one of the online discussions about the proposals and hearing Councillor Jacob speak, it came across quite strongly that the only metric of "disadvantage" that is being considered is economic disadvantage, measured by FSMs. I am parent of a Year 5 child with Learning Disability, a former school governor and I work for the NHS in a specialist Learning Disability team. I also live in what can be described as a more affluent area of the city that has a good secondary school nearby. However, I consider my child disadvantaged because they do not have access to the same education, standards, extra-curricular activities and opportunities as their peers and my child faces considerable barriers as a result. As a former school governor, Councillor Jacob will be very aware that governing

boards do not just consider economic disadvantage as barriers to success for pupils. E.g. SEND, LAC, EAL, BAME are other measures of disadvantage. The NGA is very clear on a broader definition of what disadvantage is. I do find it concerning that ignoring this may push children into being disadvantaged or being further disadvantaged, not the goal of these proposals.

- I believe in equality in education, I don't agree with the tactic you are proposing. Provide increased funding and resources for struggling schools and incentivise good teachers to come/stay at these schools so all children have access to good quality education close to where they live.
- I do if that means ensuring more children have access to good schools, not at the detriment of children who are already in areas with good schools
- I do not believe in any form of discrimination which includes discriminating against a child who lives in a catchment area for a good school. They have the same right as any other child to get the best education possible. This is what Brighton and Hove council should be aiming to achieve.
- I do support a system that supports all children, but each child needs to be in the right setting. Having disruptive children in a class doesn't help any child or the class teacher. The catchment areas also need to be fair. Each catchment should have the same amount of schools to choose from.
- I do, but I don't agree that some children are suddenly disadvantaged from current situation in the hope that some children 'might' advantage. That to be is absolutely NOT the right approach
- I fully support the principle that all children deserve access to high-quality education, however, it is crucial to recognise that achieving this requires tailored support, especially for vulnerable pupils such as those with SEND and those impacted by the pandemic. The SEND Review (2022) underscores the need for personalised, localised support, highlighting that a one-size-fits-all approach may not adequately meet the diverse needs of children across the city.
- I have spent a lot of money on a house in a catchment area with a good school. Sending my child to a sink school will not magically improve that school
- I strongly agree with this which is why I don't understand how places at private schools are only reserved for the very rich or bursaries available for those with low incomes, completely pricing out families with a good income but not enough to stretch to private school fees.
- I disagree in principle with this proposal as I think there is not a balanced and fair approach to children thriving from all demographics, ie there is a bias focus on FSM over the welfare of other children who might live in areas where there is less representation of this demographic.
- I believe we need a system that seeks to raise the quality of education for all rather than leveling opportunities out by declining the quality of the education for some.
- I support a fully comprehensive system in theory but I am aware that the existence of free schools, academies and private schools makes a system which extends the same rights to all children impossible without more radical change than the council can effect. I do not believe that we have a fair education system nor that the proposed changes would provide one.
- I support the right to education for all children (and their right to community and play), but we need more evidence-based options to get to this goal.
- I think it seems unfair that child eligible for free school dinners get given priority over other children, who come from more working families and our children are then given less priority.
- I don't think income really affects your ability to think or study, so I am confused why FSM is used as a criteria. Schools need to serve the local community, and they all

need to be good. You should be able to go to the school nearest to where you live and have a good education there.

- I support equality of education
- Free school meals children need a choice
- Fairness and equality should be at the forefront for all children, no matter their background
- everyone is equal
- Different children have different needs, require and desiring different settings with different expectations and aspirations
- Different children thrive in different environments, I'm not sure one size fits all is the best approach. This also appears to be a leading and poorly drafted question which is aimed at providing evidence to support a previously determined outcome rather than genuinely looking for peoples views.
- Everyone deserves the opportunity to a good education
- Evidence is cited that better social-mix is associated with better educational outcomes, which might be true where that mix occurs organically, but there is no evidence in the literature that artificially enforcing mix (by bussing students from more affluent parts of the city to schools in less affluent parts or vice. this kind of social engineering can make educational outcomes even worse for low socio-economic status students.)
- I support a system that holistically cares for all children. Again, this is to do with funding and expertise but achieving and thriving is also dependent on location/distance to school, a varied curriculum, and extra-curricular activity provision too. The council will need to fund these changes and I'm aware that 14 years of Tory rule has decimated that funding. Are Labour planning on boosting council budgets?
- I think children have the right to an education that meets their needs. One size fits all does not work for children. All should be encouraged to achieve and thrive.
- The council needs to separate out its objectives of PANS and FSMs - the latter needs to be evaluated before further changes are made. The evidence (shared at people and oversight committee) shows mixing children from different backgrounds works well when it does not create major disruption, so much greater thought would need to go into a proposal eg consulting bus companies.
- I'm a child of working class parents who went to grammar school. Equality of access to good education is vital not just for children but also for the nation as skills and knowledge are essential for all.
- 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.
- Please do not forget SEN children.
- In an ideal world quality, results, and opportunities would be consistent across all schools. I believe this balance to be an "ideology" that is dependant on a multitude of controllable and uncontrollable factors and therefore there will always be some disparity between schools that fluctuates across time. I support reducing the attainment gap for disadvantaged children. I do not support forcing children away from their local schools and communities to drive a balance - this is perverse and damned approach that as we have seen will cause a huge negative backlash from negatively impacted communities. Brighton and hove which (unlike London for

example) has council estates located on the outskirts of town - and therefore there is an inevitable inconsistency in FSM as part of the geographical make up
The only way to truly balance out FSM% across schools is to artificially move children from other areas into that school (an unpopular move) or to close that school and merge everyone into the remaining schools which is something the council clearly don't want to do). I believe we should accept the inevitable and focus on addressing the issues impacting poor performance in the local schools and in parallel, working on the other factors that children who experience social and economic disadvantage, suffer.

In order to enable ALL children achieve and thrive. I do not think changing the catchment areas in the city will drive this outcome.

To reiterate this point the expert advice sought by the council Ref: Professor Stephen Gorard eludes nowhere in his published "studies of improving attainment in other ways", to the changing of boundaries or catchment areas. He does recommend alternative ways of improving "attainment at schools by spending money, focusing on disadvantaged pupils, other than using money directly as an incentive for students and families. It covers studies of health and nutrition, careers information, counselling, community involvement, and the use of technology."By applying this logic - schools in disadvantaged areas with a high pupil premium would be provided superior education quality and standards to offset their disadvantage. A school that applies this would both effectively serve its community and reduce the attainment gap. Good schools and deprivation do not need to be mutually exclusive - City academy Whitehawk is well run and achieving good results for its local community. The pupil premium % is about 66% and with super high SEND - it got outstanding on 4 of 5 categories in July ofsted. This demonstrates you can have good schools in areas with deprivation

- If this question is referring to the proposals suggested, I do not agree although would of course agree in general. I am concerned that the proposals will level down those in better locations and schools rather than levelling up those who are disadvantaged. I feel this is a very leading question.
- it currently does not with the current catchment areas. Its too Hove based
- Again, this is down to funding- schools with high numbers of Pupil premium receive additional funding. Families need to be given more support from the local authority, changing catchments will not help this
- It seems evident that many children currently don't have an equal opportunity to thrive, as is borne out by GCSE statistics regarding grades.
- more needs to be done to build and share good progress across all schools
- Most of all, all schools should be supported to be able to deliver the same standards
- My child has the right to go to their nearest, local school, to be a part of that community, have access to no commute, after school activities. All schools should be funded appropriately. This proposed approach is sellotaping together a broken system which needs fixing by funding, not by moving children around the city.
- Needs to include SEN children too
- No child should be disadvantaged. This also includes not forcing children to travel long distances to struggling schools as this would not support those children to thrive
- No child should be held back from their education because of their postcode.
- Not all children are the same so one system will not do this
- Not at the expense of my own children and their access to a good school and a good education.
- Just as SEN children are provided extra support, I think that gifted children should also receive additional support
- Just because you get free school meals does not mean you should get a priority to choose your school

- Obviously all children should have access to a school that helps them thrive but this is a very leading question
- Our children already have the right to the same education and standards under the current system.
- My child has the right to go to their nearest school. All Brighton schools should be good and funded appropriately to ensure their success. Shifting boundaries to reduce FSM disparities is papering over the cracks and the easy option for the council to avoid dealing with the real issues at poorly performing schools.
- Not if it's a race to the bottom , lowering all standards mean no child gets what they need from school , better off families subsidised with tutors poorer families can't
- Of course - but this is nothing to do with catchment areas, it has to do with resourcing schools adequately, especially those with a high intake of disadvantaged children
- Of course all children getting a good education is extremely important
- Of course all children have a right to a good education but that does not mean disrupting all schooling for all children to make this happen.
- Of course all children have the right to the same education and standards. HOwever two of the current proposals seem to lower the potential rights and standards across a larger proportion of the children in the city rather than attempt to raise the standards for all. which is much more important in my opinion
- Over time, the education system in Brighton has come to favour only certain children, from certain demographic groups. ALL children need to thrive and achieve.
- Sending Fiveways kids to Longhill against their will is NOT giving them access to the same education and standards is it?
- supporting FSM children would be better rather than just redistributing them - that won't solve their disadvantage. Families as a whole need support.
- Yes but not to the detriment of others.
- I don't think that reorganising school catchments necessarily is an answer to some of the causes of different levels of provision. The way these questions are phrased are a bit pointless - who would really say no? issue is how this is done, and what other measures to counter social deprivation are put in place to support schools, like rent control, youth support etc. School catchment area changes cannot address these issues on their own. I dont think answering yes to a question as broad ranging as this on the principle of quality schooling implies that agreement to alter catchment areas is a way to achieve these aims. It would be good if demographic mix was distributed fairly across the schools, but geographical reality means this is difficult to achieve without long travel distances eliminating the possibility of travel by foot.
- Strongly support this, and development of high standard education for all.
- Supporting children to thrive means funding them, more funding to poorer performing schools to bring them up, funding travel for ALL children. Plenty of families are struggling but don't qualify for FSM.
- Parity across Brighton & Hove is what should be strived for.
- Same chances, same equity to be able access the same opportunities. Deserve the right to have a solid education.
- The council should be working with schools to create more equity in education at the staff and curriculum level rather than just reshuffling students around which does nothing to change the actual quality of education
- The current system plus letting fsm students have first choice is probably the easiest approach - along with gradual decrease in intake these students should also get free bus passes - as should 16-18s so they can travel - might have to have a express lemon bus for the schools in question.
- The current system does not allow children in the most deprived areas of the city to achieve and thrive as the school in east Brighton for example is in need of improvement and fails children.

- See previous comment. All children are different and all children and parents deserve to have a choice based on what is best for their individual circumstances.
- So why isn't the council supporting this? There are huge disparities between the quality of schools in different parts of the city.
- The current system traps those in the east of the city into poor education.
- The exact same education ignored the need for schools to tailor and flex to the needs of their community and individual pupils - as much as is possible within our system.
- The obvious answer is yes but this is a very unfair question because no one would deny a child the right to a good education. However this is unfortunately not possible in all areas of Brighton and Hove (B&H) currently. Most schools in B&H are rated good by Ofsted but there are unfortunately two persistently underperforming schools (BACA/Longhill) as I mentioned previously. Given this I would presume that not all children there are 'achieving and thriving' as they could be in another school. As there are higher levels of children eligible for FSM in these schools, the FSM policy would improve access to other schools making things more equitable, however we need results to see this and that's what we don't have before giving catchment opinions. This was suggested by the councils own academic Dr Greaves in the People Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 9th Oct who said the FSM policy may go some way to correct educational disadvantage, and we should wait to see what happens with the FSM policy before changing too much else. It was also suggested at this meeting that the most important factor in childrens attainment is the home environment.. On a more positive note Brighton council has done something new and ground-breaking in improving educational opportunities/equitability with the FSM policy this year, however this is being overshadowed by the current catchment proposals and PAN reductions. I also feel that the system changes proposed will not support all children to thrive, for example children with SEND that do not qualify for an EHCP that are being uprooted from their communities and possibly asked to travel much further away than their local school on more than one bus to a secondary school. Also children with mental health problems and medical needs that find it hard enough to get into school already, like my son. His mental health worker has told us she would work at the likely secondary school he would go to which would help with continuity of care. This is now up in the air and very distressing, and there is no priority for children with SEND/mental health problems/medical needs that don't qualify for EHCP. Also young carers, I have a disability and my son is classified as a young carer and he and others in his situation would not be prioritised. At the engagement meeting on 16th Oct it was clear from Richard Barker's response to a question on SEND children that without an EHCP they would not be supported further following any catchment changes. It feels not all children are being supported to achieve and thrive because of this and it seems now children with siblings outside of catchment are being prioritised above them and they are less likely to get in if PANs are reduced also. This is extremely distressing for parents of SEN children/children with mental health or medical conditions/young carers. I feel this would increase absence rates, put more cars on the Brighton roads (hence environmental impact) and like I said before move children to alternative options so reducing budgets further.
- Therefore, I believe improving underperforming schools would be the way to support all children to thrive and achieve. This could be done by the FSM policy, reducing PANs in underperforming schools and allowing the schools to function as smaller schools, or a federation between Longhill and a more successful school. This engagement exercise in my opinion, brings the poor reputations of BACA and Longhill further to light which does not help these schools.
- All schools should be made good to ensure this happens. that does not mean letting all kids have access to lots of different schools. All local schools should be good. Not reinforcing notion Ds/Varndean are the ones to strive for.

- The results of this survey question will tell you nothing and should not be used as a basis for decision making. What answer would you possibly expect other than 'yes'
- The school setting is only part of a child's education environment. They will not and cannot achieve or thrive if they are not supported in the home, do not have access to the tools and support to do homework and study, have to travel long distances out of their community and potentially away from friends. The school is one part of the picture, but there are other factors which need to be taken into account. You also need to explain how one system will meet the wide range of needs for different children
- The system should give opportunities for all children to go to a good school, maybe improving all schools is a good starting point.
- The proposals don't offer this for all students.
- The point of government maintained education means that it is open to all. An inclusive system benefits all
- The trial of FSM children having access to any school they choose is a much more effective way to do this giving choice rather than forcing them to go to schools far away from home because they have no choice as you are proposing.
- There is huge disparity due to religion, affluent catchment areas etc. So, as much as this would be ideal, the way the current system works is flawed. It may be the child's right to have the same education and standards but provisions are not provided for this currently or in any of the options on offer.
- The trial of FSM children having access to any school they choose is a much more effective way to do this giving choice rather than forcing them to go to schools far away from home because they have no choice as you are proposing.
- The trial of FSM children having access to any school they choose is a much more effective way to do this giving choice rather than forcing them to go to schools far away from home because they have no choice as you are proposing.
- Your proposals appear to be disadvantaging my children.
- This proposal does not take into consideration the needs of SEN children. This is a growing cohort of disadvantaged in B&H and their specific needs are being disregarded. This could be an amazing opportunity to find solutions to support SEND and other disadvantaged children across the city
- This statement doesn't hold true as long as people can buy private educations with small class sizes. All the state schools have huge class sizes
- We already have this, as children's who have FSM or are otherwise disadvantaged receive greatest priority.
- There are many schools in London that have a high proportion of FSM. What can we learn from them? The solution is not forcing 11 year olds on long journeys on multiple buses and having to wait at bus stops in the dark in winter, probably without friends from the local area, due to the long journey times involved in commuting. This is potentially very unsafe for young girls. Please look at the break down of rape statistics, where secondary age girls are particularly at risk
- Through priorities, like free school meals and home to school distance, to reduce pollution & long distance travelled which can be dangerous especially in the winter months.
- There is only one school option for children in Saltdean and I don't believe that it provides the same level of education as other schools in the area
- I believe in a school system that supports all children to achieve and thrive but I do not believe this should be done through redrawing catchment areas so that children who live near to thriving schools are disadvantaged by forcing a good proportion of them to have to attend a failing school that is miles away from where they live. Money should be pumped into the failing school to bring it up to the standard of thriving schools so that all children, no matter where they live, have a thriving school on their door step

- This shouldn't be dependent on the school they attend. All schools should be good schools.
- They should, but please consider ALL children. Don't make the situation worse for anyone to better others please

I also want to point out that the council is rushing this proposal. I urge the council to pause further action for 2-3 years to see the impact the change to FSM allocations policy has on the spread of FSM through the city. By giving every disadvantaged child the right to go to whichever school they choose, you are already providing that opportunity to children and addressing the balance of community within each school. How can you move on to further, more drastic measures before you have seen the effect of this change in policy first?

- We all want children to thrive. Wait for the effect of the FSM admissions change to take effect. This will for sure help close the attainment gap. As the experts said at the Scrutiny meeting, changing catchments is too much too soon. It risks alienating large groups in the city who will take action that will undermine the aims of this exercise.
- While I fully support the principle that all children deserve access to high-quality education, it is crucial to recognize that achieving this requires tailored support, especially for vulnerable pupils such as those with SEND and those impacted by the pandemic. The SEND Review (2022) underscores the need for personalized, localized support, highlighting that a one-size-fits-all approach may not adequately meet the diverse needs of children across the city. A system that truly helps all children achieve and thrive must ensure that schools have the capacity to support high-needs pupils. Schools like Longhill, currently rated as "Requires Improvement", are still addressing key issues like teaching consistency and behaviour management. The council's focus should be on building up these schools' infrastructure and resources so they can provide the individualized support necessary for SEND pupils and those struggling with the aftermath of the pandemic. Without addressing these core disparities in school capacity, the council risks overburdening already stretched schools and widening the educational gap, rather than closing it.
- 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.
- While I fully support the principle that all children deserve access to high-quality education, it is vital to consider that this cohort of children—born between September 2014 and August 2015 -was most significantly affected by the pandemic during their early schooling years. Studies, including the SEND Review (2022), show that achieving high educational standards for all children requires tailored support, especially for vulnerable pupils like these. A system that truly helps all children thrive must recognize the specific challenges facing this pandemic-affected cohort. Schools like Longhill, still rated as "Requires Improvement", are not yet fully prepared to provide the intensive support these pupils need as they transition from primary to secondary school. Without first addressing core disparities in school capacity and quality, redistributing students risks deepening the gap for this vulnerable cohort.
- Whilst I think the conditions for a child to thrive are bigger than simply school. It is a key factor in children lives and therefore every child should have the right to the same standards of education. As the scales are already heavily weighted against the most disadvantaged the rectifying may feel biased to begin with but equality doesn't start by treating everyone the same.
- While I fully support the principle that all children deserve access to high-quality education, it is crucial to recognize that achieving this requires tailored support, especially for vulnerable pupils such as those with SEND and those impacted by the pandemic. The SEND Review (2022) underscores the need for personalized,

localized support, highlighting that a one-size-fits-all approach may not adequately meet the diverse needs of children across the city. A system that truly helps all children achieve and thrive must ensure that schools have the capacity to support high-needs pupils. Schools like Longhill, currently rated as "Requires Improvement", are still addressing key issues like teaching consistency and behavior management. The council's focus should be on building up these schools' infrastructure and resources so they can provide the individualized support necessary for SEND pupils and those struggling with the aftermath of the pandemic. Without addressing these core disparities in school capacity, the council risks overburdening already stretched schools and widening the educational gap, rather than closing it.

- All children have the right to the same opportunities to thrive, but it is a complex issue with many components (not just education) and 'leveling down' is not the answer
- Yes all children should be supported to achieve and thrive. Achieving equity is a complex issue.
- Why should it be limited on postcode? Every child deserves the right to a good education
- Thriving through choice and support
- Those who do not wish to learn should not be left to distract those that do
- Yes all children should be supported to do well. But you won't be supporting all by lifting up some at the expense of others.
- The issue is that the "same education and standards" is not the answer when school age children are hugely diverse and need all sorts of very different provision to thrive and achieve.
- Yes all children have the right to the same education and standards and to feel safe. Schools with very high SEN are struggling to meet those needs. The local authority should allocate places across all schools so that schools are able to meet need and the whole cohort thrive. ren should be able to thrive , this sadly not case In all schools in the city at present
- We need to mold the minds of today and help them thrive
- Yes - this is complex and it is vital that children with challenges such as SEND, and mental and physical health problems, are not disadvantaged further by being forced to make ridiculous journeys to school.
- Yes - although the issues underlying why children in different areas are not thriving go deeper than where the catchment areas are.
- Yes but supporting all children to achieve shouldn't involve disadvantaging children from less-deprived areas, who still face plenty of challenges (e.g. mental health, wellbeing generally, bullying, safety etc). The proposals seem by and large to seek to achieve equity by removing access for some (more privileged) children from better performing schools located close to where they live, and forcing them to travel significant distances, very possibly via inadequate public transport, to attend lower performing and/or unpopular schools. Equally this is based on the premise that parents with children in the currently lower performing/less popular schools will want their children to travel long distances to attend the better performing schools. There currently appears to be no data supporting this premise so this could result in a lose-lose situation. The council should make efforts to increase the standards and appeal at those lower performing schools, for the benefit of their local communities and children, not to penalise and lower the standards of children living in the current catchment of the popular and/or better performing schools.
- I do but to suggest some school are not doing well because of higher FSM students isn't right. This is not down to the 'type' of students that go to a school. The school should be set up to support their local students and adapt appropriately for the local community they are in.
- There all families should have choice over which school might suit them best for their child to thrive

- Yes all children should be in a school where they can reach their full potential and thrive so a 'choice' of secondary school is useful as different schools suit different children. However I think it important that children are not allocated a school which involves significant travel time to get there (greater than 40 minutes) if they have not expressed a preference for that school and there are other schools closer e.g. a child living next door to Stringer should not be allocated BACA or Longhill unless they have expressed a preference for that school rather than Stringer, Varndean or Patcham which are closer.
- Yes and it should be a high standard throughout
- Yes but it has to be fair and considered
- Yes, of course I agree. So level up the schools and obviate the need to arbitrarily shunt a whole set of children into a school that does not have these same 'standards' as you define them..
- Yes it's important all children from all backgrounds and areas get access to good education. Critical for them to thrive
- Yes should not matter where you live
- Yes students should be given the right to the same education and standards, but changing of catchment area is not the best solution to achieve this aim as it causes more problems than it solves. For example, a larger catchment area means a longer distance travel to/from school. A smaller catchment area means students actually have no choices.
- Education should not be a rich poor divide. Blatch and Hove are good examples
- Equality of access to high educational outcomes is very important for a thriving city and for reducing social inequality.
- Equality is everything
- Education system does not support children with special educational needs and disabilities
- Every child absolutely does have this right but moving school catchments isn't going to solve this issue. Money, time and professional expertise will help much more.
- And I think that some children need more significant support from government and schooling to help them to do. FSM children are one such cohort, but others include SEND (not only those with EHCP), EAL and pupil premium. There is also a huge mental health epidemic for children and teenagers and this means that we need to consider much wider impacts before making changes that only focus on one cohort (i.e. FSM as these proposals do).
- Yes it should be fair to ALL
- Yes we need a fair and equal educational system. I don't believe private schools should exist!
- Yes however, that is not happening at present and the gaps in provision need to be fixed and access levelled.
- Yes! Equally of access for all! Parity for the east of Brighton!!!
- Yes, all children should be supported and thrive. But I do not agree on a small number of children from a select area being used as guinea pigs to prop up a failing school.
- Yes, and in order to support children one must offer them the widest choice of schools possible
- Yes but not at any cost. Forcing some students to commute much longer than their peers, or to have to be driven versus walking, or to lose all their friends from primary school to force them into a new school where they don't know anyone. This would then create more inequalities at other levels.
- Yes, but not for improving a certain cohort of disadvantaged pupils at the expense of children who are already thriving or without improving the situation for all

disadvantaged pupils. The much fairer solution is improve the under performing schools.

- Yes, but not at the expense of reducing existing high standards through social engineering. Those schools not at the levels of others need support to also become high performing.
- Yes, but not at the expense of threatening or reducing opportunities for those who are already thriving
- Yes, however some of the current proposals suggest that the Council believe that children on FSM should have greater rights than children who are not on FSM and prioritise giving those children greater choice to the detriment of other children
- Yes, in particular we need to support the growing number of children who fall in between mainstream and special school - so many children are falling through the cracks and the current system doesn't support them well enough.
- Yes, of course - we all want children to achieve and thrive, that is a ridiculous question, but having the same education and standards is only one aspect of what helps children achieve and thrive. Plus the system you are proposing is likely to do the opposite if you look at the bigger picture and potential impact of proposed changes. If children are unable to go to their nearest secondary this would hugely impact their ability to achieve & thrive and sending children across the city to support pupil numbers at unpopular schools is not the solution.
- Yes, of course. However don't the children who are entitled to free school meals have the option of applying for any school they so wish?!
- Again, high quality education is so important. Redistributing vulnerable students or those with SEND could deepen the gap instead of working on supporting these pupils in their local neighbourhood. Longhill for example "requires improvement" but so far staffing issues and behaviour management hasn't been addressed.
- No one can pretend that our current school system provides social equity. For too long the debates have labelled 'problem' communities with 'problem' children in 'failing' schools and lauded schools with low levels of inclusion as 'outstanding'. We need to redefine success in our education system at the city level and stop labelling those in our community who carry the heaviest burdens as a 'problem'. We need to live up to our values as a progressive community.
- Yes, there should be a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive, but I would only support initiatives that are responsible, sustainable, and properly designed, based on data, so that disadvantaged children can do better, while others do not have a negative impact on their lives. All children are very important.
- You can't isolate a single strand, of poverty, education for example, and use it to disguise the deep rooted multi generational poverty that some children are born to. Tinkering with catchments in covering the budget deficits for a declining birthdate so stop playing games making children bus themselves across the city every day.
- You can do this by having fewer schools though! Support those children who live further away from popular schools to come in on public transport - don't ship children who live within walking distance of thriving and supportive school catch buses to failing ones and also force siblings to go to different schools just because of some silly social engineering fad to mix things up and change catchments.. I'm seriously concerned by these proposals
- you are very far from achieving this for SEN.
- This issue has already been partly addressed by prioritising FSM pupils in admissions criteria.
- Again, this is backwards thinking - redraw the catchment map to give those on FSMs more choice, not improving the schools close to them.
- All disadvantaged children should be supported to achieve (FSM, low income, refugee, EHCP, SEND support young carers etc). All vulnerable children need to be considered when looking at school provision. As another criteria, it should be good

practice to minimise travel time to school and ideally prioritise walking over bus/car and bike.

- It should not be a socio economic factor that decides life chances.
- Because they all deserve the same
- As per previous answer, obviously the system should support children to achieve and thrive but not at any cost.
- As long as it doesn't come at the cost of allowing the most able to achieve and thrive
- I think the ambition should be for equity rather than equality, which means that some children, for example those with SEN may require a different educational environment and additional/different standards to be met. I think therefore all children should have access to the appropriate education and standards required to thrive, not the same.
- It is not just about trying to send disadvantaged children to certain schools by re-arranging the boundaries. Family background and parental responsibilities matter enormously.
- Absolutely all children should have the same level of access
- Schools today must support a diverse range of students, each with unique needs and challenges. From day to day, teachers and staff work with students who speak English as an additional language (EAL), those in or recently out of care, students with special educational needs (SEN), including those with Education, Health, and Care (EHC) plans, and students with low prior attainment. Many students also come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, such as those eligible for free school meals, or have relocated to the city, often requiring additional support as they adjust to a new environment. Each of these groups has distinct complexities, and it is crucial that schools provide tailored interventions that promote equity and inclusion. No single group should take precedence over another. For instance, EAL students may require language support to access the curriculum, while those with SEN may need personalised learning plans. Students from low-income families may face barriers that hinder their academic and personal growth, demanding both financial and emotional support. To achieve true inclusivity, schools must share the responsibility across the entire school community, ensuring that all students are valued and supported. This requires a collaborative effort, where leadership, staff, and support systems work in unison. By balancing the needs of all students and avoiding prioritisation of one group over another, schools can create an environment that fosters success for every child, regardless of their background or circumstance. In doing so, they promote fairness and a culture of inclusion for all. By changing the catchment areas can you ensure equity across all vulnerabilities or is this just a tick box exercise?

6. Child Wellbeing and Development

- Yes. However - the council options proposed do not support all children to achieve and thrive. This will impact those children's mental health - their sleep will suffer and they will miss out on before and after school enrichment activities. All children should have access to a good education in their local area.
- My daughter is only 7 but has heard rumours about changes and is already worrying about being separated from her friends and her community. There are children who will suffer as a result of this ideological social engineering.
- Because from the moment children start school, some are already at a disadvantage compared to their peers. This needs to be taken into consideration when measuring standards. For children to achieve and thrive, they need the right support, tailored to their needs.

- Absolutely, but more needs to be done to bring the schools up to standards. Changing the catchment areas and making children who have schools within walking distance, which are up to standards seems ludicrous. Fix the below standard schools, then those within walking distance to those schools will thrive and not feel penalised. No child should have to travel over 5 miles to a school, if it can be helped. Your proposals force this on children that do not have to make the long distance travel. It is not in their best interests what-so-ever. Fixing the actual issue is key here. It seems these new plans create more problems. Studies show kids who do not have to get up early to travel and get home late from travelling do better. They will be fresher to complete their homework. How do you feel after a long day at work, travelling and then coming home knowing you still have work to complete. It is draining, it is not restful.
- A concern is that not all children learn at the same rate nor do they understand things at the same rate so whilst i agree with the above, i struggle to understand the expectation of the education sysytem to teach all children the same thing at the same rate when children have different abilities to acheiving. Also some achievements for children are the smallest things that may not always get recognised
- Achieve and thrive must consider not only educational attainment but also mental health. For mental health to be optimised children aged only 11 need to make this significant transition to a local school, particularly where their primary school is a feeder school and transition arrangements are excellent and the progression sensitively managed.
- 2) Children should feel SAFE! A feeling of safety cannot be achieved by requiring an 11 year old to be transported large distances by public transport, often in the dark during winter periods, Experiencing additional mental strains due to the number and complexity (and congestion) of buses, with Additional air pollution.. And they should certainly not be required to do this incredibly unsociable early and late hours.
- I believe that there are many contributing elements to a system which enables all children to achieve and thrive. The quality of the schools are one element, but also important are elements such as the children's mental health, their safety and security, their physical health, a sense of community, and having the conditions right to facilitate learning. Focusing too much on any one element at the cost of the others, in my view, will not result in a system which supports all children to achieve and thrive. When it comes specifically to education standards, to ensure this is fair to all, the city should strive to raise levels of those schools which are underperforming without lowering the standard of those already performing well. All children should have their closest schools as high performing schools to offer them a good choice, and enable them the balance of elements needed to achieve and thrive.
- I am a school counsellor and the rise in anxiety in all children is alarming post-Covid. These children are struggling to connect in their communities after all that lockdown entailed, and increasing anxiety by forcing children with close by schools to travel long distances with a dependence on public transport is only going to add to the mental health struggles of children and teens. CAMHS is at breaking point - why would you choose this as a hill to die on? All children must suffer because some children already have to travel long distances? I'm aware you have no duty to SEND children without an EHCP, but don't you have an ethical duty to children as public servants?
- As with the previous question, of course children should achieve and thrive. But what does "the same education and standards" mean? The same curriculum/extra-curricular activities? The same exam results/level of achievement? What system change is needed to ensure children achieve and thrive?
- Every child has the right to access education but the needs for one group might be different for another. We shouldn't assume all children will thrive in the same schooling environment.

- Every child has the right to a wonderful, fruitful education opportunity. They are our future.
- Forcing children to separate from friends and travel long distances will create tiredness, cost and anxiety for both students and parents. This will NOT help children to achieve and thrive.
- Brighton and Hove can not continue to ignore the fact that we have for generations let pupils down when statistics show this isn't even slightly improving. How many more children are we willing to let slip before we start to respect each child's right to a good education.
- But I don't think the way to achieve it is to force children to be carted around the city on a daily basis. It has big implications on traffic and pollution and does nothing for children's mental health. Ideally all children in the city should have a good school in reasonable walk distance or a short bus stop away, using the public buses.
- Depends on the child needs. The proposed changes will also be detriment to children
- Including not forcing children to travel and lose sleep.
- I don't agree that all children should access the same education. Children are different and have differing needs. All children should have access to an excellent education that suits THEM as individuals.
- Flawed question as you don't define thriving and sustainable and maintaining any school can't be at the cost of the pupils wellbeing
Flawed question as you don't define thriving and sustainable and maintaining any school can't be at the cost of the pupils wellbeing
- Education inside of school is interrelated to the health and well-being of each pupil. Therefore, the pupils support group, the parent's capacity to assist in their education and the time outside of school is paramount to the productivity within the classroom. Therefore, keeping children within their community and reducing commute times will have an arching benefit to the overall success of the child.
- I believe children also thrive when they have an option to attend a school with their peers, progression to senior school is already a huge change to process. Accompanied by limited options to remain with some peers, I feel, may compound apprehension and have unfavourable academic results.
- I think there should be some element of choice, some kids do better in arts or crafts, or languages or academic subjects, so it's not bad if there is some difference
- I think this question misses the point. Under several of the options given, this will disadvantage families where the children will have to travel further to school, and are less likely to start a new school without their friends and former school mates
- The councils should also be trying to support children in their local area to minimise travel times for all and protect children safety and wellbeing
- Schools can make the difference for poorer children
- Yes, all children should be supported to do their best.
- But not at the expense of child safety when you are sending children a huge distance to other schools and not letting them attend the school literally opposite their house (surrenden crescent)
- I would also like to see opportunities for less academic students to develop interests that then give an incentive to Learn. Harness a child's enthusiasm to spur on learning
- Of course, but don't think this idea does will support all children to thrive. I think it will make it far worse.
- Education provision should be based on the needs of the individual child, not all children are the same
- I would advocate for children to be able to attend good schools within their local community. This is a leading question. A large number of children will not thrive if they have to travel two hours per da and this will have a profound impact on their wellbeing.

- I would say yes but not to the expense of children's safety as some children in proposal B will have a ridiculously long journey to school when there are a number of closer schools in their area that they can attend easily. If plan b goes ahead and my child is sent to longhill I would move out of the city. We pay a ridiculous amount of money to live in the city itself and to have your child sent to an underperforming school miles away is ridiculous
- It's what every child deserves
- Of course all children should be supported by the education system to achieve and thrive, schools should be able meet the different needs of children, including disadvantaged children, because they have the resources, leadership and governance to do so. This should be the focus of the council, not trying to manipulate catchment areas in an attempt to mix children from different parts of the city at the expense of the children who have to travel and the schools who will struggle to build a strong community of parents and carers invested in their success if they don't live as close by.
- My child received no education provided by the state for his last term of primary school and all of secondary due to SEND (autism and anxiety, very academically able and non-troublesome child) He was on roll at state schools for two and a half years of this time, but not able to attend. Nothing was provided either by individual schools or the LA.
- Not all children will achieve and thrive in our current school system. That's just a sad fact. Schools don't have the capacity or funding to give equal opportunities. Not all students will respond well to a school environment due to an array of factors. Years of underfunding and lack of investment in education have led to this situation. Different schools will excel in different areas depending on staff, facilities and pupils. A system that gives all children equal support to achieve and thrive will have to address a myriad of factors including physical and mental health, government funding, staffing, facilities, deprivation, lack of affordable housing, transport, congestion etc.
- Of course all children have the right to a good education, but proximity to schools should be the primary eligibility criteria. Not expect children to have to commute across the City everyday. This brings huge stress and safety concerns to families. To address disparity in the quality of education at every school in the City, the council need to invest in the struggling schools to bring up their standards.
- Of course it's important for all children to thrive BUT NOT at the cost of creating new 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!!
- Sadly not all children will achieve and thrive with the same input. They are all individuals and their achievements and life goals will vary greatly.
- Personally I don't believe that achievement should be the aim. I would rather my children were happy and healthy.
- Not at the expense of mental health, time with family and the ability of parents to do a full days work!
- they need to thrive in all aspects of life - being with friends, not being split from friends due to living on the opposite side of the road, not travelling miles or being used to make a rubbish school better
- Of course we want all children to thrive but we need to look into the schools to do that and not just by putting children into any schools that could be further for that child to travel. Putting children into schools that are further to travel will enable single parents to work (as they would have to drive their children to school) causing more of an economic divide.

- Only if access for all does not impact outcomes for children with fewer additional needs.
- Of course all children should be supported to thrive,
- Yes I agree, so why limit access to Varndean? Why have 2+ years waiting lists for CAHMS disproportionately impacting neurodivergent children? Why don't schools have proactive domestic violence policies in place protecting children and their primary caregivers from abusers and trauma which impacts education and health? Reducing student numbers, changing catchment areas is not fixing what needs fixing.
- Some children struggle to achieve but they are just as important as high achievers, so some children need a different education which targets their high, medium or low achievement needs.
- To thrive you need to not have a really long journey to school every day. Much better for well being and school attainment to live near the school you go to so you have time to study after school.
- We should embrace the passion we have in this city to provide the best care for children and whilst I fully support the principle that all children deserve access to high-quality education, it is crucial to recognize that achieving this requires tailored support and this should be thought through properly
- Well - while standard should be the same - children are different and it is OK I think for some schools to have focus areas, like some known for arts, others for sports, and then children should ideally be going to the one that suits them. This is how it was in my city when I was young, and because the schools were different, but all schools were accessible to all, none of them were overrun by kids so to speak.
- Yes but again this is too vague. Introducing long 2 hour+ journeys to a school for example, would not enable most children to achieve or thrive particularly if there are options closer to their home. This doesn't consider the additional needs of children with disabilities or neuro-developmental needs not subject to an EHCP. This question is very vague and idealistic.
- Yes but this should be done on a way that disrupts as few children across the city as possible
- Yes but Forcing children to travel across the city for secondary school will lead to anxiety, poor MH & lower attendance. Keep the current school places on the better performing schools where demand is higher.
- Yes I believe all children have the right to good education standards but also they have the right to attend school within their own community where they have developed friendships. For some children change is hard to accept and through out the primary years they have been building relationships and wouldn't want to see my child placed in a school far from home and away from friends
- Yes I do, however the proposals I feel could have damaging effects on more students across the city, by increasing commutes for more children which would have negative effects upon mental health and wellbeing. I am concerned for parents and children who have children with special educational needs without formal plans (as its so hard to get these with the threshold so high and many barriers for parents) it concerns me that these children would fall through the gaps and find these commutes challenging on top of an already challenging experience of school itself. I also feel concerned about some of these long commutes being unsafe especially for younger children- for instance in the darker hours in winter. I believe under some of the proposals children would need to be at bus stops prior to 7am in order to get to school. I have two children, who aren't even teenagers yet and I struggle to get them out of the door for a 9am start (which is a walk to a local school). There is also a lot of research on the importance of sleep within teenagers and their developing brain- I would be concerned that some of these proposals would have a negative impact on this element of a child's life and ability to learn.

- Ultimately, I am of the belief that the all round holistic care for children: of which education is only one part - cannot be achieved by requiring families and children to travel the length of the city, to attend school.
-

7. Implementation and Evidence

- Yes, through improvement in provision. My children are at Brunswick and even though it is a middle class area the provision is not good. There is little evidence that changing catchment areas and increasing the time taken to travel to school improves performance. I feel as if you are experimenting with our children with little or no evidence.
- You are knee jerking to this issue and putting in place change after immediate change without pausing to evaluate the changes already in place. Instead of shipping in children from inner city out to schools on the boundary edges of our city, wait to see if the strong changes you have already put in place will have the desired effect on the viability of Longhill. Instead of waiting to see if you have managed to level up Longhill for the improved future of children in the east of the city, you are imposing long commutes on children from the middle of the city, affecting their own future attainment, educationally, physically and emotionally, as well as the environmental and transport infrastructure impact on our city
- Hopefully you have learnt via misplaced 11-year olds in recent years that primary school year six peer groups should not be unnecessarily broken up on transition ? Otherwise this is a silly, patronising question !
- I believe that schools functioning at the moment are successful and this should not change. Underperforming schools should face more support through funding and addressing social needs in the area.
- To think otherwise would be ludicrous, this is best achieved through properly researched and properly administered strategies, not hasty changes
- Yes but don't presume this proposal achieves this outcome
- I also don't feel comfortable that the data to support this change is sound.
- Yes, but it depends on what the system entails.
- Yes of course but I don't think your proposal addresses this.
- Yes but the council is also responsible for coming up with a solution that does not disadvantage other children or family cohorts
- Yes but not via the options currently outlined in the proposals
- Yes but not in the way you are proposing
- Yes but I don't think these proposals will achieve that.
- Yes but I do not believe your proposal will do this as they do not address the financial inequalities & severe lack of funding
- Yes, and the current one doesn't do that. I don't think changing the admission process is necessarily going to address this though.
- Yes and for that reason, the council cannot proceed with this initiative whilst 2 schools are "requires improvement"- they should absolutely focus on getting them to an acceptable standard before attempting to engage the public on this. Stop blaming the children for the schools where the education provided is sub standard- once those schools are good the problem with PANs will sort itself..."build it and they shall come".
- Yes - but I do not agree that the current proposals will do this
- Totally agree
- This is utterly insulting. Who would disagree? But the sense one is being railroaded into a solution is very strong.

- This is the second time in recent history that this kind of LA exercise has been carried out by people who seem to know or care little about education
- This is hard to disagree with
- This is impossible to answer without knowing the context?? I cant 'agree on a system' without knowing what it is.
- This is an ideal but your boundary changes will not achieve it.
- I agree with the goal but I do not agree that the proposed change is the only way to achieve this.
- This approach is only fair.
- Things should remain as they are. It schools require improvement, they should be given the funding to do so.
- There is no evidence that the proposals will have any impact on which children 'thrive'. Children in Brighton & Hove on low incomes have poorer outcomes academically is multifactorial. In areas where those on low income have a BAME background culturally education is given greater importance by communities than in lower income areas with a predominantly white background such as Brighton. Therefore in communities such as London or Birmingham children from lower income families will have different levels of support for education at home, nearly changing schools will not impact there needs to be increased community support where required not changing of catchment areas.
- There has not been enough information and evidence supplied at this stage.
- There are different answers to this question depending on the context
- The support should take the form of allocating additional funding to all schools in Brighton and extra funding to those which struggle, rather than reshuffle the pupil population with absolutely no resources and the have the wishful thinking that outcomes will improve automatically.
- The statement is not clear. What is meant with it. Is more mixing needed? If so have other impacts the environment taken into account.
- I have also not seen evidence/data that supports that the catchment changes will actually improve underperforming schools and the achievements of children there, so am not convinced the new catchments would support ALL the children in Brighton and Hove unfortunately. Sending in more children from outside their current catchment areas would be a system that sends more children to schools that unfortunately do not support them to achieve and thrive.
- The current proposals do not represent such system. (as per previous and further comments)
- System is a vague concept
- Postcode lottery currently which seems unfair.
- Please leave the system the way it is.
- what processes do you plan to put in place children are thriving? Do you believe some schools are currently not supportive children to thrive? If so what support are those schools going to receive to ensure all children can thrive?
- But the current system doesn't allow this and I'm not sure any of the proposed ones will actually allow this with two schools in special measures and having been struggling for decades. Could another option be to open a new school at the top of Elm Grove?
- Of course, but this does tend towards homogenised outcomes with some children being held back in order to improve the attainment of others. How will "the same standards" help more able children to achieve their full potential?
- Of course I'd like all children to be supported to thrive and achieve. But I don't see how these proposals will improve the system and I'm concerned about the impact of these proposals.
- Obviously yes. However I do not feel the proposed changes will do this.

- Obviously I agree. Who wouldn't? it's how this is achieved that is important, not if this is desirable - it's self-evidently desirable.
- 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.
- Not sure how changing catchments should affect this. All Brighton & Hove schools should be able to give the same level of high quality education to all pupils regardless of background.
- Not if it means option B, which will split communities and force city centre students to travel a long bus journey every day.
- Not enough details about this system is provided here for me to be able to make a decision
- I don't really understand why these wider philosophical and political questions are being asked regarding very specific consultation about school catchments. Introducing generic, blanket statements about ethos and aims without presenting them in a clear manner with actionable goals isn't helpful.
- No, I don't believe in your proposed solution. I'm also suspicious of the lack of clearly shared info, rushed meetings and tight deadlines.
- Leading question. I do however this proposal and the options included do not support this. New plan required.
- Leading question. Disagree strongly with proposals and don't think question is worded in a way that allows me to say this
- It's a basic and it needs fixing
- It's an admirable idea and wonderful in theory but how can it be accomplished realistically?
- It would be good to understand what's behind this question - it seems hard to imagine anyone disagreeing with it, so I hope it's not used to indicate evidence of support for some (currently unclear) future proposal.
- It would be crazy to have a system that supports all children to achieve and thrive
- Is this a rhetorical question I wonder. I wonder if the council can come up with more pertinent questions to truly get to the heart of things that matter in education. I'd like to know who devised these questions and following maps of catchment areas and how our diverse community is reflected in the creation and rolling out of this questionnaire.
- In principle yes, but depends what the system is
- Ideologically I'd love all children to thrive, but I'm not convinced that changing the school boundaries will address the social and parental issues that cause underachievement.
- Ideally yes but is this actually achievable
- I do not believe there should be aggressive changes as what is proposed
- I do not agree with the suggested changes to the catchment areas
- I do agree, but there needs to be a more comprehensive analysis relative to the proposals presented to enable parents/carers make an informed decision.
- I am not entirely sure what ensuring all children thrive looks like. What evidence are the plans based on? Children thriving or not is a lot more nuanced than which school they go to
- How could the alternative be ethically acceptable?
- Disagree with premise of statement, there is always a price to pay for any choice

- don't understand, is it just a belief 'The council believes all of our children have the right to the same education' children with challenging learning needs are completely disadvantaged in current provision.
- depends what agenda this is trying to support
- Depends how it is implemented.
- But I don't believe any of these options provide that.
- But not necessarily agreeing that the proposals listed here will achieve that
- Brighton is a unique city and has the resources for a gold-standard state education system that is modelled across all schools.
- All parents and education authorities would share this view, but there must be other solutions than redefining catchment areas. What wider assessment have you done to evaluate the many factors affecting attainment in the council's secondary schools?
- Agree with the principle, but not the nonsensical proposals.
- Again, we do need to support all children but not based on a proposal which show a severe lack of research and evidence of its outcome. This document wouldn't pass at university, it shouldn't pass here.
- Again, of course I support the right for all children in Brighton and Hove to have high education standards, and for a system to achieve that end. This question does not provide details on how that will be achieved, and thereby ask for our feedback on the methods of how that system will work.
- Again, of course, who would answer no to this, this is not really a question that needs feedback....it is the story of question you get when someone is about to present you with THEIR IDEA of how to achieve this, rather than asking us, the parents about how WE think this could be achieved.
- Unfortunately, and especially: Option B in the council recommendations - The above factors are completely lost, And ultimately, the all-round holistic care for young children will be lost.
- Again I don't feel that the proposal helps with this
- Again does moving children around the city promote all children to thrive? Please share the evidence you have for this.
- Again framed to look like you agree with the reasoning for setting up this "proposal " of saving one school at the expense of the whole community as per my first comments
- Absolutely, but again the plan to address this is flawed and isn't likely to achieve the results you are looking for.
- "A system that supports all children to achieve and thrive" is obviously a positive that nobody would object to. It's not a yes/no question that can be answered without more detail.
- Absolutely but I don't think the changes proposed address that