

Comments received from parents/carers and groups 2015/2016

Date	Ref	Agree with admission arrangements?	Comments made
04.12.13	1	Yes	Just wanted to say I am in full agreement with the Council's proposals
04.12.13	2	Yes	I would agree that the criterion whereby attendance at the nursery previously added weight to an application should be removed. It is not always possible to use nursery schools linked to schools for working families, as usually there is only a half-day provision. This therefore gives unfair advantage to those able to use the nursery at the preferred school.
04.12.13	3	Yes	I am a city resident. I am in favour of all of the proposed changes that were outlined in your email.
04.12.13	4	Yes	Under criteria 5. I do not feel it is appropriate to give preferential treatment to children attending a linked nursery. Many working parents within catchment have to use a private nursery as some attached to schools have restrictive and inflexible hours not conducive to parents working hours. Such parents would be penalised because it would mean having to compete for spaces with children who attended the nursery but who do not live in catchment. In many cases the parents of these children have at least one parent not in employment and are therefore more able to use the nursery. When both parents work this is often not practically possible-you would predominantly be penalising working parents in catchment and favouring unworking parents outside of catchment. Unworking parents will fall into two main categories, those on benefits and those who are wealthy enough to allow one parent not to work. The group with two working parents are probably in a situation where both have to work in order to make ends meet, the so called "squeezed middle." Continued below
04.12.13	4	Yes	This group would also find it very difficult to go to schools outside of catchment since they have to drop at school then go directly to work. If they are unable to get a place in their catchment school they may have an unacceptable distance to travel to school and this may interfere with work. The system works well as it is. I appreciate that some parents complain that their children attend a nursery and then cannot get into the attached school, but equally, these parents have chosen not to send their children to their catchment nursery so are fully aware of the probability that they will not get a place. They may complain that it is unfair to their children but ultimately they have created the situation of themselves. I agree with the other two amendments

04.12.13	5	No	<p>Hello, I strongly object to widening the catchment area. This is very unfair on people who have moved to areas for schools and spent a lot of money on houses. We need to move but can't as I don't want to loose our school catchment for my second child. I know so many who have siblings that didn't get into the school and were literally the street across from catchment. I think they should have priority over widening to other areas. Other areas will just choose the best schools and stop those who live nearby with siblings getting in. I also disagree with not allowing nursery to be a criteria. Those who have grounding in the nursery should have preference over those who have not. I had to work but was able to sort out child minders to enable my son to attend the pre school. Others can't be bothered with the hassle as its easier to go to nursery, but for those who do their best to work around the hours and adjust child care arrangements I think it's fair being part of the criteria</p> <p>Many thanks</p>
05.12.13	6	Yes	<p>To whom it may concern, Regarding the above, as someone who has been directly affected by the school waiting list reduction time, I wholly support the change back to the original system. The new introduced system this year of 30 days was in my opinion simply unfair. I have recently moved in to an area where there is a over subscribed school. I was happy to wait until a place became available for my daughter as we currently travel 2 miles to her present school. But then to be told that she had been removed from the waiting list after 30 days was a shock, because that meant that if a place became available after this time someone applying at that time, whether in the catchment area or not would get the place before my daughter. I welcome the change to this criteria.</p>
06.12.13	7	No	<p>I would be grately disappointed for my child if she attended a nursery,settled in well and made a great social circle within that nursery to then be told she was not guaranteed a place at there primary school as would most parents.the transistion from nursery,reception to year 1 needs to be kept as familiar to the child as possible to avoid any undue upset.As we know a change of peers,school or anything unfamiliar can cause upset for a child of that age.I believe the policies we have now are in favor of the children to make the transition to primary as easy as possible for parents,teachers and especially the child.why would we really want to start shaking up the systems we have in place that seem to be working well for everyone involved</p>

07.12.13	8	No	<p>Yes we would very much like to give feedback regarding the proposal of School admission arrangements for 2015/16 because this is a very sensitive issue for many parent. With regard to increasing the period of time that the waiting list is open for within Infant/Primary/Junior schools (up until the last day of the summer half term) We have to say this length of time is unrealistic and also emotionally unfair to the child. Our son was offered our second choice of school closely followed by his induction which went fantastically well. So we quickly ordered his uniform at the school and our son was soon telling everyone where he was going to school which was a relief that he was so happy. However the thing that could have put a spanner in the works was a letter that we received the day before his first day at school, offering him a place at our fist choice of school! (we did appeal to the school at the time regarding his refused application). Continued below</p>
07.12.13	8	No	<p>At this late stage there was no way that we could pull our child away from a school that he felt comfortable and happy in, plus the fact that we had also got his uniform and he had told everyone the school he was going to. So we contacted the other school and arranged that day to take our son to have a look, to see how he felt about it and to give us both piece of mind. I am so glad that we did this as on this visit it was clear that this school was not the right choice for our son and the second choice was indeed the best. Olliver is very happy at his school and we are happy with the school too. I must say that we haven't seen the proposed catchment areas but we feel it could bring problems to amend the catcment areas to a wide capacity, as this could put schools under unwanted pressure to except other children over those who live closer to the school. Also parents want to send their child to a school for many reasons which include social as well as educational benefits. This is how a school sustains good ofstead reports. Contued below</p>

07.12.13	8	No	We agree that if a child is attending a nursery which is attached to the school, they should without doubt have an automatic place at that school because they are comfortable, they have friends, the parents are happy and all this will do is cause such allot of upset for all concerned. Such a bad idea and Nottingham folk will not be happy!!
08.12.13	9	No	On receiving this e-mail to these proposed changes for schools why don't you just leave things as they are! Do you not understand how difficult it is for parents to get to know the criteria and the way things operate.....obviously not..... what difference is it going to make.....seriously none it just looks good written down on paper. Instead put the resources to a better use by actually physically seeing what education will suit particular children rather than just opting for what's the easiest.
11.12.13	10	Yes	1. Remove criterion 5 - this is a sensible and fair approach as not all infant/primary schools offer this facility – I have no issue with this proposal and supportive of it. 2. Waiting list extension - again, sensible approach – I am a supporter of this change. 3. Amend catchment areas to incorporate all currently undesignated areas of the city - totally unsupportive of this point. The school my daughter goes to already receives approx. 80 applicants each year over and above the numbers they can accommodate, often resulting in catchment pupils application being rejected... this proposal would only compound this issue. In addition, when I purchased my property it was absolutely to ensure we lived in an area with a school with good OFSTED performance figures, this proposal would have a financial impact on us and therefore I am 100% unsupportive. Thank you for this information, this is much clearer now and given the detail below, I would support the proposal, Regards, Alison
19.12.13	11	No	I think that criterion 5 should not be removed. Children attending nursery already like the place . Make a lot of friends there . They get prepared to move to the school and they settle better.
19.12.13	12	?	As a parent, we have moved to a particular area to ensure our children have at least a level of priority when applying for a school. We trust that children living within catchment of a particular school will continue to be given priority. I'm mindful that following the news today, there will be increased applications for better performing schools but at the same time I trust the council will continue to prioritise children who live within catchment. Furthermore, we have children that are in different stages of school and see no benefit in not prioritising children where they are already in a connected school. For example, moving from infant to junior and then onto secondary. Surely, children should be prioritised and even more so if their siblings attend one of the adjoining schools. Not doing so would impact on the parents and indeed the need to start driving between schools rather than walking as we do today. Whilst, I am hopeful that we won't be affected by any changes I would be concerned that should the prioritisation of places as in place today be removed.

09.01.14	13	?	<p>Hi there, my son and daughter attend Fernwood Infant school, we purchased our home in this pricey area to ensure we were in catchment, I took comfort in knowing that once they had a place in the federation that was it- they would go through the school system, with the same friends and school routine from the age of 4 to 16 years. So I am very concerned that you propose to remove criteria 5 (i.e. pupils attending the nursery of the school will no longer be given any priority in the oversubscription criteria). Does this apply for infant to junior transition or just the nursery example given here?? I would hope that once a child has settled for 3 years in an infant school that they can relax and know that they will continue on within the same school onto juniors and beyond. We are in catchment but my son seemed to be in a baby boom year which meant places were tight and we are towards the edge of our catchment I believe (? Far Rye, NG8 1GJ) so I am now concerned about any changes to next years admissions.</p>
27.01.14	14	Yes	<p>Thank you for sending your proposed admission arrangements. The County Council has considered your arrangements and coordinated timelines for 2015-2016 and does not wish to raise any issues.</p>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]