

Committee:	Children's Services Scrutiny Committee
Date:	17 November 2014
Title of Report:	Inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement
By:	Director of Children's Services
Purpose of Report:	To update the committee on actions following the inspection and the approach to reviewing progress against the plan

Recommendation:

The committee is recommended to note the inspection letter following the inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement and to receive the post-inspection action plan and approve the approach to reviewing progress against the plan

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 The financial implications for the actions set out in the action plan were reported to Cabinet 16th September 2014. Where possible, resources within the SLES budget and staffing have been re-prioritised. An additional £870,000 has been identified from available Dedicated Schools Grant funds and the Corporate Transformation Fund to fund the improvements.

2. Supporting information

2.1 East Sussex County Council (ESCC) was inspected in June 2014 under the Ofsted inspection framework, which was introduced in May 2013, for local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement. The outcome of the inspection was published 4th August 2014. There are only two judgments for the inspection, effective or ineffective. The Council's arrangements for supporting school improvement are judged to be ineffective. The Ofsted judgement was reported to Cabinet on 16th September 2014.

2.2 The inspection letter, which is attached at appendix 1, highlighted key strengths and areas for improvement. The action plan has been developed to address the areas for improvement and this is attached at appendix 2.

2.3 The Local Authority will be re-inspected within 12 months of the June 2014 inspection. An inspection working group has been set up to monitor progress against the action plan, identify additional actions that need to be taken and to ensure readiness for the next inspection. A clear communications strategy has been developed and we are working in collaboration with schools and settings to ensure the best outcomes for children and young people in East Sussex.

2.4 The working group has developed a robust process through which we are monitoring progress against the action plan and identifying how our work, in partnership with schools and settings, is having an impact on the attainment and outcomes for children and young people.

2.5 Monitoring meetings have taken place with Ofsted, Department for Education officers and David Laws, Schools' Minister. Further monitoring will take place throughout the year.

3. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendations

3.1 In line with the Council's key priority to drive economic growth we are committed to improving educational outcomes for all children and young people in the County, from ensuring children are able to make a good start in the early years to raising the participation of 17 and 18 year olds in education. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the report and progress against the action plan.

STUART GALLIMORE

Director of Children's Services

Contact Officer: Amanda Watson, Planning and Performance Manager

Tel: 01273 481339

Local Members: All

Background Documents:

Tribal
1–4 Portland Square
Bristol
BS2 8RR

T 0300 123 1231
Textphone 0161 618 8524
enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
www.ofsted.gov.uk

Direct T (0)117 311 5466
Direct email
sarah.power@tribalgroup.com



15 July 2014

Mr Stuart Gallimore
Director of Children's Services
East Sussex County Council
County Hall
St Annes Crescent
Lewes
East Sussex

Dear Mr Gallimore

Inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement under section 136(1) (b) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006

Following the recent inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectors on 9-13 June 2014, I am writing on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills to confirm the inspection findings.

We are grateful to you for your cooperation, and to your staff, the Chief Executive, Leader of the Council, the Lead Member for Learning and Effectiveness, contracted partners, headteachers and governors who gave up their time to meet with us¹.

This inspection was carried out because of concerns about:

- the decline in the proportion of primary schools judged good or better for their overall effectiveness and the significantly higher-than-average proportion judged inadequate
- the low attainment and progress of pupils in primary schools from 2011 to 2013
- the wider-than-average gap between the achievements of pupils known to be entitled to free school meals and other pupils across all key stages
- the much lower-than-average proportion of 18 year olds successfully moving on to education, training or employment.

Summary findings

The local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement are ineffective.

¹ During the inspection, discussions were held with senior and operational officers, elected members of the Local Authority, governors and other stakeholders. Inspectors scrutinised available documents, including strategic plans, and analysed a range of available data.

- Too many primary-aged pupils in East Sussex attend schools that are not good enough and around 10% attend schools judged to be inadequate. This is much higher than average. The proportion of inadequate schools is also well above average.
- Over the past three years, a significantly lower-than-average proportion of pupils attained the expected levels in reading, writing and mathematics in Key Stages 1 and 2. Standards in English and mathematics are too low across both key stages.
- The gap in progress made by pupils known to be entitled to free school meals and their peers across all age groups is too wide. Too many primary-aged pupils are ill-prepared for secondary school.
- Too few older students attain Level 3 qualifications; the proportion of 18 year olds moving on successfully to education, training or employment is too low.
- The local authority's 2012 strategy to raise standards included facilitating autonomous 'alliances of schools. This strategy failed to: improve school leadership, including governance; reduce the proportion of inadequate primary schools; stem the decline of good schools; or raise the achievement of pupils across the primary phase.
- Challenge and support to schools to reduce exclusions have not been effective in lowering the above-average proportion of permanent exclusions in primary and secondary schools, or the high proportion of fixed-term exclusions in these and special schools.
- Essential information and guidance about an individual school's performance is received too late in the year by governors. It replicates information already published nationally but is not summarised in a way to ensure governors have a clear external evaluation of their particular school's strengths and areas of concern. This hinders them in challenging underachievement quickly and robustly.
- Systems to monitor the impact of school improvement services' staff do not work consistently well. For example, notes of visit to schools do not routinely say what school leaders should improve or how they will be held to account for their actions. In plans for work with schools, success measures are too often not focused sharply on the difference the actions identified will make. As a result, it is not sufficiently clear if they are working.
- Headteachers report improving relationships with, and strengthening leadership of, the local authority. However, support for the council's plans for improving schools is not yet universal among those who need to be involved, such as some school leaders.

There are a number of strengths in East Sussex.

- The proportion of secondary and special schools judged good at their most recent Ofsted inspection is significantly above average; as is the proportion of outstanding special schools.
- The impact of the Virtual School headteacher's challenge and support to schools can be seen in the above-average achievements of looked-after children.
- Initiatives like the 'Village School' in the Early Years Foundation Stage, where private, voluntary or independent settings are working closely with local schools, is helping to prepare children for school more effectively and improve the quality of provision.

- Partnership with agencies to secure sufficient, suitable provision for school leavers post-16 enabled a higher-than-average proportion in 2013 to participate in their chosen education or training. Well above average proportions of students who attend further education colleges and sixth forms now access good provision.

The local authority arrangements for school improvement require re-inspection in 12 months.

Context

A two-tier primary and secondary system comprises 153 primary, 26 secondary and ten special schools. Of these, 14 secondary, nine primary and one special school are academies. There is a free school (4-18) and a studio school (14–19). Alternative provision placements for secondary-aged permanently excluded pupils have been devolved to four behaviour and attendance partnerships led by four secondary schools. There are 242 early years settings. Most are private, voluntary or independent with 15 nursery classes in primary schools. Post-16 provision comprises two further education colleges, one land-based college, a sixth form college and eight school sixth forms. The Director of Children’s Services was appointed in April 2014, following interim arrangements since May 2013. Changes to the structure of school improvement services saw reduced staffing in 2011. The Assistant Director, Schools, Youth and Inclusion Support oversees two full time equivalent Heads of Education Improvement, 15 managers and 10 advisers. Ten commissioned primary consultants and four consultant secondary headteachers provide extra capacity. Since September 2012, the local authority has encouraged the development of 19 local alliances of schools. It intends to move to seven formal area groups of primary, secondary and special schools by September 2015.

Areas for improvement

- Halt the decline in primary school performance and accelerate the pace of improvement, so that inspection outcomes are at least in line with the national averages by summer 2015.
- Identify and communicate unequivocally to underperforming schools that their rate of improvement is not good enough and follow through with robust monitoring.
- Ensure every school has high calibre leadership and governance and rapidly increase the number of effective leaders in primary schools, through pursuing key local authority strategies such as school-to-school support.
- Systematically monitor the impact of support and intervention provided by school improvement services, holding managers to account more effectively for the quality of the provision.
- Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals.

- Ensure all learners have successful transitions between the phases of education training or employment to age 19, and sharply improve Level 3 attainment.
- Provide strong strategic leadership and challenge to schools to support the reduction of temporary exclusions across all types of schools.
- Provide all governing bodies with timely information and guidance to enable them to evaluate how well their school is performing and provide informed challenge to school leaders.

Corporate leadership and strategic planning

- The council's decision to reduce funding and take a 'hands-off' approach to challenging and supporting schools in 2011 reduced the quality of provision in, and the leadership of, primary schools. Following disappointing school test results in 2012, elected members initiated a review of the local authority's performance and, after significant consultation with schools and partners, developed the 'Excellence for All' strategy, which they began implementing in autumn 2013.
- The strategy provides an ambitious vision for improvement, with corporate, political and service leaders wanting to ensure every learner achieves well and attends a good school. However, the impact of this strategy on weak progress and leadership in primary schools, raising standards in English and mathematics and reducing temporary exclusions or improving the outcomes for pupils entitled to free school meals, is only now starting to show some improvement including the sharp two-year rise in the numbers of inadequate primary schools beginning to be reversed. Initial indications also suggest improvement in achievement in the Early Years Foundation Stage and Key Stages 1 and 2 this year.
- The council's ambitions and the sharper focus on improvement are generally understood and welcomed by headteachers and governors. The evidence of improving relationships with the local authority is clear. However, a significant minority of headteachers and governing bodies do not share the local authority's ambition, which is slowing the rate of improvement in some schools.
- Elected members have increased their scrutiny of school improvement services by adding an Education Performance Panel alongside the Scrutiny Committee and the quarterly monitoring of service plans. The panel is too recently set up to have had a significant impact, but its headteacher representatives are positive about the challenge being brought to bear on Early Years Foundation Stage outcomes.
- Elected members, corporate and senior officers receive detailed information about the strengths and weaknesses in the performance of schools and the work of services. However, the reports on services focus on whether actions have been completed, rather than on their impact. This impedes holding services to account for their work.
- Partnership working to secure sufficient, suitable provision for Year 11 school leavers is paying dividends; an above-average proportion of the 2013 cohort is participating in education or training. Improvements in further education provision now ensures the significant majority of students attend good provision.

- The proportion of young people achieving Level 3 qualifications, however, is still too low. Until very recently, the partnership's focus was not firmly enough on the support for 18 year olds, and the proportion moving successfully on to training or employment remains well below average. The local authority has rightly commissioned new contractors to tackle this.

Monitoring, challenge, intervention and support

- The impact of local authority monitoring, challenge, intervention and support has been ineffective overall because there has been an increase in the proportion of primary schools requiring improvement or judged to be inadequate.
- Until this academic year, senior officers did not use information on school performance well enough to tackle concerns at an early stage.
- This has started to improve, with sharper intelligence-sharing between leaders of the school improvement service and services for governors, financial audit and human resources.
- School leaders receive detailed, timely reviews of their pupils' performance. However, reviews for governors arrive too late in the year and are not presented clearly. This hinders governors' understanding of their school's strengths and areas for development and weakens their ability to challenge school leaders.
- Headteachers report that through the 'Excellence for All' strategy, the challenge to schools has been more rigorous, with improved deployment of staff and intervention in schools causing concern. School improvement leaders accept that, until recently, the service was reactive rather than proactive; meaning it was unable to tackle weaknesses quickly or avoid a decline in the number of good schools.
- Once schools are identified as requiring improvement or inadequate, Ofsted's monitoring shows that the school improvement service, in most cases, provides effective support and challenge. However, service reports do not always explain clearly to underperforming schools what leaders need to do and what difference they need to show. Follow-up visits do not routinely report on whether the rate of improvement is sufficient.
- Support for vulnerable 16 to 17 year olds is strong. For example, the employment and care to work strategy, the strategy to develop employability skills, a supported employment programme, residential provision, and funding for travel to remove barriers to participation, all contribute positively to the experience of this group of older learners.

Support and challenge for leadership and management (including governance)

- The local authority had a clear rationale for developing school-to-school support through alliances. However, choosing to facilitate rather than lead developments resulted in unevenness in the alliances' effectiveness, as well as a lack of focus on

improvement in some and a paucity of good leadership in others. Too many headteachers do not have a clear understanding of their alliance's purpose.

- The process of transition, from the 19 alliances to seven area groups, each led by a consultant headteacher, has yet to be explained to schools. Leaders are unclear about who will check that these arrangements make an impact. In addition, these groups will not be fully operational until September 2015. This is too slow for the primary sector.
- There are too few good or outstanding primary leaders locally to promote good practice. Until very recently there has been only one teaching school, two national leaders of education and one national leader of governance. Capacity has been enhanced with three more teaching schools and four national leaders of education.
- The local authority's use of statutory powers to intervene in schools causing concern has not been effective and has only recently begun to stem the decline in primary schools. The use of formal warning notices has been limited. Recent actions, such as removing delegated powers from one primary school, deploying additional governors to a number of weaker governing bodies and informal warning letters to schools, show the authority is beginning to act more urgently. Nevertheless, these actions and others, such as replacing governing bodies with Interim Executive Boards, are often in response to Ofsted judgements rather than used proactively to prevent such judgements being necessary.
- The Chief Executive, lead members and senior staff have fostered largely effective relationships with academies. Local authority leaders have robust discussions when there are concerns about an academy's performance. However, there is too long a delay in contacting the Department for Education when concerns arise, such as the growth in fixed-term exclusions attributed to some primary academies.

Use of resources

- The local authority's use of resources is ineffective, notably in improving primary schools' effectiveness.
- Decision-making is based on thorough reviews of school need, but there is a lack of clarity about how to hold school improvement services to account for the impact of centrally held funds. There is no mechanism to indicate whether funding is above, below or similar to national averages for schools. This makes it difficult to evaluate the impact or value for money of the local authority's work.
- Budget-setting is open and transparent with the School Forum playing an active role. Discussion is collaborative and a good representation of schools, including academies, means the views of headteachers, bursars, school finance managers and governors are heard when allocating money. Resources allocated to schools are checked properly by the finance team against priorities in school development plans.

- School leaders are held to account effectively by the local authority for surplus budgets and plans are checked after two years to ensure planned savings have been used appropriately for building programmes or growth in staffing. Deficit budgets give rise to timely formal audits and successful recovery within the three years expected.

I am copying this letter to the Secretary of State and the Leader of East Sussex Council. This letter will be published on the Ofsted website.

Yours sincerely

Margaret Farrow
Her Majesty's Inspector

Strategic aims, targets and objectives

Improvement Priorities:
Priority 1: Halt the decline in primary school performance and accelerate the pace of improvement.
Priority 2: Identify and communicate unequivocally to underperforming schools that their rate of improvement is not good enough and follow through with robust monitoring.
Priority 3: Systematically monitor the impact of support and intervention provided by school improvement services, holding managers to account more effectively for the quality of the provision.
Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals
Priority 5: Ensure all learners have successful transitions between the phases of education training or employment to age 19, and sharply improve Level 3 attainment.
Priority 6: Provide strong strategic leadership and challenge to schools to support the reduction of temporary exclusions across all types of schools.
Priority 7: Ensure every school has high calibre leadership and governance and rapidly increase the number of effective leaders in primary schools, through pursuing key local authority strategies such as school-to-school support
Priority 8: Provide all governing bodies with timely information and guidance to enable them to evaluate how well their school is performing and provide informed challenge to school leaders.

Priority 1: Halt the decline in primary school performance and accelerate the pace of improvement					
Indicators of Success		2013 % Outcome	2014 % Outcome	2015 % Target	2016 % Target
1.1. The proportion of Early Years settings judged good or outstanding		67.8% (at 1/9/13)	71.7% (at 1/9/14)	85% (at 1/9/15)	90% (at 1/9/16)
1.2. The proportion of primary schools judged good or outstanding		66.7% (at 1/9/13)	71% (at 1/9/14)	81% (at 1/9/15)	85% (at 1/9/15)
1.3. The number and proportion of primary schools judged to require Special Measures		13 (7%) (at 31/8/13)	7 (4%) (at 31/8/14)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)

Priority 2: Identify and communicate unequivocally to underperforming schools that their rate of improvement is not good enough and follow through with robust monitoring.	
Indicators	
2.1. School performance is assessed as soon as data is available in July and schools potentially at risk of a category are contacted for early discussions about support	The local authority has a clear understanding of individual schools' performance from timely data analysis and discussions with school leaders. This is used to plan effective programme of support and interventions. In schools where leaders and governors
2.2. Preliminary LA categories are available for managers planning support programmes during August	
2.3. Discussions take place with schools based on updated categories following release of national data and in-year	

data collection. Further support and interventions are planned accordingly	are failing to fulfil their roles and responsibilities, the LA uses its powers to ensure action is taken.
2.4. Advisers ensure schools have clear action plans in place, with clear milestones to enable governors to monitor the impact of actions taken by the school.	
2.5. Where schools do not engage with the local authority to address areas of concern identified by advisers and consultants, warning letters are delivered which set out the expectations of actions by the governing body.	

Priority 3: Systematically monitor the impact of support and intervention provided by school improvement services, holding managers to account more effectively for the quality of the provision.	
Indicators of Success	
3.1. External Advisers support schools to set targets at least in line with FFTD and provide appropriate guidance on expectations of progress and quality of provision.	All schools are setting challenging targets, and monitor in-year progress through regular collection of progress data, which is evaluated through the adviser programme and meetings with the consultant heads. This enables support and interventions to be adjusted as needed so all schools achieve their agreed targets for improvement within the timescales set
3.2. External Advisers, Consultant Headteachers and other school improvement professionals monitor in-year progress and provide clear feedback to schools on their progress	
3.3. Managers and consultants are given regular feedback on the quality of their work and are provided with professional development opportunities at regular intervals.	

Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals					
Indicators of Success		2013 % Outcome	2014 % Outcome	2015 % Target*	2016 % Target
4.1. The proportion of children achieving a good level of development at the end of the Foundation Stage		East Sussex national	East Sussex national	East Sussex	East Sussex
4.2. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving a good level of development at the end of the Foundation Stage		43.8%	65.8%	75%	80%
4.3. The proportion of children meeting or exceeding the early learning goals for literacy		20.4%	19.3%	17%	15%
4.4. The proportion of children meeting or exceeding the early learning goals for maths		54.0%	69.4%	78%	82%
4.5. The proportion of pupils working at the required level in the year 1 Phonics check		69.2%	77.0%	84%	88%
4.6. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils working at the required level in the year 1 Phonics check		62.7%	69.4%	80%	85%
4.7. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Reading at Key Stage 1		17.2%	16.2%	14%	12%
		76.1%	79.2%	84%	86%

Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals									
Indicators of Success	2013 % Outcome		2014 % Outcome		2015 % Target*	2016 % Target			
	East Sussex	national	East Sussex	national					
4.8. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Reading at Key Stage 1	19.3%	12%	14.5%	11%	10%	9%			
4.9. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Writing at Key Stage 1	63.5%	67%	69.2%	70%	75%	78%			
4.10. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Writing at Key Stage 1	23%	15%	18%	14%	9%	8%			
4.11. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Maths at Key Stage 1	75.9%	78%	78.8%	80%	84%	86%			
4.12. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving Level 2b or above in Maths at Key Stage 1	19.6%	10%	14.1%	9%	8%	7%			
4.13. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Reading at Key Stage 2	85.6%	86%	88.2%	88%	91%	93%			
4.14. The percentage of pupils achieving expected progress in reading at Key Stage 2	88.1%	88%	90.2%	90%	93%	95%			
4.15. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Writing at Key Stage 2	81.4%	84%	85.0%	85%	87%	88%			
4.16. The percentage of pupils achieving expected progress in writing at Key Stage 2	90.8%	92%	93.4%	93%	95%	97%			
4.17. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Maths at Key Stage 2	81.9%	85%	84.7%	85%	87%	88%			
4.18. The percentage of pupils achieving expected progress in maths at Key Stage 2	84.8%	88%	87.6%	89%	91%	92%			
4.19. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in reading, writing and maths combined at Key Stage 2	71.7%	75%	77.7%	78%	84%	88%			
4.20. The proportion of pupils achieving Level 4b or above in reading and maths and level 4 in writing combined at Key Stage 2	59.5%	63%	66.2%	67%	73%	77%			
4.21. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Maths combined at Key Stage 2	22.0%	18%	17.9%	tbc	12%	10%			
4.22. The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in English	69%	68.5%	69.6%	tbc	71%	73%			
4.23. The percentage of students achieving expected progress in English	72.4%	70.4%	70.1%	71%	73%	75%			
4.24. The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in mathematics.	69.5%	71.4%	66.2%	tbc	71%	73%			
4.25. The percentage of students achieving expected progress in maths	70.1%	70.8%	62.3%	65.4%	73%	75%			

Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals						
Indicators of Success	2013 % Outcome		2014 % Outcome		2015 % Target*	2016 % Target
	East Sussex	national	East Sussex	national	East Sussex	East Sussex
4.26. The proportion of students achieving 5+ A*-C at GCSE including English and maths	59.9%	60.8%	52.7%	56.1%	58%	60%
4.27. The gap between the proportion of FSM and non-FSM pupils achieving 5+ A*-C at GCSE including English and maths	28.8%	26.7%	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc

Priority 5: Ensure all learners have successful transitions between the phases of education training or employment to age 19, and sharply improve Level 3 attainment.						
Indicators of Success	2013 % Outcome		2014 % Target		2015 % Target	2016 % Target
	5.1. The number of academic age 18 year olds who are NEET	14.9%	18 - 14.7%	below 10%.	below 10%.	below 10%.
5.2. The percentage of students achieving Level 3 by age 19.	East Sx 57.3% Nat 59.1%	Not currently available	national average or above	national average or above	national average or above	national average or above
5.3. Participation of 16 and 17 year olds	16: 92.5% 17: 84%	16 - 95% 17 - 86%	16- 96% 17- 88%	16- 97% 17- 90%	16- 97% 17- 90%	16- 97% 17- 90%

Priority 6: Provide strong strategic leadership and challenge to schools to support the reduction of temporary exclusions across all types of schools.						
Indicators of Success	2013 % Outcome		2014 % Outcome		2015 % Target	2016 % Target
	6.1. The number of temporary exclusions across East Sussex	2811	2560	-25% compared to previous year	-10% compared to previous year	-10% compared to previous year
6.2. The number of temporary exclusions in Hastings and Rother	936	1027	-30% compared to previous year	-15% compared to previous year	-15% compared to previous year	-15% compared to previous year

Priority 7: Ensure every school has high calibre leadership and governance and rapidly increase the number of effective leaders in primary schools, through pursuing key local authority strategies such as school-to-school support						
Indicators of Success	2013 % Outcome		2014 % Outcome		2015 % Target	2016 % Target
	7.1. The proportion of Heads from Schools which are judged by Ofsted as being Outstanding who are signed up to be NLEs/LLEs	36%	44%	47%	50%	47%

7.2	The proportion of Heads from which are judged by Ofsted as being Outstanding who are working with East Sussex as NLE/non-LLE system leaders	43%	50%	52%	55%
7.3.	The proportion of schools going into Special Measures where we consult on an IEB	82%	100%	100%	100%
7.4.	The proportion of Federations and Multi-Academy Trusts at primary level	8.5%	16%	36%	46%

Priority 8: Provide all governing bodies with timely information and guidance to enable them to evaluate how well their school is performing and provide informed challenge to school leaders.					
Indicators of Success					
8.1.	Updated timeline for the provision of data, for all governing bodies, distributed in September 2014				
8.2.	New datapacks and guidance, for all governing bodies, distributed in September 2014.				
8.3.	Bespoke data dashboard, for all governing bodies, distributed in October 2014.				
8.4.	Training provided for Chairs of Governors and Headteacher on RAISEonline				
8.5.	Evaluation of data, guidance and training, by all governing bodies, by March 2015.				
Governing bodies understand the progress and attainment of pupils and groups of pupils in their school and are able to effectively challenge the school leadership to ensure improvement plans are adequate and to monitor those plans through the year, as demonstrated through Governing Body Minutes.					

*** Note on targets: all outcomes targets for 2015 have been set using national trend data (where available) and East Sussex 2014 provisional outcomes. Targets will be reviewed as national data is confirmed to ensure that targets are appropriately aspirational.**

External Advisers support schools to set targets at least in line with FFTD and provide appropriate guidance on expectations of progress and quality of provision. External Advisers, Consultant Headteachers and other school improvement professionals monitor in-year progress and provide clear feedback to schools on their progress Managers and consultants are given regular feedback on the quality of their work and are provided with professional development opportunities at regular intervals

<p>Priority 1: Halt the decline in primary school performance and accelerate the pace of improvement, so that inspection outcomes are at least in line with the national averages by summer 2015.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By July 2015 the proportion of Early Years settings judged good or outstanding compares favourably with national averages. • By July 2015 the proportion of primary schools judged good or outstanding compares favourably with national averages. • By July 2015 the number and proportion of primary schools in special measures has significantly reduced.
<p>Priority 2: Identify and communicate unequivocally to underperforming schools that their rate of improvement is not good enough and follow through with robust monitoring.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local authority has a clear understanding of individual schools' performance from timely data analysis and discussions with school leaders. • This understanding is used to plan effective programmes of support and interventions. • In schools where leaders and governors are failing to fulfil their roles and responsibilities, the LA uses its powers to ensure action is taken.
<p>Priority 3: Systematically monitor the impact of support and intervention provided by school improvement services, holding managers to account more effectively for the quality of the provision.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools set challenging targets, and monitor in-year progress through regular collection of progress data. • Progress is evaluated through the adviser programme and meetings with the consultant heads. • Support and interventions are adjusted as needed so all schools achieve their agreed targets for improvement within the timescales set
<p>Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proportion of children achieving at least the national average for literacy and mathematics in EYFSP outcomes is increased to 78% and 84% respectively in 2015. • The proportion of pupils achieving Level 2b+ in Reading, Writing and Mathematics at the end of KS1 is increased to 84%, 75% and 84% respectively in 2015. • The proportion of KS2 pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Mathematics combined is increased to 84% in 2015. • The proportion of KS2 pupils achieving Level 4b or above in Reading and Maths, combined with Level 4 Writing is increased to 73% 2015.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proportion of pupils making good progress in Reading, Writing and Mathematics at KS2 is increased to 93%, 95% and 91% respectively in 2015. The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in English is increased to 71% by July 2015. The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in mathematics is increased to 71% by July 2015. Attainment and progress gaps between FSM and non-FSM pupils are decreased so they are lower than the national average across all key stages in 2015.
<p>Priority 5: Ensure all learners have successful transitions between the phases of education training or employment to age 19, and sharply improve Level 3 attainment.</p> <p>Lead: Elizabeth Funge</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proportion of academic age 18 year olds who are NEET decreases to below 10%. The proportion of students achieving Level 3 by age 19 increases. The success in increasing participation for 16 and 17 year olds (96% for 16 years old and 88% for 17 year olds) is maintained.
<p>Priority 6: Provide strong strategic leadership and challenge to schools to support the reduction of temporary exclusions across all types of schools.</p> <p>Lead: Nathan Caine</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary exclusions are reduced by 25% in 2014-15, compared to 2013/14. Those areas facing the greatest challenges in terms of temporary exclusions have a bigger decrease than the County average during 2014/15.
<p>Priority 7: Ensure every school has high calibre leadership and governance and rapidly increase the number of effective leaders in primary schools, through pursuing key local authority strategies such as school-to-school support.</p> <p>Lead: Lesley Wickham</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of Heads from outstanding Schools who are signed up to be East Sussex system leaders is increased.. All schools going into Special Measures, except in exceptional circumstances, have delegated budgets removed or an IEB put in place. The number of Federations and Multi-Academy Trusts at primary level increase by 20% by July 2015, compared to the previous year.
<p>Priority 8: Provide all governing bodies with timely information and guidance to enable them to evaluate how well their school is performing and provide informed challenge to school leaders.</p> <p>Lead: Di Francombe</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear performance data is provided to Governors early in Term 1 to enable them to triangulate information with other sources such as headteachers' reports. Further data is provided and signposted throughout the year to ensure Governors have access to the most up to date information about their school and its comparative performance.

* Education Improvement Partnerships were formerly known as Area Groups

<p>Priority 1: Halt the decline in primary school performance and accelerate the pace of improvement, so that inspection outcomes are at least in line with the national averages by summer 2015.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By July 2015 the proportion of Early Years settings judged good or outstanding compares favourably with national averages. By July 2015 the proportion of primary schools judged good or outstanding compares favourably with national averages. By July 2015 the number and proportion of primary schools in special measures has significantly reduced. 			
<p>Actions</p>	<p>Owner</p>	<p>Milestones</p>	<p>Timing</p>	<p>Progress (B/R/A/G)</p>
<p>1.1 Review the service's processes for support and challenge to schools, especially those that Require Improvement or Special Measures to ensure that they provide appropriately robust measures for improvement.</p> <p>1.2 Introduce leadership reviews for all schools judged by OfSTED or LA as Requiring Improvement, which are not making sufficient progress towards Good.</p>	<p>Alison Rendle</p>	<p>a. New protocols agreed and communicated to schools.</p> <p>b. All schools identified for leadership reviews informed and dates agreed for reviews to take place.</p> <p>c. Clear action plans, identifying strategies for improvement and targeted support, drawn up with the school's external adviser.</p> <p>d. Milestones and monitoring clearly identified</p> <p>e. Increase in the number of schools moving from RI to Good</p>	<p>September 2014</p> <p>By October 2014 and at regular intervals</p>	<p style="background-color: #92d050;">G</p>
<p>1.3 Review the Service's processes for support and challenge to Early Years settings, especially those that are Inadequate or Require Improvement, to ensure that they provide appropriately robust measures for improvement.</p>	<p>Lesley Wickham</p>	<p>a. New enhanced and intensive support protocols agreed and communicated to settings.</p> <p>b. Increase in the number of settings improving OfSTED grading on re-inspection.</p>	<p>Termly review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2014 March 2015 July 2015 <p>October 2014</p>	<p style="background-color: #92d050;">G</p>
<p>1.4 Strengthen the primary adviser programme by ensuring that advisers:</p>	<p>Lesley Wickham</p>	<p>a. New protocols agreed and communicated to schools.</p>	<p>Termly review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2014 March 2015 July 2015 <p>End of July 2014</p>	<p style="background-color: #92d050;">G</p>

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • receive training on the format of visits and expectations of report writing • receive training on updates to the current Ofsted framework • are quality assured by Ofsted-trained personnel • are (where possible) aligned to Education Improvement Partnerships to facilitate networking and sharing good practice between local schools • work more closely with governors • have access to early data sets produced by the LA as well as full access to RAISE and FFT • monitor the school's progress against agreed targets 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Training events held for new and current advisers to update on new Protocols. c. Induction of new advisers and regular training for all advisers to share expectations and improve programme consistency. d. Shadowing of new advisers and coaching provided where appropriate. e. Training materials and protocols shared with headteachers and chairs of governors f. Desktop risk-assessment of all schools, based on 2014 provisional results, completed by SLES managers and communicated to advisers as part of categorisation information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July and Sept 2014 July 2014 (1 of 5) then 2-3 monthly July and Sept 2014 October 2014 End July 2014 (EY & Primary) End Aug 2014 (Secondary) End Sept 2014 (Special) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G G G G
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support school improvement planning to ensure strategic planning and rapid progress towards improvement targets • have a better overview of the support being provided to a school and measure its impact • are aware of the expectations for safeguarding and alert programme coordinators promptly to any concerns 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. All schools have school development plans which are fit for purpose and used by governors to monitor school's progress h. Safeguarding issues regularly monitored and appropriate actions taken to raise concerns with LA when observed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By October 2014 Reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - December 2014 - March 2015 - July 2015 Term 1/2, 3/4, 5/6 (category 1 and 2) Termly (category 3 and 4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G G
<p>1.5 Recruit new Primary Consultant Heads to provide additional capacity to support LA category 2 and 3 schools; to improve the sharing of good practice between good schools and build capacity for outstanding</p>	<p>Alison Rendle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Recruitment of Primary Consultant Heads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 2014 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<p>1.6 Hold initial meeting with heads to design and agree ways of working with schools.</p> <p>1.7 Confirm offer from Consultant Primary Heads to schools and Education Improvement Partnerships and agree impact measures.</p>		<p>b. All headteachers have a clear understanding of the purpose of the consultant headteachers' group and engage with them to bring about school improvement.</p>	October 2014	A
1.8 Increase resources available for commissioning proven external providers, including the new Education Improvement Partnerships, to bring additional capacity and expertise to the improvement of schools facing multiple challenges.	Alison Rendle	<p>a. Schools requiring additional capacity and expertise from external provider have been identified.</p> <p>b. Additional capacity commissioned from external providers, including new Education Improvement Partnerships.</p>	July – Sept 2014	G
1.9 Implement consistent and effective processes to ensure that the LA is able both to work in partnership with academies and to challenge those that are under-performing.	Alison Rendle	<p>a. Consultation with academy trusts on protocol for working with the LA</p> <p>b. Criteria and processes for LA referral to DfE clearly articulated and communicated to academy sponsors.</p> <p>c. Where academies are under performing there is clear evidence to demonstrate that the LA has both offered support and referred the academy to the DfE.</p>	September 2014	G
			October 2014	A
			October (categorisation) Terms 2 and 4 (in-year progress data	A

<p>Priority 2: Identify and communicate unequivocally to underperforming schools that their rate of improvement is not good enough and follow through with robust monitoring.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local authority has a clear understanding of individual schools' performance from timely data analysis and discussions with school leaders. This understanding is used to plan effective programmes of support and interventions. In schools where leaders and governors are failing to fulfil their roles and responsibilities, the LA uses its powers to ensure action is taken.
--	---

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
2.1. Desktop risk-assessment of all schools, based on 2014 provisional results by SLES managers.	Alison Rendle	a. Provisional categorisation of schools completed and possible menus of support identified for individual schools.	September 2014	
2.2. Clear communication with headteachers and governors about LA's concerns and identification of actions to support improvement.		b. School categories confirmed with headteachers and chairs of governors	October 2014	A
2.3. Analysis of progress data and confirmation of school categories.				
2.4. Strategies for improvement with clear milestones and expectations of improved outcomes within a tight time frame agreed with external adviser.		c. Analysis of schools' in year data and work in books demonstrates appropriate progress towards agreed targets.	January 2015 April 2015 July 2015	

<p>Priority 3: Systematically monitor the impact of support and intervention provided by school improvement services, holding managers to account more effectively for the quality of the provision.</p> <p>Lead: Alison Rendle</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All schools set challenging targets, and monitor in-year progress through regular collection of progress data. Progress is evaluated through the adviser programme and meetings with the consultant heads. Support and interventions are adjusted as needed so all schools achieve their agreed targets for improvement within the timescales set
---	--

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
3.1 Introduce the role of external evaluator for LA category 3 and 4 primary schools, including special measures schools without an IEB to evaluate progress towards milestones and identify any barriers towards progress.	Nicola Blake	a. External evaluators commissioned.	October/November 2014	G
		b. Evaluation meetings with identified schools three times a year.	December 2014/January 2015	
		c.. External evaluator visits indicate that advisers have provided appropriate levels of challenge to enable schools to address identified areas for improvement, as demonstrated by improved progress data and Ofsted outcomes.	March 2015/April 2015 June/July 2015 September 2015	
3.2 Monitor the impact of Primary Consultant Heads support to individual schools and groups of schools through collection of progress data and Ofsted outcomes.	Alison Rendle	a. Success measures on school improvement plans are met within agreed time scales as indicated in milestones and measured on a bi-terminly basis.	December 2014 March 2015 July 2015	
		b. More RI schools move to good and good schools maintain or improve their OfSTED grading.	December 14, April and July 15	
3.3 Work with the Secondary Consultant Heads to develop and commission	Elizabeth Funge	a. On track to achieve their target of % of schools that are good or better.		

support for secondary schools where under-performance is identified.		b. In year and end of year progress data and Ofsted outcomes clearly demonstrate that schools are meeting agreed improvement targets regarding pupil outcomes.	January 2015 March 2015 July 2015	
3.3 Monitor the impact of Secondary Consultant Heads support to individual schools and groups of schools through collection of progress data and Ofsted outcomes.	Elizabeth Funge	In year and end of year progress data and OfSTED outcomes clearly demonstrate that schools are meeting agreed improvement targets regarding pupil outcomes.	January 2015 March 2015 July 2015	
3.4 Monitor impact of external providers support to under-performing schools through robust contract monitoring and the collection of in year progress data and feedback from Advisers.	Alison Rendle	a. In year and end of year progress data and OfSTED outcomes clearly demonstrate that schools are meeting agreed improvement targets regarding pupil outcomes.	January 2015 March 2015 July 2015	
3.5 Review the processes for the collection and use of in-year progress data.	Di Francombe	a. New process for collecting in year progress data agreed and communicated to schools.	September 2014	G
3.6 Establish new reporting system for SMT and Education Performance Panel to monitor and evaluate progress.		b. Internal reporting systems and processes designed for analysing in-year progress data and reviewing LA category of RI schools in-year.	September 2014	
		c. New reporting system for SMT and Education Performance Panel amended to include in-year progress monitoring.	October 2014	G
		d. Elected members have clearer picture of progress in-year.		
		e. First collection of in-year progress data from schools.	1 st week of January 2015	
		f. Further collection of in-year progress data from schools.	March/April 2015	
		g. Monitoring of progress in SM and RI schools by IEB, external evaluator, or by Senior Manager, to include progress data, impact of support and HMI monitoring.	Monthly	G

Priority 4: Rapidly improve and sustain high attainment in English and mathematics by the end of all key stages, especially for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals

Lead: Alison Rendle

Success Measures

- The proportion of children achieving at least the national average for literacy and mathematics in EYFSP outcomes is increased to 78% and 84% respectively in 2015.
- The proportion of pupils achieving Level 2b+ in Reading, Writing and Mathematics at the end of KS1 is increased to 84%, 75% and 84% respectively in 2015.
- The proportion of KS2 pupils achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Mathematics combined is increased to 84% in 2015.
- The proportion of KS2 pupils achieving Level 4b or above in Reading and Maths, combined with Level 4 Writing is increased to 73% 2015.
- The proportion of pupils making good progress in Reading, Writing and Mathematics at KS2 is increased to 93%, 95% and 91% respectively in 2015.
- The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in English is increased to 71% by July 2015.
- The proportion of students achieving A*-C at GCSE in mathematics is increased to 71% by July 2015.
- Attainment and progress gaps between FSM and non-FSM pupils are decreased so they are lower than the national average across all key stages in 2015.

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<p>4.1 Review the impact of interventions and primary support programmes in mathematics and English in 2013/14 and target resources to those with evidence of potential for substantial and rapid impact.</p> <p>4.2 Work with Secondary Consultant Heads to evaluate secondary schools' performance and determine which schools need support for English and mathematics.</p> <p>4.3 Use early KS5 analysis of outcomes to identify impact of support and challenge.</p>	Alison Rendle	<p>a. Evaluation of interventions and support programmes in mathematics and English completed using provisional data for 2013/14.</p> <p>b. 2014/15 targeted interventions and support programmes to address the issues identified from 2014 data analysis communicated to Education Improvement Partnerships and schools.</p> <p>c. Secondary schools requiring support in English and/or mathematics identified and approaches agreed to address under performance.</p>	<p>August 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>September 2014</p>	<p></p> <p style="background-color: #92d050; text-align: center;">G</p> <p></p>

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
4.4 Pilot in-depth subject reviews for English and mathematics in schools where 2014 outcomes give cause for concern.	Bill Roddick/ Deborah O'Donoghue	a. First subject reviews completed and evaluated and process and materials refined where appropriate. b. Further subject reviews rolled out to schools identified as meeting the agreed criteria.	December 2015	
4.5 Increase focus on CPD for English and mathematics subject leaders including through review of subject leader network meetings and conferences for subject leaders based on the Ofsted model.		c. Subject leader networks reviewed and refocused upon key priorities for the year.	January – March 2015	
4.6 Promote and support the development of the new regional Maths Hub (led locally by St Richard's Catholic College), to drive improvements in maths teaching and outcomes by providing data analysis, identifying best practice, building capacity, sign-posting to external providers.	Bill Roddick	a. Identify the scope and focus of Maths Hub plans. b. Work actively with Maths Hub on initiatives that will have a rapid impact across ESCC during this year e.g. identifying school-to-school support expertise and capacity.	October 2014	G
4.7 Commission specialist expertise in English and Maths in order to accelerate improvement.	Bill Roddick/ Deborah O'Donoghue	a. Schools identified where subject specialist expertise is required.	September 2014	
4.8 Monitor progress in English and maths in schools receiving support		b. Specialist expertise commissioned	October 2014	A
4.9 Commission specialist training in Early Years speech, language and communication to accelerate improvement in targeted schools.	Fiona Large/Ruth Szulecki	c. Schools receiving commissioned support make in year progress as agreed when support is initiated.	Termly	
4.10 EYFS CPD training programme to increase focus on writing in reception and early mathematics.		a. Schools and pre-schools identified where improved outcomes are required. b. ELKAN training rolled out to identified schools and pre-schools. c. All schools report in-year 'progress towards targets' attainment data for writing and mathematics. Schools participating in targeted programmes provide entry and exit data, as well as ongoing data throughout the programme	Termly September 2014 Term1 and 2 2014 Term 2 2014 and Term 4 2015 Term 1 2014 to Term 4 2015 (according to programme)	G G

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<p>4.11 Commission specialist expertise in closing achievement gaps for pupils eligible for FSM in order to accelerate improvement in targeted schools.</p> <p>4.12 Monitor progress in closing achievement gaps in schools receiving support.</p>	Alison Rendle	<p>a. Schools identified where closing the gap specialist expertise is required.</p> <p>b. Specialist support commissioned from system leaders or consultants.</p> <p>c. Schools receiving commissioned support make in year progress in line with expectations.</p>	<p>September 2014</p> <p>Sept/Oct 2014</p> <p>Termly December 2014 March 2015 July 2015</p>	<p>[Redacted]</p>

<p>Priority 5: Ensure all learners have successful transitions between the phases of education training or employment to age 19, and sharply improve Level 3 attainment.</p> <p>Lead: Elizabeth Funge</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proportion of academic age 18 year olds who are NEET decreases to below 10%. The proportion of students achieving Level 3 by age 19 increases. The success in increasing participation for 16 and 17 year olds (96% for 16 years old and 88% for 17 year olds) is maintained. 			
Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
5.1 Expand the successful Village Project approach to strengthen the transition between Early Years Providers and Primary Schools.	Lesley Wickham//Ruth Szulecki	a. Number of schools and settings engaged in Village Project increased by 50%.	By October 2014	G
5.2 Identify champions in each Education Improvement Partnership to develop at least one Village project per area.		b. In Year progress data and end of Key Stage data shows at least a 5% increase from previous year.	January and April 2015 data collection points and end of Key Stage outcomes July 2015	
5.3 Monitor the impact of the model to strengthen Early Years and KS1 outcomes by collecting progress data and feedback.				
5.4 Pilot a re-engagement programme for 18 year olds.	Caroline McKiddie	a. Targeted cohort of 18 year olds identified.	September 2014	G
5.5 Monitor participation data for the cohort monthly.		b. Programme commissioned and launched.	November 2014	
		c. Impact/progress measures required.	monthly	G
5.6 Build on success in supporting young people into EET at age 16 and 17, by commissioning additional capacity to improve transitions for young people at or nearing age 18.	Caroline McKiddie	a. Proposal/s invited for tracking and support for 18 year olds.	September 2014	
5.7 Further develop tracking systems for 18 year olds, including improved data sharing with key partners		b. New support commissioned for supporting 18 year olds.	October 2014 onwards	G
		c. Impact/progress measures.	Monthly	G
5.8 Establish post-16 network of schools and FE Colleges and commission them to focus on:	Elizabeth Funge	d. Monthly participation data shows increase of 18 yr olds in EET and reduction in the % of unknowns. First meeting of new post-16 providers network held and priorities and ways of working established	October 2014	G

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving English and maths to age 19 • improving Level 3 outcomes <p>5.9 Consider 2013-14 results and determine target for Level 3 attainment for 2014-15</p>		Targets set for 2014- 15	November 2014	

<p>Priority 6: Provide strong strategic leadership and challenge to schools to support the reduction of temporary exclusions across all types of schools.</p> <p>Lead: Nathan Caine</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary exclusions are reduced by 25% in 2014-15, compared to 2013/14. • Those areas facing the greatest challenges in terms of temporary exclusions have a bigger decrease than the County average during 2014/15. 			
Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<p>6.1 Carry out a rigorous review of the impact of interventions and initiatives to reduce exclusions and improve attendance. Target resources to those with evidence of potential for substantial and rapid impact.</p> <p>6.2 Monitor and evaluate the impact of interventions and support on a half termly basis using the exclusions data.</p>	Nathan Caine	<p>a. Action plan developed to target high excluding schools with associated resource against each.</p> <p>b. 2014-15 interventions and support identified and communicated to Education Improvement Partnerships and Schools.</p> <p>c. Half-termly data collection process in place with progress towards targets shown.</p>	<p>October 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>six weekly</p>	<p>G</p> <p>G</p> <p>G</p>
<p>6.3 Develop a clear process for challenging all schools, including academies, who do not share fully in their responsibilities to excluded learners and target resources at the highest excluding schools to secure change in quality first teaching.</p> <p>6.4 Join up intelligence across ESBAS and SLES so that exclusions and attendance data are used when challenging schools.</p> <p>6.5 Work with Education Improvement Partnerships to identify ways in which they could influence reductions in exclusions.</p> <p>6.6 Develop nurture classes and share intelligence with schools.</p>	Nathan Caine	<p>a. Robust data dashboards compiled for all areas of the county to highlight areas of concern and highlight disparity across geographical areas.</p> <p>b. Education Improvement Partnerships engaged in using data dashboards for their local areas to determine what action they should take to support reductions in exclusions</p> <p>c. Reduction in exclusions across all Education Improvement Partnerships</p>	<p>October 2014</p> <p>Termly meetings</p> <p>July 2015</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p> <p>G</p>

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
6.7 Pilot new systems within the Hastings and Rother area for increasing school ownership of children who are excluded, at risk of exclusion or require placement through the Fair Access Protocol.	Nathan Caine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. First meeting held with Headteachers to discuss data for area and consider potential solutions to challenges faced. b. Proposed solutions for local area implemented. c. Impact of proposed solutions using exclusions data evaluated and report to all Headteachers who are part of first meeting. 	September 2014	
6.8 Improve the support to primary schools to reduce exclusions by extending behaviour and attendance partnerships across primary as well as secondary phase and through the allocation of Behaviour Support provision to primary schools for specific targeting on early intervention and training to reduce escalation.	Nathan Caine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. New Behaviour and Attendance Collaboratives for Primary Schools established. b. New offer of Behaviour Support provision for Primary Schools published. 	October 2014 onwards Monthly October 2014	G G
			October 2014	A

<p>Priority 7: Ensure every school has high calibre leadership and governance and rapidly increase the number of effective leaders in primary schools, through pursuing key local authority strategies such as school-to-school support.</p> <p>Lead: Lesley Wickham</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of Heads from outstanding Schools who are signed up to be East Sussex system leaders is increased.. All schools going into Special Measures, except in exceptional circumstances, have delegated budgets removed or an IEB put in place. The number of Federations and Multi-Academy Trusts at primary level increase by 20% by July 2015, compared to the previous year
--	--

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
<p>7.1 Expand the pool of system leaders with the track record and expertise to provide school to school support by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> designating East Sussex Leaders of Education (ESLE) designating East Sussex Leaders of Governance (ESLG) as a stepping stone to increasing the number of East Sussex Governors able to apply to be National Leaders of Governance commissioning system leaders from out of county (e.g. Teaching Schools in London, Kent, West Sussex) Monitor and review the impact of support from ELSE and ESLG. Those not demonstrating clear impact designated. 	Julie Dougill/Di Francombe	<p>a. Development and publication of criteria and payment models for East Sussex Leaders of Education (ELSE) and East Sussex Leaders of Governance (ESLG).</p> <p>b. Programme to designate new ELSE and ESLG designed and commissioned.</p> <p>c. Continued expansion of the number of ELSE and ESLG</p>	<p>October 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>Termly December 2014 April 2015 July 2015</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A</p>
<p>7.2 Provide strategic leadership for the development of a suite of professional development programmes to support system leaders.</p>	Julie Dougill	<p>a. Development programmes and support procedures devised for system leadership at all levels: for new headteachers, aspiring Primary and Secondary Headteachers, Executive Headteachers and aspiring Executive Headteachers.</p>	September 2014	

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Publication of CPD leadership framework 	October 2014	G
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Programmes delivered. 	June 2015	G
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Summative report produced, indicates positive evaluation of CPD programmes provided for Leaders. 	June 2015	
7.3 Establish robust partnerships with teaching school alliances and other collaborative groups in order to develop leadership capacity	Julie Dougill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Available capacity and gaps in capacity within existing partnerships identified. 	October 2014	G
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Leadership development provision in TSAs and partnerships in other authorities located 	October 2014	A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. High quality provision from nationally accredited providers identified and commissioned to work with TSAs 	December 2014	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Protocols and commissioning processes for deployment of TSA school to school support established 	June 2015	
7.4 Further develop the use of leadership reviews to support the development of	Claire Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Commissioned leadership reviews across the authority as required. 	September 2014	G

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
primary school headteachers.		b. Support packages for primary school leaders implemented following reviews.	From October 2014	G
7.5 Continue to improve primary school leaders' knowledge of Ofsted inspection processes paying due attention to any changes in the framework in inspection.	Lesley Wickham	a. Further Ofsted training programmes in East Sussex commissioned.	March 2015	G
7.6 Monitor and review the impact of Ofsted training on Ofsted leadership grades.		b. All RI schools and LA category schools 3/4 supported to attend Ofsted training	July 2015	
7.7 Build on the successful use of IEBs over the 2013-14 year by developing an approach that can be adopted by GBs to ensure they tackle underperformance swiftly and robustly in the manner of an IEB.	Di Francombe/ Jan Gough	a. All schools at-risk of Special Measures identified and appropriate intervention powers implemented to strengthen governance (IEB-type approach, additional governors, etc).	September 2014	A
		b. Improved governance across East Sussex schools as evidenced in OfSTED inspection reports.	July 2015	G
7.8 Accelerate the development of federations and partnerships to secure improvement and to ensure that small rural schools remain viable through enhanced support to identified schools.	Jessica Stubbings	a. Ongoing identification of small primary schools with significant performance challenges through updated risk assessment.	July – September 2014	G
7.9 Pilot the use of providing building capacity grants to governing bodies for one year to address some of the barriers to the development of federations and build a critical mass of schools working in federations and partnerships.	Jessica Stubbings	b. Take up of selected pilot schools of new grant to support those wanting to take forward Collaborations, Federations or Multi-Academy Trust as solution to performance challenges.	September – December 2014	G
7.10 Ongoing support to schools implementing structural solutions to address performance challenges.	Jessica Stubbings	c. Good take up by schools of the enhanced support offered to move towards partnership solutions. d. Increased number of federation consultations underway.	September – March 2015 January – July 2015	G

<p>Priority 8: Provide all governing bodies with timely information and guidance to enable them to evaluate how well their school is performing and provide informed challenge to school leaders</p> <p>Lead: Di Franccombe</p>	<p>Success Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear performance data is provided to Governors early in Term 1 to enable them to triangulate information with other sources such as headteachers' reports. • Further data is provided and signposted throughout the year to ensure Governors have access to the most up to date information about their school and its comparative performance.
---	--

Actions	Owner	Milestones	Timing	Progress (B/R/A/G)
8.1 Review current datasets provided to governors, identify improvements, and introduce revised datapacks (which provide a clear interpretation of performance of the school).	Di Franccombe	a. End of September 2014 datapacks issued to governors.	September 2014	
8.2 Accelerate the development of new datapacks to ensure provisional data is available to Governing Bodies as soon as possible in the new academic year.		b. Mid-late October: Copy of the FFT Governor Dashboard issued	October 2014	A
8.3 Provide access to further data as it becomes available via SID, RAISE and FFT Aspire, ensuring that Governors receive a flow of data that can inform discussions through the year.		c. Mid-late October: Governors notified when RAISEonline unvalidated data has been released.	October 2014	G
8.4 Collect feedback from Governing Bodies on the new data packs and refine for next year		d. March 2015: Copy of the Ofsted Dashboard issued.	March 2015	
		e. Feedback from governing bodies	April 2015	

FFTD	Fischer Family Trust "D" Estimate. Fischer Family Trust (FFT) is a national charity that analyses prior attainment and other contextual data on individual pupils and then estimates the future attainment outcome for schools. These estimates are based on a number of different scenarios and each is given a letter. FFTD Estimates set out what a cohort of pupils should attain if the school performs as well as the top 25% of similar schools.
NEET	Not in Education Employment or Training. We track the destinations of young people aged 16-18 to ensure they have a place in further education, a job or are in training. Those that do not have such a place are known as NEET and we target these young people to help them plan for their future.
NLE	National Leader of Education
LLE	Local Leader of Education
NLG	National Leader of Governance
LLG	Local leader of Governance
SM	Special Measures – When schools are judged by Ofsted to be inadequate they are put into special measures which means they must be supported by the local authority to improve and they are monitored regularly by an HMI (see below)
RI	Requires Improvement – this Ofsted Judgement use to be "satisfactory" but the change of name reflects that if a school is less than good, it needs to improve. RI schools are expected to draw up an improvement plan and will receive at least one HMI monitoring visit.
IEB	Interim Executive Board. When a school goes into special measures, the local authority has the power to remove the governing body and replace it with an IEB until the school is removed from Special Measures. IEBs usually have a small membership including education professionals and representatives from finance and HR.
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector.
ELKLAN	Elklan Ltd writes and delivers accredited courses for education and other staff working with those with speech, language and communication needs and for parents, and trains a network of licenced tutors to deliver Elklan courses locally.
GB	Governing Body

