



**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
HEATHFIELD AREA REVIEW
FINAL REPORT**

JANUARY 2016



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	BACKGROUND AND STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES	4
3	PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES RELATING TO SCHOOL ORGANISATION	6
4	THE AREA REVIEW PROCESS.....	8
5	HEATHFIELD AREA REVIEW	9
6	STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS.....	13
7	OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION	15
8	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
	APPENDIX A - Heathfield Area: Additional Data	26

1 INTRODUCTION

“All Children and young people who are educated in East Sussex will attend an establishment that is at least rated good by Ofsted”

Excellence For All – A strategy for education improvement in East Sussex (2013 to 2015)

1.1 Aim of the review

The aim of this area review has been to ensure that there is sufficient provision to meet demand for places now and in the future, and also to look more widely at the organisation of schools in the area to make certain they are well placed to deliver a viable, high quality education to their local communities.

The area review is not just about “raw” number of places, but also about the quality and sustainability of those places. In its analysis and subsequent recommendations the review has considered many variables which influence the quality of provision as well as how East Sussex County Council (ESCC) will be able to guarantee the right places at the right time in the right areas of the highest quality.

Nicky Morgan, alongside every parent and professional educator, expects that no child “*would spend a single day in a failing school*”.

“At the heart of our commitment to delivering real social justice is our belief that every pupil deserves an excellent education and that no parent should have to be content with their child spending a single day in a failing school,”

Nicky Morgan, Secretary of State for Education, 3 June 2015

The review process has not identified failing schools in the Heathfield area; there is however always potential for failure where a school is not able to guarantee sustainability. Sustainability is not just about financial viability but also the ability of the school to secure good outcomes for all pupils over time. Consideration of this has been an important part of this area review process.

In order to achieve consistently high outcomes there is recognition in *Excellence For All – A strategy for education improvement in East Sussex (2013 to 2015)*, that all sustainable good and outstanding schools will demonstrate potential to be strong in all the following areas. To this end ESCC has prioritised the further development of these key areas:

- Leadership development
- System leadership
- Better governance
- Improved teaching
- Improve outcomes for disadvantaged learners
- Improve Behaviour, Attendance and Safety Early Years
- Joint practice development.

In addition, the ESCC Portfolio Plan 2015/16–2017/18 Children and Families Learning and School Effectiveness makes a very firm commitment:

"Within the context of the ongoing reduction of local government funding we will use the resources we have wisely to ensure we focus on the agreed priorities.

The need for savings will continue for the foreseeable future, and we will need to consider some radical changes to our service offer in all areas to become more innovative, efficient and effective. This will include looking at how services are delivered and who they are delivered by."

Whilst the review is not driven by the need to make financial savings the need to ensure that high quality education is provided as cost effectively as possible is important and has been one of the considerations of this area review.

2 BACKGROUND AND STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Each Local Authority which has responsibility for Education has a number of statutory responsibilities. These include:

- Securing sufficient school places
- Securing sufficient childcare places
- Duties with regard to school admissions.

2.1 School Places

Local Authorities have a statutory responsibility (Education Act 1996 Section 14) to secure sufficient school places for school age pupils within their area. Additionally, this Act (Section 13 general duties) along with the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (Section 5) requires Local Authorities to promote high standards of education and ensure fair access to education for all children and young people. These duties were further underlined by the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (Section 1) which enshrined a duty to promote high standards and the fulfilment of potential. This is further strengthened through the Education and Adoption Act 2015.

2.2 Childcare Places

The Childcare Act 2006 requires Local Authorities to secure sufficient childcare places for working parents (Section 6) and ensure that all three- and four-year-old children can access high quality free nursery education (Section 7). There are additional requirements to assess the sufficiency (Section 11) and to provide advice and information (Section 13) to parents.

The Childcare Bill is currently going through Parliament with further implications on capacity in respect of increased provision for eligible working families.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482517/Childcare_Bill_Policy_Statement_12.03.2015.pdf

2.3 School Admissions

Local Authorities have a number of statutory duties with regard to School Admissions. An Admission Code is published (most recent December 2014) which provides details of these responsibilities stemming from the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (Section 85 - 2). This Act (Section 86 – 1) was amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (Section 42) requiring Local Authorities to provide advice and assistance to parents and to allow parents to express a preference for a school place. While not a statutory requirement Local Authorities are expected to achieve a high percentage of first preferences. In 2015 84.68% of parents gained their first preference in East Sussex and 93.73% gained one of their three preferences. There are no national figures available for comparison at this point.

It is the intention of the Government to consult on a further amendment to the schools admission code in respect of the admission of summer born children to the reception class in the September following their 5th birthday. Parents would be able to exercise choice and opt for admission to Reception or Y1 by right.

<http://schoolsweek.co.uk/nick-gibb-to-amend-school-admissions-code-for-summer-born-children/>

Therefore the Local Authority (in this case East Sussex) must seek to balance securing sufficient school places (avoiding over sufficiency) with ensuring high standards and providing parents with an opportunity to express a preference. This is a growing challenge for Local Authorities as the number of other Admissions Authorities is increasing. Local Authorities determine the admissions for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools. Academy Trusts and the Governing Bodies of Aided Schools determine the admissions for their schools and set the annual Planned Admission Number (PAN). Popular schools are encouraged to grow in order to meet demand.

2.4 Additional factors

2.4.1 Partnership arrangements

There are also a number of additional factors that have a bearing on this review. These include the national expectation that all schools work in partnership with other schools to provide a network of school to school support. This has led to the formation of different arrangements including school led trusts and federations. Small schools are actively encouraged to consider strong partnership arrangements such as collaborations and hard federations with single governing bodies and leadership and multi-academy trusts. Additionally, the number of candidates for headship is decreasing and some schools are having difficulty in recruiting. Federation is an important consideration as the pressure on school budgets grows and the underpinning minimum funding guarantee provides decreasing financial protection. Further changes to the funding formula are planned and the impact, whilst uncertain, is unlikely to provide significant additional finances. Local Authorities are expected to ensure the efficient use of public funds especially at this time of financial pressure on public service spending while at the same time ensuring continuously improving outcomes for all pupils in their area.

2.4.2 Government policy

Most recently the Government has indicated additional requirements which will impact on this review. The Education and Adoption Act 2015:

- Broadens the scope for intervention by the Secretary of State in underperforming schools
- Requires every school judged “inadequate” by Ofsted to be converted into an academy
- introduces a new “coasting” category for schools
- Remove the requirements for a general consultation to be held where a school “eligible for intervention” is being converted to a sponsored academy.

2.4.3 Regional Schools Commissioners (RSCs)

The role of the Regional Schools Commissioners (RSCs) is also a significant and growing factor. As well as monitoring the performance of academies within their area they also have powers to approve changes to open academies such as changes to age ranges, mergers between academies and changes to multi-academy trusts. They have the responsibility of addressing under-performance in local authority maintained schools through the sponsored academy arrangements, a responsibility that is likely to be used more robustly in future.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/academy-conversion-primary-academy-chain-development-grant>

Though there is still a place for federation the RSC favours multi academy trusts, and to this end is actively promoting the founding of or expansion of primary/mixed multi academy trusts. The recently reintroduced primary academy chain development grant provides primary schools a one- off financial incentive to form a multi academy trust or group together to enter an existing trust. Primary schools that are converting to academy status and have fewer than 210 pupils can also apply for the small school supplement grant. East Sussex recognises that federations can be a useful stepping stone to multi-academy trusts.

3 PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES RELATING TO SCHOOL ORGANISATION

3.1 Context

These reviews are set in the context of ESCC's Education Commissioning Plan 2015-2019. This plan sets out principles for the addition of new places. The plan states that the Council will:

- prioritise the expansion of outstanding and good schools and settings
- consider the pattern of parental preference to meet demand
- consider transport patterns to reduce travel times to schools and settings wherever possible
- where there is demand for both school and early years places, the Council will, wherever possible, provide additional accommodation designed to ensure a seamless transition between Nursery and Reception
- support new settings (including in the private, voluntary and independent sectors) and new schools (including academies, free schools, studio schools and university technical colleges) where their location will help relieve pressure on places and/or increase parental choice and raise outcomes
- where possible, only enlarge schools where it creates or sustains round forms of entry as the preferred model of organisation
- value for money.

3.2 Policies

The Council's School Organisation Policy (Appendix A to the Education Commissioning Plan 2015-2109) also sets out some underlying policies:

- to ensure that all schools are well placed to deliver high quality education that meets the needs of their local community and makes the best use of public funding
- where there is sustained evidence that a school is failing to meet the needs of the local community and/or to deliver improved outcomes and/or is not financially viable, to explore the options for closure or a partnership solution
- to maintain a sustainable network of village schools, through exploring a range of partnership solutions where appropriate (collaborations, federations, trust status and academy chains)
- to address the relative under performance at Key Stage 2 of junior schools compared with all-through primary schools by supporting infant and junior schools to form a federation or amalgamate
- to ensure any change to school organisation impacts positively on school performance and the life chances of children; to support governing bodies to review, on an annual basis, their organisational and leadership arrangements and to plan for building leadership capacity
- to develop an approach to school organisation review that enables stakeholders to engage fully and effectively in the process.

3.3 Voluntary Controlled/Aided

Within the area covered by this review a significant number of schools are Voluntary Controlled church schools and there is one Voluntary Aided School.

3.4 Church Schools

3.4.1 Chichester

The Diocese of Chichester is developing its strategy for school organisation through a working party and pilot project in another part of the county. Through this a number of key points are emerging which are likely to form its overall strategy. These are:

- the Diocese recognises the financial and educational pressures upon small schools and is looking to develop long term strategic solutions in partnership with the County Councils and the Regional Schools' Commissioner
- there is also a recognition that short/medium solutions may need to be considered
- the Diocese does not take a 'protectionist view' but does, as one would expect, want to see some diversity in provision within an area and the continuation of comparable place numbers in church schools
- the Diocese has worked closely with East Sussex County Council to support schools to move to federation
- the Diocesan Multi Academy Trust is likely to have a preferred model of developing schools to be operating with at least a two form entry capacity either as individual schools or as a cluster of schools
- any closure of church schools would only be supported if there were clear opportunities for expansion of church school places in other areas or opportunities for new church schools.

3.5 Small Schools

For the purpose of this report a small school is defined as having one form of entry (1fe) with a Pupil Admission Number (PAN) of 30 or less. For schools with less than a half form of entry (0.5fe) and with a PAN of 15 or less these might be described as very small schools. Many of the schools included in the reviews can also be described as rural (serving a population of less than 10,000).

4 THE AREA REVIEW PROCESS

In October 2014 the Lead Member for Learning and Schools Effectiveness gave approval for officers to carry out two area reviews of early years and primary school places, one in the Lewes area and one in the Heathfield area. The stated aim of the review was to ensure there is sufficient provision to meet the predicted demand for places in each area but to also look more widely at the organisation of schools and settings in each area to make sure they are well placed to deliver a high quality education to their local communities.

The area review process adopted was based on good practice identified in other areas of the country. The process involved a number of key stages:

- the preparation of comprehensive data sets for each area including: early years providers and school performance and achievement, collaborative structures in place, place planning and pupil migration, financial situation and predictions and premises information
- desk top analysis of the data sets and the key issues with officers from different teams across the Children Services' Department and the Dioceses
- offer of an individual visit to all the schools included in the reviews to discuss the key issues from the data set with them and to understand their context further
- stakeholder meetings held in each location to include all early years providers, schools, Diocese representatives, and local Councillors. The meetings provided a chance for stakeholders to discuss the information in the data key issues and to explore possible solutions. The feedback from each of the stakeholder meetings is provided in the individual reports for Lewes and Heathfield respectively
- following the stakeholder meetings a number of schools were identified where further discussions were required with them about some of the emerging options for the schools. Meetings with these schools took place in the autumn term and the feedback from these meetings has been used to shape the final report and the recommendations.

5 HEATHFIELD AREA REVIEW

5.1 Background and Context

5.1.1 Schools

The review of Heathfield and some of the surrounding area schools includes three in Heathfield with an additional six schools in the surrounding area that are part of the Heathfield Community College community area. The schools are:

Heathfield

- All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School
- Cross in Hand CE Primary School
- Parkside Community Primary

Surrounding Area:

- Broad Oak Community Primary School
- Dallington CE Primary School
- Five Ashes CE Primary School
- Mayfield CE Primary School
- Maynards Green Community Primary School
- Punnetts Town Community Primary School

5.1.2 Schools' status

- Four of the schools are community schools, five schools are Church of England schools. All Saints' and St Richard's is a Voluntary Aided school whilst the other four CE schools are Voluntary Controlled. Three of the schools form the Woodlands Federation (Broad Oak, Dallington and Punnetts Town).

5.1.3 PAN - Heathfield

- The overall PAN for the Heathfield area is 230 from 2015/16.

5.2 School Data - Analysis

Table 1: Published Admission Numbers

DfE No	School	Year R Published Admission Number															
		2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22		
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
	Heathfield Total	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	19	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
	Surrounding Area Total	109	110	110	110	110	110	110	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	219	220	220	220	220	220	220	230	230	230	230	230	230	230	230	

Note:

Mayfield's PAN increased from 20 to 30 in 2015/16

- By 2015/16, four schools will have round forms of entry (1fe or 2fe) and two schools will have half a form of entry. The remaining three schools will have PANs that do not equate to a half or a full form of entry.
- The current number on roll across the area is 1321 (2015/16) as illustrated in the table below.

Table 2: Number on Roll 2015/16

DfE No	School	Current PAN 2015/16	Current CAP 2015/16	Number on Roll by Year Group 2015/16							NOR	Surplus/ Deficit %
				R	1	2	3	4	5	6		
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary Sch	20	140	17	5	8	5	13	6	9	63	55%
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	60	420	43	32	37	49	45	51	50	307	27%
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	30	210	27	26	29	25	30	26	24	187	11%
	Heathfield Town Total:	110	770	87	63	74	79	88	83	83	557	28%
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	20	140	16	13	23	18	20	17	20	127	9%
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	15	105	15	15	11	17	13	14	16	101	4%
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	10	56	11	6	8	8	5	11	8	57	-2%
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	30	210	28	28	23	20	21	24	27	171	19%
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	30	210	30	30	29	31	30	28	32	210	0%
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	15	105	9	18	11	16	15	18	11	98	7%
	Surrounding Area Total:	120	826	109	110	105	110	104	112	114	764	8%
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	230	1596	196	173	179	189	192	195	197	1321	17%

Source:

Number on Roll by Year Group – October 2015 School Census

Current PAN and CAP - 08.12.15 (Pupil Forecast January 15)

- In 2015/16 All Saints' and St Richard's had a surplus capacity of 55%, Cross-in-Hand 27%, Parkside 11% and Mayfield 19%. Overall, there was a surplus capacity of 17% across the area.
- Table 1 in Appendix A shows the projected pupil numbers in the period to 2020/21 measured against capacity. Pupil numbers are expected to be 1325 against a capacity of 1596, giving a surplus capacity of 271 places (17%) across the area. Two schools (All Saints' and St Richard's and Cross-in-Hand) are forecast to have significant surplus capacity of 60% and 31% respectively. Three schools (Parkside, Mayfield and Punnetts Town) are forecast to have surpluses in excess of 10%.
- Since the area review process began Wealden District Council have been out to consultation on their new Local Plan which sets out their preferred options for growth and projected housing numbers in the period 2015 to 2037. The consultation ended on 30 November 2015. The Plan includes significant new housing across Wealden including up to 1200 in the Heathfield and wider area over the Plan period.

- The local authority has undertaken some preliminary forecasts for the Heathfield area, taking account of Wealden District Council's (WDC) preferred option for housing delivery in the area over the period 2013 to 2037. The analysis comes with major caveats:
 - The volume of additional new housing will no doubt also stimulate births in the areas affected. This has not been factored into the forecasts
 - In the absence of more detailed data, housing numbers have been spread evenly over the Local Plan period based on an annual average given by WDC. In reality we can probably expect additional housebuilding in each area to be more concentrated although maybe with more happening in the middle or later years of the plan.
- The preliminary forecasts indicate that the projected pupil numbers are expected to be in the region of 1428 against a capacity of 1596 giving a surplus capacity of 168 places or 11% across the area.
- The table below provides data on first preferences. Over the past three years only one school has been consistently over-subscribed (Mayfield) while four have always been under-subscribed (Five Ashes, Dallington, All Saints' and St Richard's and Cross-in-Hand).

Table 3: First Preferences

DfE No	School	2012/13				2013/14				2014/15				2015/16			
		PAN	1st Prefs	% 1st Prefs Above/Below PAN	Yr R NOR	PAN	1st Prefs	% 1st Prefs Above/Below PAN	Yr R NOR	PAN	1st Prefs	% 1st Prefs Above/Below PAN	Yr R NOR	PAN	1st Prefs	% 1st Prefs Above/Below PAN	Yr R NOR
	Heathfield Town:																
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	20	5	-75%	5	20	6	-70%	5	20	3	-85%	6	20	13	-35%	17
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	60	41	-32%	45	60	36	-40%	43	60	34	-43%	37	60	40	-33%	43
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	30	24	-20%	25	30	18	-40%	22	30	24	-20%	29	30	34	13%	27
	Heathfield Town Total	110	70	-36%	75	110	60	-45%	70	110	61	-45%	72	110	87	-21%	87
	Surrounding Area:																
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	20	25	25%	20	20	24	20%	23	20	10	-50%	13	20	16	-20%	16
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	15	22	47%	19	15	8	-47%	9	15	14	-7%	17	15	14	-7%	15
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	10	7	-30%	8	10	5	-50%	7	10	5	-50%	5	10	8	-20%	11
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	20	24	20%	27	20	25	25%	23	20	31	55%	28	30	35	17%	28
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	30	29	-3%	30	30	30	0%	31	30	38	27%	30	30	28	-7%	30
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	15	12	-20%	16	15	7	-53%	7	15	17	13%	17	15	9	-40%	9
	Surrounding Area Total	110	119	8%	120	110	99	-10%	100	110	115	5%	110	120	110	-8%	109
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	220	189	-14%	195	220	159	-28%	170	220	176	-20%	182	230	197	-14%	196

Source: ESCC School Admissions Team and School Census

Notes:

	First preferences above PAN or up to 10% below PAN
	First preferences between 11-25% below PAN
	First preferences 25%+ below PAN

- Two early years providers closed in summer 2015 (Huffle and Daisy Chain); Dallington School started offering nursery provision to pick up the places previously offered by Daisy Chain. A number of schools in the Heathfield area have been considering offering nursery provision to replace the provision lost by Huffle. It is not yet clear what impact government proposals to extended funded childcare for three- and four-year-olds to 30 hours per week will have on the availability of places.
- Live birth data indicates that in 2017/18 there will be an increase of around 11 reception aged pupils compared to the current (2015/16) total of 196 reception pupils in Heathfield and the surrounding area. This would give a Yr R total for 2017/18 of 207. In the Reception published admission number for 2017/18 there will be 230 places available in Heathfield and the surrounding area.
- Data regarding pupil characteristics does not indicate any particular equality issues although one school (Five Ashes) does have a higher percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals and pupil premium grant.

- All schools in the Heathfield and surrounding area have been graded “good” in their last Ofsted inspection.
- EYFS performance data for 2014/15 shows that all schools achieved above or well above the National Average of 66% for children achieving a Good Level of Development. (GLD)
- In 2014/15 the achievement of pupils at Key Stage 1 in reading, writing and mathematics varied across schools and across the different subjects, with five schools (All Saints’ and St Richard’s, Cross in Hand, Parkside, Dallington and Maynards Green) achieving above the national average in all three subjects.
- Key Stage 2 attainment data shows that in 2014/15 all but four schools (All Saints’ and St Richard’s, Broad Oak, Dallington and Mayfield) achieved results above the National Average for level 4 in combined Reading, Writing and Maths.
- All schools have buildings which are deemed to be satisfactory by the County Council. One school, Five Ashes, has all its pupils in undersized classrooms. Two schools, Cross-in-Hand and Parkside, have the vast majority of their pupils in undersized classrooms though this is partially off-set by shared activity areas that allow pupils to access more space. Two schools have over 50% of their pupils in mobile accommodation (Broad Oak and Dallington). Two further schools have 25% of their pupils in mobile accommodation (Mayfield and Punnetts Town). Six of the nine schools have undersized Hall space, below the minimum requirement of 140 sqm (All Saints’ & St. Richard’s, Parkside, Broad Oak, Dallington, Five Ashes and Punnetts Town). Four of the nine schools have no playing field on site (Cross-in-Hand, Five Ashes, Mayfield and Punnetts Town) although in some cases the playing field is very close to the school (e.g. Cross-in-Hand).
- The school budget share per pupil varies across the schools. The average funding per pupil for the Heathfield area is £3,947 which is above the East Sussex average of £3,722. Additionally, there are four schools which received significantly more in 2015/16. These schools were Dallington (£4,565) Punnetts Town (£4,833), All Saints’ and St Richard’s (£6,446) and Five Ashes (£7,403).
- Detailed data on attainment and progress for the Key Stages can be found in Tables 2 – 4 in Appendix A.

6 STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS

All schools were represented at the stakeholder meeting. Many early year providers attended and the Diocese of Chichester was represented. Participants recognised that the subject of pupil numbers and capacity was an emotive one.

- Participants wished to be assured that the pupil numbers projected reflected an accurate position (e.g. sufficient allowance for housing development) and whether as well as pupils moving into the area (e.g. from Hailsham and Hertsmonceux – some 14% of pupils) there were also pupils moving out who could be catered for in the area (including those with special needs).
- Participants queried whether, if amalgamation/closure is considered, would there be subsequent costs such as transport and redundancy costs which might off-set savings?
- Most acknowledged that funding, especially for small schools, is likely to become an increasing pressure. A smaller budget can lead to less experienced staff being recruited while the cost of older buildings puts additional pressures on schools' budgets.
- Generally most participants expressed a view that federation was preferable to closure. Some recognised that collaboration/federation might help secure the future of some schools but there was also recognition that even with federation there is still the potential for a significant surplus of places (and anyway would reduction of PAN across a federation be enough to avoid a closure?). There was also recognition that change might occur in two stages with some short term solutions and other longer term ways forward.
- Some expressed concerns that any change might lead to the closure of what are currently "successful" schools with good outcomes. They also raised issues regarding parental preference for small schools and the important links many had with their community and local church. While mixed aged classes are seen as a challenge for some, others stated that this can be good for children and some parents like the family grouping.
- The presence of representatives from the Woodland Federation provided opportunity for others to ask how a federation might work. The benefits of federation such as staff development, shared expertise and economies of scale were acknowledged. However, there were questions raised about how the distinct ethos of a school is sustained after federation and whether parents really understood the role of the executive headteacher.
- Some wished to see a strategic approach to federation rather than it being a response to the departure of the head from a neighbouring small school and wanted to see consideration being given to federations outside the immediate geographical area.
- Participants wanted to be assured that stakeholder views would be taken into account and that decisions had not already been taken.
- Early year provider representatives were concerned about the reduction in places through the impending closure of two providers and also expressed concerns about the need for more before and after school care. Early year providers also wanted to see improved progression into schools and expressed a wish to be based on school sites wherever possible. They also recognised that greater collaboration between themselves as providers would be of benefit.

- There were no specific proposals put forward by participants although subsequent to the meeting a number of proposals have been suggested by schools:
 - federation of Five Ashes with Mayfield
 - reduction of Cross-in-Hand to 1.5 form of entry
 - specialist provision within the area linked to the specialist unit at Heathfield Community College extension of school age to 3-11.

- Governors at All Saints' and St Richard's have also suggested the school expands the role it currently plays in supporting local schools with the 'Thrive' programme. This programme supports pupils who have particular social and emotional needs. In this model the governors see the school offering both full-time and dual role support as well as training to other schools.

7 OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

7.1 Introduction

The information gathered in the data packs and the discussions that have taken place through the area review process identify two schools, Five Ashes and All Saints' and St Richard's where a number of factors suggest that options for the schools should be considered:

- Both these schools have a 'Good' Ofsted judgement, but neither school has been inspected within the last 3 years.
- Both schools have had variations in their attainment data over the last 3 years. In 2014/15 both schools were at or above the East Sussex average for % of pupils achieving a L2+ in English and Writing. All Saints' and St Richard's were above for Maths and Five Ashes was below. In 2014/15 both schools were at or above the East Sussex average for the combined L4 (Reading/Writing/Maths). The year before All Saints' and St Richard's were above and Five Ashes were below the East Sussex average for this measure.
- There are variations in performance at the schools over the years which may be due to the very small cohorts.
- The Headteacher at Five Ashes left in December 2015 and the school has entered into a collaboration with Mayfield with a single Executive Headteacher from January 2016.
- All Saints' and St Richard's has a surplus capacity of 90 pupils/64% against the PAN for the school; this surplus capacity has been broadly the same over the last four years and is predicted to continue into the future.
- Five Ashes is a very small school with a PAN of 10 and 57 currently on roll, there is currently no surplus capacity at the school.
- Parental preference in these schools shows a trend of being very low while other schools are over-subscribed. Both schools saw an increase in parental preferences in 2015/16 at 35% below the PAN for All Saints' and St Richard's (from 85% the previous year) and 20% for Five Ashes (from 50% the previous year).
- Many of the pupils who attend All Saints and St Richards travel from outside the immediate vicinity of the school.
- Just over 50% of the pupils who attend Five Ashes come from outside the village of Five Ashes.
- Both schools are having to rely on mixed age classes. While research shows that mixed age classes are not a barrier to progress, there is evidence that teacher training and experience are key to success. More than a 2 year age range in one class can present significant challenges to teachers inexperienced in vertical grouping and would require additional whole school training for teachers.
- Both schools require above average school share budget funding and the highest of all schools in the area. All Saints' and St Richard's (£6,446) and Five Ashes (£7,403).

Other schools that were identified as sharing some of the characteristics of Five Ashes and All Saints' and St Richard's were Dallington and Punnetts Town, both these schools have a PAN of 15 and are small schools. However neither school has a large number of surplus places or a clear trend of low preferences. Both schools are part of a three school Federation with a single Executive Headteacher.

7.2 Options evaluation – Five Ashes

Five Ashes: No Change – the school continues as a Voluntary Controlled school with a PAN of 10

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 10 would help ensure that the LA can meet parental preferences for those who choose this school who are often from the local area
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education

Disadvantages of this option:

- the school may continue to struggle to receive a high number of first preferences
- the school may need to consider re-structuring to ensure that it is financially secure
- the current Headteacher left at the end of December 2015 and it will prove challenging to recruit another substantive Headteacher. For the foreseeable future the school is entering into a collaboration with Mayfield, and their Headteacher will be Executive Headteacher of the two schools
- the school is likely to continue to experience variations in performance due to the small cohorts
- the school may face challenges around recruitment and retention of high quality teachers and leaders this may pose a risk around Ofsted gradings
- opportunities for KS2 pupils breadth of curriculum may be compromised if school further decreases in size and parents choose larger schools with perceived greater opportunities

Risks to pursuing this option:

- the ability of the school to be able to continue to offer education and be financially secure
- the capacity of the school and the local authority to sustain improvement at the school.

Five Ashes: Federation – the school enters into a federation with a local school.

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 10 would help ensure that the LA can meet parental preferences for those who choose this school who are often from the local area
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- federation would help share good practice between the schools, including the sharing of continued professional development, staff and expertise
- federation may make it easier to attract and retain staff
- a strong federation governing body would provide clear strategic direction and expertise to the school
- shared leadership, and other staffing across the two schools would help reduce staffing costs and ensure that the school is financially secure
- bringing pupils from the two schools together will provide opportunities to broaden the experiences for pupils and support transition to secondary school.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the federation may not be sufficient to improve outcomes consistently year on year or to increase the number of first preferences that the school receives
- there will continue to be a high percentage of surplus places across the Heathfield area
- the costs of operating a school of this size on this site may still be high as federation is not a short cut to reducing costs.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- the federation would need to be managed well with good leadership to ensure outcomes at both schools continue to improve.

Five Ashes: Closure - The local authority takes forward statutory processes to consult on the closure of the school

Benefits of this option:

- a small and financially vulnerable school is closed
- there is capacity with the local area to accommodate the displaced pupils without having to expand any other school
- the surplus places across the Heathfield area would be reduced

Disadvantages of this option:

- pupils in the village will have to travel further to their nearest school and there will be increased transport costs as a result. Initial analysis of what this would mean for existing pupils at the school suggest that over half would qualify for transport costs and this could total between £34,000 - £50,000 per annum
- there would be no places for additional pupils as the area expands as new housing is provided through new build
- the immediate local community will lose their village school.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- whilst there is sufficient capacity overall in the local areas that the pupils are resident in there may be some pressure at particular schools in particular year groups depending on parental preference
- the Wealden DC Local Plan identifies significant housing developments across the area and this may result in an increase in pupil numbers over time in the Mayfield/Five Ashes area
- closing the school is likely to be unpopular with governors, parents of pupils at the school and the local community.

Five Ashes: Join Multi Academy Trust – An academy sponsor is found who can take Five Ashes on as part of a multi academy trust

Benefits of this option:

- the school would become part of a self sustaining MAT
- the local community would retain education provision in the area.

Disadvantages of this option:

- any academy sponsor is unlikely to accept small unsustainable schools into a multi academy trust
- the school is still going to be financially and educationally vulnerable
- conversion to academy processes may deflect energy from improving outcomes.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- The school would not be attractive to a sponsor given the high cost of maintaining the site
- The Diocese of Chichester has confirmed that the school is too small on its own to be considered for the Diocese of Chichester multi-academy trust.

7.3 Options evaluation – All Saints' and St Richard's

All Saints' and St Richard's: No Change – the school continues as a Voluntary Aided school with a PAN of 20

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 20 would help ensure that the LA can meet parental preferences for those who choose this school, including those that want a voluntary aided school
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- the school could explore opening up nursery provision to fill the gap left by early year providers who are closing locally (it should be noted that other local schools are also considering this as an option)
- the school site could be reconfigured in order to free up accommodation for a nursery or community use, for example THRIVE, meeting the requirements of the Childcare Bill should this become the Childcare Act.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the school may continue to struggle to receive a high number of first preferences and continue to operate a high percentage of surplus places
- the school may need to consider re-structuring to ensure that it is financially secure
- the school is likely to continue to experience variations in performance due to the small cohorts
- the school may face challenges around recruitment and retention of high quality teachers and leaders this may pose a risk around Ofsted gradings
- opportunities for KS2 pupils breadth of curriculum may be compromised if school further decreases in size and parents choose larger schools with perceived greater opportunities
- there will continue to be a high percentage of surplus places across the Heathfield area.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- the ability of the school to be able to continue to offer high quality education and be financially secure
- recruitment of leadership and quality teachers may prove to be difficult in the long term
- the capacity of the school and the local authority to sustain improvement at the school.

All Saints' and St Richard's: Federation - the school enters into federation with a local school.

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 20 would help ensure that the LA can meet parental preferences for those who choose this school, including those that want a voluntary aided school
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- a federation would help share good practice between the schools, including the sharing of continued professional development, staff and expertise
- federation may make it easier to attract and retain staff
- a strong federation governing body would provide clear strategic direction and expertise to the school
- bringing pupils from the two schools together will provide opportunities to broaden the experiences for pupils and support transition to secondary school
- the governors of the school have already indicated their wish to pursue a federation and have already contacted a number of local schools
- the school could explore opening up nursery provision/expand its age range to fill the gap left by early year providers who are closing locally (it should be noted that other local schools are also considering this as an option)
- the school could operate on part of the site and free up accommodation for early years, THRIVE or some educational purpose which might benefit both (all) schools in the federation.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the federation may not be sufficient to improve outcomes consistently year on year or to increase the number of first preferences that the school receives
- the costs of operating a school of this size on this site will still be high as federation is not a short cut to reducing costs
- there will continue to be a high percentage of surplus places across the Heathfield area.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- leadership costs may not be reduced as the school currently has a substantive Headteacher, the federation may have to explore a co-Headship model or re-structure
- the federation would need to be managed well with good leadership to ensure outcomes at both schools continue to improve.

All Saints' and St Richard's: Closure – The local authority takes forward statutory processes to consult on the closure of the school

Benefits of this option:

- a small and financially vulnerable school is closed
- there is capacity with the local area to accommodate the displaced pupils without having to expand any other school and in many cases pupils would be attending a school closer to their home address
- the surplus places across the Heathfield area would be reduced

Disadvantages of this option:

- the immediate local community will lose the local school
- the Diocese will lose the only voluntary aided church school in the area and this would reduce choices for parents; though it has been suggested that another local voluntary controlled school may consider changing its status to a Voluntary aided school
- there would be no places for additional pupils as the area expands as new housing is provided through new build.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- whilst there is sufficient capacity overall in the Heathfield area some of the pupils do come from the wider area including Herstmonceux and Hailsham this may lead to pressure at particular schools in particular year groups in these areas depending on parental preference
- closing the school is likely to be unpopular with staff, governors, parents of pupils at the school and the local community
- the Wealden DC Local Plan identifies significant housing developments across the area and this may result in an increase in pupil numbers over time in the Heathfield area.

All Saints and St Richards: Join Multi Academy Trust – An academy sponsor is found who can take the school on as part of a multi academy trust

Benefits of this option:

- the school would become part of a self sustaining MAT
- the local community would retain education provision in the area.

Disadvantages of this option:

- any academy sponsor is unlikely to accept small unsustainable schools into a multi academy trust
- the school is still going to be financially and educationally vulnerable
- conversion to academy processes may deflect energy from improving outcomes.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- The school would not be attractive to a sponsor given the high cost of maintaining the site
- The Diocese of Chichester has confirmed that the school is too small on its own to be considered for the Diocese of Chichester multi-academy trust.

7.4 Other options considered

A proposal was also put forward to reduce the PAN at Cross-in-Hand to 30 and make the school one form of entry to reduce the number of surplus places across the area. Implementing this would be against national evidence that larger schools perform better and are more financially secure than smaller schools. This action would serve to increase the number of small schools in the area and over time undermine the sustainability of Cross-in-Hand itself. There would also be redundancy costs associated with this as well as disproportionate ongoing maintenance costs for the school with fewer numbers. The school has had a recent Ofsted inspection and was graded as 'Good'.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

Following consideration of the options for the two schools presented above and discussions with Headteachers and governors of the individual schools the following recommendations are put forward for approval. A major consideration has been the introduction of the Wealden Local Plan in September 2015 which puts forward plans for significant new housing across the Heathfield area. These recommendations will ensure that the local authority can continue to provide sufficient pupil places in the Heathfield area, enable the local authority to meet parental preferences for schools and help ensure that schools are more sustainable in the future. The Diocese of Chichester are supportive of these proposals.

Recommendation 1:

Five Ashes CofE Primary School – The school forms a federation with Mayfield CE Primary School

The school is already in a collaboration with a local school, Mayfield CE Primary School and the recommendation is that the two schools quickly move to a formal federation. The federation will help the school become more sustainable, to recruit and retain staff and to secure strong leadership.

Recommendation 2:

All Saints’ and St Richard’s CofE Primary School - The school works with the local authority and the Diocese of Chichester to form a federation with another local school

The recommendation is that the school moves quickly to a formal federation with a local school. The federation will help the school become more sustainable, to recruit and retain staff and to secure strong leadership.

Recommendation 3:

Free School

The local authority should continue to monitor the impact of the housing plans in the Wealden DC Local Plan on forecast pupil numbers and consider the reconfiguration of schools in the area through a Free School which could provide provision that is more sustainable and in better equipped school buildings. The local authority should work closely with the Diocese of Chichester on exploring this option.

Recommendation 4:

Early Year’s Village Approach

East Sussex Early Years Improvement team have an expectation that all early years provision on school sites work in close partnership together, under the ‘**Early Years Foundation Stage Village Project**’ approach, to achieve the best outcomes for children in the foundation stage. There is strong evidence that this approach benefits children in nursery and reception with good transitions being a key element of success. This approach should be further developed by schools within the Heathfield area with the local early years providers.

APPENDIX A - Heathfield Area: Additional Data

Table 1:

Surplus/Shortfall of School Places by Academic Year

D/E No	2014/15				2015/16				2016/17				2017/18				2018/19				2019/20				2020/21				
	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	Capacity	Number on Roll	Surplus/Deficit No.	Surplus/Deficit %	
Heathfield Area																													
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	140	57	83	59%	140	63	77	55%	140	61	79	56%	140	63	77	55%	140	56	84	60%	140	57	83	59%	140	56	84	60%
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	420	348	72	17%	420	307	113	27%	420	320	100	24%	420	306	114	27%	420	299	121	29%	420	291	129	31%	420	290	130	31%
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	210	179	31	15%	210	187	23	11%	210	188	22	10%	210	191	19	9%	210	184	26	12%	210	183	27	13%	210	179	31	15%
	Heathfield - To be decided	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	2	-2		0	12	-12		0	21	-21		0	27	-27		0	24	-24	
	Heathfield Total	770	584	186	24%	770	557	213	28%	770	571	199	26%	770	572	198	26%	770	560	210	27%	770	558	212	28%	770	549	221	29%
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	140	130	10	7%	140	127	13	9%	140	128	12	9%	140	130	10	7%	140	134	6	4%	140	134	6	4%	140	128	12	8%
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	105	101	4	4%	105	101	4	4%	105	101	4	3%	105	104	1	1%	105	105	0	0%	105	103	2	2%	105	108	-3	-3%
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	56	57	-1	-2%	56	57	-1	-2%	56	57	-1	-2%	56	54	2	4%	56	54	2	4%	56	53	3	6%	56	51	5	9%
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	170	168	2	1%	210	171	39	19%	210	169	41	20%	210	178	32	15%	210	185	25	12%	210	182	28	13%	210	180	30	14%
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	210	206	4	2%	210	210	0	0%	210	210	0	0%	210	218	-8	-4%	210	224	-14	-7%	210	224	-14	-7%	210	224	-14	-7%
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	105	94	11	10%	105	98	7	7%	105	95	10	9%	105	90	15	14%	105	87	18	17%	105	83	22	21%	105	85	20	19%
	Surrounding Area Total	786	756	30	4%	826	764	62	8%	826	760	66	8%	826	773	53	6%	826	789	37	4%	826	779	47	6%	826	775	51	6%
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	1556	1340	216	14%	1596	1321	275	17%	1596	1331	265	17%	1596	1344	252	16%	1596	1349	247	15%	1596	1336	260	16%	1596	1325	271	17%

Heathfield to be decided includes an allowance for additional pupils arising from new housing development

Key

	Any deficit or a surplus less than 10%
	Surplus between 10% and 24.99%
	Surplus over 25%

Please note it is not possible to show the nominal deficit/shortfall as a percentage for 'Heathfield to be decided' as Capacity is zero.

Source:

2008/09 - 2013/14 totals are actuals from the January 14 Schools Census

2014/15 totals are actuals from the January 2015 Schools Census

2015/16 totals are actuals from the October 2015 School Census

All other years are forecast totals from 03.07.15 (Pupil forecast January 2015)

Table 2:

Early Years Foundation Stage Attainment Data 2011/12 to 2014/15

DfE No	School	Good Level of Development							
		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
		Total No. of Pupils Yr R	%GLD	Total No. of Pupils Yr R	%GLD	Total No. of Pupils Yr R	%GLD	Total No. of Pupils Yr R	%GLD
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	9	67%	5	20%	5	60%	5	80%
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	54	70%	46	57%	44	80%	35	71%
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	29	76%	24	42%	22	68%	29	86%
	Heathfield Town Total:	92	72%	75	49%	71	74%	69	78%
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	17	77%	21	29%	23	74%	14	71%
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	15	67%	20	55%	9	67%	16	88%
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	6	67%	8	50%	9	100%	6	83%
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	22	64%	27	30%	23	83%	29	83%
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	30	83%	28	50%	31	71%	31	87%
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	17	24%	16	6%	8	75%	17	82%
	Surrounding Area Total:	107	65%	120	37%	103	76%	113	83%
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	199	68%	195	42%	174	75%	182	81%
845	East Sussex Total:	5298	57%	5,360	44%	5,356	66%	5,625	74%
	England Total:	605,995	64%	643,302	52%	641,331	60%	655,016	66%

Source: School Census Jan 2012, Jan 2013, Jan 2014 and Jan 2015
Statistical First Releases Nov 2014 and October 2015; Keypas July 2015
DfE Performance Tables 2012, 2013 and 2014
Data collected directly from Schools by ESCC Data, Research and Information Management team

Key:

Indicates Good Level of Development (GLD) below East Sussex average

England Includes state-funded Primary schools, including academies and free schools, private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sectors.

GLD – 2009 to 2012: a child who has achieved a score of 6 or more in all 7 scales of the PSE(Personal, Social and Emotional Development) and CLL (Communication, Language and Literacy) areas of Learning and scored 78 points or more across all 13 scales of the EYFSP.

GLD – 2013 onwards: is the most widely used single measure of child development in the early years. Children have been defined as having reached a GLD at the end of the EYFS if they achieved at least the expected level in the ELGs (early learning goals) in the prime areas of learning (personal, social and emotional development; physical development; and communication and language) and in the specific areas of mathematics and literacy.

Table 3:**Key Stage 1 Attainment 2011/12 to 2014/15**

		Percentage Achieving L2B+															
		2011/2012				2012/2013				2013/2014				2014/15			
DfE No	School	Total No of Pupils Y2	Reading	Writing	Maths	Total No of Pupils Y2	Reading	Writing	Maths	Total No of Pupils Y2	Reading	Writing	Maths	Total No of Pupils Y2	Reading	Writing	Maths
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	9	67%	67%	78%	5	60%	40%	80%	12	67%	67%	67%	4	100%	100%	100%
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	48	81%	79%	73%	59	66%	59%	73%	49	78%	69%	78%	49	92%	80%	88%
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	23	78%	74%	83%	19	89%	68%	84%	28	71%	71%	79%	23	91%	91%	91%
	Heathfield Town Total:	80	79%	76%	76%	83	71%	60%	76%	89	75%	70%	77%	76	92%	84%	89%
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	15	87%	80%	87%	17	71%	53%	65%	18	89%	83%	83%	20	70%	65%	85%
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	19	79%	58%	95%	15	80%	67%	73%	13	77%	77%	77%	18	83%	83%	89%
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	9	56%	22%	44%	8	63%	25%	63%	8	88%	88%	100%	8	88%	100%	75%
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	29	79%	14%	76%	25	84%	80%	80%	20	85%	75%	75%	27	78%	78%	78%
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	29	72%	69%	69%	30	97%	90%	87%	28	89%	86%	89%	30	93%	87%	90%
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	8	88%	63%	88%	13	92%	92%	92%	15	87%	67%	87%	17	88%	88%	82%
	Surrounding Area Total:	109	77%	50%	77%	108	84%	74%	79%	102	86%	79%	83%	120	83%	82%	84%
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	189	78%	61%	77%	191	79%	68%	63%	191	82%	75%	81%	196	87%	83%	86%
845	East Sussex Total:	4,980	74%	62%	75%	5,207	76%	64%	76%	5,362	79%	69%	79%	5,467	83%	74%	84%
	England Total:	578,230	76%	64%	76%	595,092	79%	67%	78%	614,042	81%	70%	80%	642,568	82%	72%	82%

Source: School Census Jan 2012, Jan 2013, Jan 2014 and Jan 2015
Statistical First Releases Nov 2014 and 2015; Keyphas July 2015
DfE Performance Tables 2012, 2013 and 2014
Data collected directly from Schools by ESCC Data, Research and Information Management team

Key:

Indicates attainment below East Sussex average

England Figure includes: state-funded primary schools, including academies and free schools, private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sectors.

Table 4:**Key Stage 2 Attainment Data 2011/12 to 2014/15**

		% Achieving L4+ Reading, Writing and Maths							
		2011/2012		2012/2013		2013/2014		2014/15	
DfE No	School	Total No of Pupils Y6	% L4+ R/W/M	Total No of Pupils Y6	% L4+ R/W/M	Total No of Pupils Y6	% L4+ R/W/M	Total No of Pupils Y6	% L4+ R/W/M
3327	All Saints' and St Richard's CE Primary School	12	58%	7	71%	5	100%	10	80%
3015	Cross in Hand CE Primary School	49	82%	50	84%	43	91%	57	88%
2160	Parkside Community Primary School	30	97%	24	79%	31	90%	28	89%
	Heathfield Town Total:	91	84%	81	81%	79	91%	95	87%
2055	Broad Oak Community Primary School	22	91%	29	86%	21	95%	21	71%
3017	Dallington CE Primary School	15	80%	9	67%	7	100%	13	77%
3071	Five Ashes CE Primary	4	75%	14	57%	3	67%	6	83%
3043	Mayfield CE Primary School	18	78%	18	67%	23	87%	19	79%
2074	Maynards Green Community Primary School	21	90%	28	93%	30	93%	26	92%
2082	Punnetts Town Community Primary School	13	100%	12	67%	12	92%	8	100%
	Surrounding Area Total:	93	87%	110	77%	96	92%	93	83%
	Heathfield and Surrounding Area Total	184	85%	191	79%	175	92%	188	85%
845	East Sussex Total:	4,949	71%	4,810	72%	4,926	78%	5,005	80%
	England Total:	511,835	75%	533,965	76%	553,464	81%	568,725	80%

Source: School Census Jan 2012, Jan 2013, Jan 2014 and Jan 2015
 Statistical First Releases Nov 2014 and Dec 2015
 DfE Performance Tables 2012, 2013 and 2014

Key:

Indicates attainment below East Sussex average
 England: State-funded primary schools, including Academies and free schools