



**EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
LEWES 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.....	9
5	LEWES AREA REVIEW	10
6	STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS.....	14
7	OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION	16
8	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
	APPENDIX A - Lewes Area: Additional Data	28

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 recommendation 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 Lewes 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 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, 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 these reviews. 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
- Removes 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 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 2014-2018. 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, wherever possible, provide additional accommodation designed to ensure a seamless transition between Nursery and Reception
- support new schools and settings, including academies, free schools, studio schools and university technology colleges where their location will help relieve pressure on places and/or increase parental choice and raise outcomes
- provide value for money.

3.2 Policies

The Council's School Organisation Policy (Appendix A to the Education Commissioning Plan 2014-2108) 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 as well as there being two Voluntary Aided Schools. The Voluntary Controlled Schools are all Church of England and the two Voluntary Aided Schools are a Church of England and Catholic School. There are no Church of England Voluntary Aided Schools in Lewes town.

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, particularly leadership and governance, 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 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 and percentage increasing in proportion to other schools in an area.
- the Diocese has worked closely with ESCC to support schools to move to federation including mixed federations between church and community schools.
- 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
- the Diocesan MAT will undertake due diligence before taking small schools in to ensure long term viability.
- 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. Particularly where new centres of population are developing and the dioceses has no existing schools whether VC or VA.

3.4.2 Arundel and Brighton

The Diocese of Arundel and Brighton has set out its position in relation to small schools:

- The Diocese recognises the pressures upon small schools and is looking to develop long term strategic solutions. These may include partnership work with the County Councils and the Regional Schools' Commissioner
- The Diocese recognises 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 is actively supporting its schools in considering developing diocesan multi-academy trusts. Information to schools from the Diocese states: *"This is an exciting time for the diocese as we move forward in developing diocesan cluster MATs and it has been very encouraging to see so many schools engage in the debate!"* It is to be expected that small primaries will be able to call upon the DfE's primary chain development grant to accelerate the clustering of Diocesan primary schools.
- The Diocese will closely monitor, with the County Council, the number of places in Lewes to ensure that changes do not have a negative effect on potentially vulnerable schools, for example those with a PAN less than a whole form of entry.

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 school. 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 LEWES AREA REVIEW

5.1 Background and Context

5.1.1 Schools

The review of Lewes Town and some of the surrounding area schools includes six primary schools within the town of Lewes with an additional three schools in the surrounding area. The schools are:

Lewes Town

- Pells CE Primary
- South Malling CE Primary
- Southover CE Primary
- St Pancras Catholic Primary
- Wallands Community Primary
- Western Road Community Primary

Surrounding Area

- Hamsey Community Primary School
- Iford and Kingston CE Primary
- Rodmell CE Primary

5.1.2 Schools' status

- The CE Primary schools are all Voluntary Controlled schools with the exception of Rodmell which is Voluntary Aided. St Pancras Catholic Primary is Voluntary Aided.
- Western Road has Foundation Trust status as part of the Lewes Co-operative Learning Partnership with Priory (secondary) School. Pells, South Malling, Southover, Iford and Kingston and Rodmell are also members of the Co-operative Learning Trust as founding partner schools but without changing their existing foundation status. Wallands, St Pancras and Hamsey are not part of the Co-operative Learning Trust.
- Hamsey is entering into a collaboration with Plumpton primary school from September 2015, with an executive headteacher over the two schools. Hamsey are keen to explore federation as a longer term solution for their school.

5.1.3 PAN - Lewes

- The overall PAN for Lewes Town and surrounding area is currently 249, increasing to 274 in 2016/17. By 2016/17, five schools will have round forms of entry (1fe or 2fe) and one school 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.

5.2 School data

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	
3094	Pells CE Primary School	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	44	44	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
3041	Southover CE Primary School	44	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	60	60	60	60	60	60	
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
	Lewes Total	218	219	205	205	205	205	205	205	220	220	220	220	220	220	
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	12	12	12	12	12	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	Surrounding Area Total	40	40	40	41	41	44	44	44	54	54	54	54	54	54	
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	258	259	245	246	246	249	249	249	274	274	274	274	274	274	

Note:

South Malling reduced its PAN from 44 to 30 in 2010/11

Hamsey increased its PAN from 12 to 15 in 2013/14

Southover's PAN will increase from 45 to 60 in 2016/17

Iford and Kingston's PAN will increase from 20 to 30 in 2016/17

Table 2: Number on Roll 2015/16

DfE No	School	Current PAN 2015/16	Current CAP 2015/16	Number on Roll 2015/16										Surplus/Deficit %	
				R	1	2	3	4	5	6	NOR				
	Lewes Town:														
3094	Pells CE Primary School	20	140	13	14	9	12	15	16	12	91	35%			
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	30	270	30	30	30	30	59	30	42	251	7%			
3041	Southover CE Primary School	45	375	45	60	45	47	48	49	48	342	9%			
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	20	140	19	22	13	21	17	15	12	119	15%			
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	60	420	61	62	61	62	67	67	67	447	-6%			
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	30	210	27	30	30	30	28	30	30	205	2%			
	Lewes Town Total	205	1555	195	218	188	202	234	207	211	1455	6%			
	Surrounding Area:														
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	15	105	7	18	15	15	11	16	16	98	7%			
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	20	170	27	30	27	24	23	22	22	175	-3%			
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	9	63	9	9	7	7	5	7	4	48	24%			
	Surrounding Area Total	44	338	43	57	49	46	39	45	42	321	5%			
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	249	1893	238	275	237	248	273	252	253	1776	6%			

Source:

Number on Roll by Year Group – October 2015 School Census

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

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
	Lewes Town:																
3094	Pells CE Primary School	20	7	-65%	8	20	6	-70%	8	20	9	-55%	13	20	11	-45%	13
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	30	38	27%	30	30	37	23%	30	30	32	7%	30	30	41	37%	30
3041	Southover CE Primary School	45	46	2%	45	45	46	2%	46	45	63	40%	60	45	46	2%	45
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	20	15	-25%	18	20	10	-50%	13	20	11	-45%	19	20	14	-30%	19
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	60	53	-12%	58	60	50	-17%	51	60	80	33%	61	60	66	10%	61
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	30	36	20%	30	30	43	43%	29	30	23	-23%	30	30	19	-37%	27
	Lewes Town Total	205	195	-5%	189	205	192	-6%	177	205	216	6%	213	205	197	-4%	195
	Surrounding Area:																
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	12	6	-50%	11	15	21	40%	16	15	10	-33%	15	15	5	-67%	7
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	20	21	5%	17	20	14	-30%	18	20	24	20%	30	20	44	120%	27
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	9	7	-22%	7	9	4	-56%	8	9	7	-22%	10	9	7	-22%	9
	Surrounding Area Total	41	34	-17%	35	44	39	-11%	42	44	41	-7%	55	44	56	27%	43
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	246	229	-7%	224	249	231	-7%	219	249	259	4%	268	249	253	2%	238

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

5.3 Analysis of data

- In 2015/16 Wallands and Iford and Kingston had more pupils on roll than the schools' nominated capacity. The remaining schools had surplus capacity with Pells having a surplus of 35%, St Pancras 15% and Rodmell 24%. Overall, there was a surplus capacity of 6% across the area.
- The table in Appendix A shows the projected pupil numbers in the period to 2020/21 measured against capacity. Pupil numbers are expected to be 1745 against a capacity of 1918, giving a surplus capacity of 173 places (9%) across the area. However, some schools are forecast to have significant surplus capacity (Pells, St Pancras), while others are forecast to have in excess of 10% surplus capacity (Western Rd, Hamsey).
- Data showing first preferences' pressure shows a wide variation across schools. Three schools have consistently had first preferences below PAN across the last three years (Pells, St Pancras and Rodmell) and two schools (Western Rd, Hamsey) have had preferences below PAN in two of the last three years.
- Early Years forecasts predict a small surplus of places in the area. However, it is not yet clear what impact government proposals to extend funded childcare for three- and four-year-olds to 30 hours per week will have on the availability of places.
- Live birth data shows a downward trend but recently approved new housing developments within the town, including the "North Street development" will increase pressure on places.
- Data regarding pupil characteristics does not indicate any particular equality issues although one school (Pells) does have a significantly higher percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals and pupil premium grant.
- The majority of schools are currently judged by Ofsted to be "Good", with one school (Iford and Kingston) judged to be "Outstanding". However a number of schools have not had Ofsted inspections for over three years, including Iford and Kingston (2009) and South Malling (2011). One school (Pells CE Primary) is currently judged to be "Requires Improvement".
- Early Years Foundation Stage data shows that for 2014/15 all schools with the exception of one school (Rodmell) achieved above the national average of 66% for 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. Five schools (South Malling, St Pancras, Wallands, Western Road and Iford and Kingston) achieved above the national average in all three subjects.
- Key Stage 2 attainment data shows that in 2014/15 all but three schools (Pells, Wallands and Rodmell) achieved results above the National Average for level 4 in combined Reading, Writing and Maths.
- Detailed data on attainment and progress for the Key Stages can be found in Appendix A.

- All schools have buildings which are deemed to be satisfactory by the County Council. A number have sites below the recommended site area (Southover, St Pancras, and Rodmell). Some schools are reliant on the use of mobile classrooms (South Malling, Hamsey, and Iford and Kingston). DDA compliance is restricted in a number of schools (Southover and Western Road) usually because of two storey construction. A large number of schools have no dedicated hall space or undersized hall space (Hamsey, Iford and Kingston, Pells, St Pancras, and Rodmell). Southover and Western Road share a playing field and Rodmell does not have an on-site playing field.
- The school budget share per pupil varies across the schools. The average for the Lewes area is £3,773 which is close to the East Sussex average of £3,722. However, there are four schools which are receiving significantly more in the 2015/16 financial year. These are St Pancras (£4,319), Hamsey (£4,619), Pells (£5,433), and Rodmell (£5,523).

6 STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS

All schools, except St Pancras Catholic Primary School, were represented at the stakeholder meetings. A few Early Years providers also attended. Both dioceses were represented.

- A general consensus emerged indicating that the main concerns are about Pells and Rodmell and their viability (quality, size and cost).
- It was noted that about 20% of parents are not obtaining their first preference while around 20% of pupils were attending schools in the area while living outside the area (Ringmer and Newhaven/Peacehaven).
- Participants recognised that when there are surplus places this often reflects parental choice particularly around individual school ethos. This may lead to schools predominantly reflecting parental social standing. Generally it was felt that with one or two exceptions the locality of the school is key rather than the status (for example community or controlled) and that even Ofsted grades (unless inadequate) were not deterring expressions of preference. The desire for small schools was often seen as a parental preference. It was also noted that the walking distance to schools within and across Lewes was low so any changes are unlikely to have transport implications.
- Many participants expressed a view that schools' PANs with whole forms of entry (30, 60, 90) are preferable for administrative and organisational purposes.
- The Lewes Co-operative Learning Partnership (LCLP) is at an emergent stage but there is a growing recognition that it could contribute to future strategic leadership in the town.
- When considering the merits of federation some expressed concern regarding potential loss of identity where each school's set of values and/or culture is diminished. The different status of schools was also seen as a potential barrier to federation. However, many saw that there were opportunities to make greater use of sharing resources and expertise. There was inevitably some concern regarding potential loss of jobs through federation.
- Early Years providers represented wished to see greater school links and would like wherever possible to be based on school sites. It was noted that for some providers about 15% of children were coming from addresses out of Lewes Town. Concerns were also expressed about the potential impact of the proposed 30 hours on Early Years providers.
- There were a number of observations about Pells. These included:
 - the school serves the most disadvantaged part of town, many parents from this area are taking their children to Wallands/South Malling
 - the school is not always chosen even though it was the nearest school
 - the school suffers from higher pupil mobility than other schools
 - concern that if Pells moved/closed this would have a negative impact on the EY provision which is on site (Pippins) and currently full.
- A number of suggestions were made regarding alternatives for Pells. These included:
 - relocation perhaps in the North Street area
 - designating as a specialist resource for behaviour
 - partnership with neighbouring schools – Wallands/South Malling
 - rebranding
 - if site no longer required then other educational uses could be found.

- A number of comments were made regarding Rodmell. These included:
 - lots of pupils attend from outside the local community coming from Newhaven and Peacehaven)
 - could the local schools contain these pupils if Rodmell closed (a new school (1 fe) is opening in Newhaven in September 2015)?
 - Rodmell is Voluntary Aided and concern was raised as to how its distinctive character could be maintained. Elsewhere the neighbouring Iford and Kingston is over-subscribed and the village is growing.

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, Rodmell and Pells where a number of factors suggest that options for the school should be considered:

- Pells has a “requires improvement” (RI) Ofsted judgement. Pells received its second RI judgement in 2015. If the school does not obtain a “good” (or higher) at the next inspection it will be placed in Special Measures and an academy solution will have to be found.
- Under the Education and Adoption Act 2015 Pells could attract intervention by the Regional Schools Commissioner and be moved to academy status/closure without consultation.
- The headteacher of Pells left in December 2015 and there is an interim Executive Headteacher in place from January 2016. Recruitment to the Headteacher post is likely to be a challenge.
- Rodmell had an Ofsted inspection in November 2015 and was awarded a Good grading.
- Key stage 1 achievement data for 2014/15 shows that the % of children achieving L2b in reading and writing and maths at Pells improved to just below the national average. At Rodmell data for 2014/15 shows that the % of children achieving L2b in reading improved but is still below the national average. In writing the % dropped significantly and for maths it stayed the same at 100%.
- The Key Stage 2 attainment data for 2014/15 shows that the % of children achieving Level 4+ for the combined reading/writing/maths decreased significantly at Pells and increased at Rodmell though still significantly below the national average.
- There are variations in performance at the schools over the years which may be due to the very small cohorts.
- Pells has a surplus capacity of 49 pupils/35% against the overall PAN for the school; this surplus capacity has been broadly the same over the last five years.
- Rodmell has a surplus capacity of 15 pupils/24% against the PAN for the school.
- Parental preference in these schools is low while other local schools are over-subscribed.
- Many of the pupils who attend Pells come from within the local area but a significant number who live close to the school attend other schools across the town, particularly Wallands and South Malling.
- Most pupils who attend Rodmell travel from outside the immediate vicinity of the school.
- At Pells 65% of the pupils are FSM and a third are SEN. Only 17 of the pupils at the school are neither FSM nor SEN.
- Both schools are having to rely on mixed age classes. Rodmell teaches pupils in three classes: a mixed Reception and Year 1 class, a class of Year 2 and Year 3 pupils and a class of Year 4, 5 and 6 pupils. However Ofsted did not find this a hindrance to progress and therefore it is not seen as a barrier to success.
- 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 a than 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, both schools require above average school share budget funding and the highest of all schools in the area, Pells (£5,433), and Rodmell (£5,523).
- The current Early Years provision on the Pells site does not appear to have established a successful Village partnership with the school, and few of the pupils that attend the pre-school progress onto the school. The governors of Pells have renewed the lease for the early years provider for another year.
- It is recognised by the local authority, the Diocese and by Ofsted, that the headteacher and governors at Pells have worked hard to improve outcomes at the schools over the last few years and are already actively discussing the best options for the school and its pupils given the challenges of the low first preferences that the school receives.

St Pancras has also been identified through the area review process as a small school which has a trend of low first preferences school and some surplus capacity. However results at this school are strong and the school has a 'Good' Ofsted judgement.

As recently as November 2015 "The Bishop and Trustees of the Diocese of Arundel & Brighton have indicated a willingness to consider proposals from the Diocesan schools to form "cluster" Catholic multi academy trusts, i.e. academy trusts established to run a group of Catholic schools who have come together based on a shared set of ideals and who are close enough geographically so that collaboration is meaningful and effective"

We would expect that in time St Pancras will consider joining such a MAT. Being part of a formal partnership structure will help alleviate some of the challenges of being such a small school.

The following section put forward options for consideration for Pells and Rodmell along with the benefits, disadvantages and risks of each option. For each school the four options to be considered are: no change, federation, closure or joining a multi-academy trust.

7.2 Options evaluation - Pells

Pells: 'No Change' - the school continues as a voluntary controlled school with a PAN of 20.

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 20 would help ensure that the LA can provide sufficient primary places in Lewes
- the school currently provides places for a significant proportion of disadvantaged pupils
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the school will continue to struggle to receive a high number of first preferences
- the school will need to consider re-structuring to ensure that it is financially secure
- the current Headteacher left at the end of the autumn term 2015 and it will be challenging to recruit another substantive Headteacher
- the pupils attending this school are receiving education that has been graded 'RI' twice in the most recent Ofsted inspections
- key stage 2 attainment results for 2014/15 show that the performance at the school has decreased significantly from the previous year
- the school is likely to struggle to attract and retain high quality teachers
- the school has the highest cost of provision in the area at £5,433 per pupil
- the Pells governors have given considerable thought to the future and acknowledge the issues, their over-riding concern has been to secure an appropriate high quality education for their present and future pupils and feel as such that the current situation cannot continue
- 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 and the local authority to sustain improvement at the school including finding a suitable Headteacher to lead the school
- the ability of the school to be able to continue to offer education and be financially secure
- if the school does not obtain a 'good' (or higher) at the next inspection it will be placed in Special Measures and an academy solution will have to be found. It will be extremely unlikely that there will be interest from an academy sponsor to take on Pells due to its size as less than 1 form of entry, at this point the Regional Schools Commissioner may ask the local authority to consider closure as one option
- the school is vulnerable to being defined as a vulnerable/'coasting school' under the Education and Adoption Act 2015 and is at risk of intervention from the Regional Schools Commissioner.

Pells: Federation - the school enters into a federation with another local school

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 20 would help ensure that the LA can provide sufficient primary places in Lewes
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- the federation could help with a 're-branding of the school' and help increase the number of first preferences that the school receives
- a federation would help share good practice between the schools, including the sharing of continued professional development, staff and expertise and help improve performance at Pells. There are many examples, both nationally and locally where such a federation has led to significantly improved results
- a strong federation governing body would provide clear strategic direction and expertise to the school
- opportunities for bringing pupils from the two schools together could help improve outcomes for Pells learners and support their transition to secondary school
- over time the federation may wish to explore amalgamation of the two schools
- 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 – the space to be managed by the federated governing body to the benefit of all schools.

Disadvantages of this option:

- to succeed in a federation a local school deemed at least securely good with an experienced headteacher with capacity to support Pells would be required and would need to be identified very quickly
- the school may still struggle to appoint a Head of School
- the federation may not be sufficient to improve outcomes for Pells quickly enough or to increase the popularity of the school
- if the federation led to amalgamation of the two schools any potential increase of the PAN could have a detrimental impact on pupil numbers at St Pancras.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- identifying another school with the capacity and willingness to federate
- if the school does not obtain a 'good' (or higher) at the next inspection it will be placed in Special Measures and an academy solution will have to be found
- the Regional School Commissioner may not see federation as robust enough to secure rapid improvement and intervene through the introduction of a sponsor without the trigger of a special measures judgement.

Pells: Closure – The local authority takes forward statutory processes to consult on the closure of the school

Benefits of this option:

- parents of the pupils at the school would be able to apply for places at other local schools that are currently Ofsted graded 'good' or better and where attainment outcomes are stronger. The commitment of ESCC to offer all pupils a place in a school rated good or better would be achieved for all local families
- the risk of the school being defined as a 'coasting school' or being put into special measures after then next inspection and requiring intervention from the Regional Schools Commissioner is removed
- the closure of the school may help St Pancras school to increase its number of first preferences
- in the longer term the pupil forecasts suggests that the PAN across the town would be sufficient for the number of pupils if Pells were to close
- an undersubscribed and financially vulnerable school is closed
- there is capacity within 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
- KS2 pupils in particular would receive the benefit of larger schools with greater curriculum opportunity
- better value would be achieved as Pells is high cost due to surplus places in the school
- risk of future contraction of school roll with attendant teaching and leadership capacity reduction putting standards at risk will be removed.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the removal of the school's PAN of 20 places will increase pressure on places in the Lewes area, spaces in the short term would be very tight and parental preferences for schools may not be able to be met
- the local authority has no capital funding to permanently expand another school to accommodate any short term pressure
- the Diocese will lose a church school from the town and this could reduce choices for parents in they cannot gain a place at one of the other church schools
- the immediate local community will lose their local education facility.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- other local schools will need to accommodate and meet the needs of the pupils currently at Pells many of whom are in receipt of pupil premium and also receive additional educational needs support
- further exploration would be required with the Diocese about the determination of any capital receipts from the Pells land and whether these could be used to improve provision at another church school in Lewes, at this point in time there is no guarantee that this can happen
- closing the school is likely to be unpopular with staff, parents of pupils at the school and the local community.

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

Benefits of this option:

- the school would become part of a self sustaining MAT and the expertise of the MAT cluster would be the catalyst for and the means of rapid improvement for the school. This would depend upon there being a sponsor “ready to step in” and support the new academy even prior to conversion
- the risk of the school being put into ‘Special Measures’ after the next inspection is removed as this would be a closure and opening of an academy which is exempt from Ofsted inspection (though subject to DfE /RSC rigour) for 3 years. This would allow the school to concentrate on its rapid improvement overseen by the MAT sponsor
- the local community would retain education provision in the area.

Disadvantages of this option:

- an academy sponsor is unlikely to accept small unsustainable schools into a multi academy trust
- belonging to a MAT does not guarantee a rapid turn around in performance and outcomes
- conversion to academy processes may deflect energy from school improvement at a time when the school has reduced leadership capacity.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- no academy sponsor has shown any interest in taking on Pells as part of a multi-academy trust
- 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 Other options considered

Other options put forward at the stakeholder events included the re-location of the school and the re-designation of the school as a specialist facility. A re-location of the school would require capital investment that is not currently available to the local authority and the identification of land for a new school; this option is therefore not considered viable. The re-designation of the school as a special school or specialist unit would require the closure of the current school and the current pupils would need to be accommodated in other local schools. An application to open a new special school site and/or discussions with the Diocese to use the school buildings as a specialist unit would then need to be taken forward. This suggestion could only be pursued if the option to close the school is agreed and implemented.

7.4 Options evaluation - Rodmell

Rodmell: 'No Change' – the school continues as a voluntary aided school with a PAN of 9.

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 9 would help ensure that the LA can provide sufficient primary places in the area alleviating pressure in Lewes and Newhaven
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- there would continue to be a rural village school.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the school will need to consider re-structuring to ensure that it is financially secure
- the school may have to consider reducing the number of classes across the whole school which, if implemented, is likely to be unpopular with parents and will require further staff training.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- the new school that has opened in Newhaven and the loss of the bus service may mean that fewer parents choose Rodmell as their preferred option
- the ability of the school and the local authority to sustain improvement at the school. The school is now rated good but such a small school will always be at risk arising from small changes in demographic, teacher supply and leadership
- opportunities for KS2 pupils breadth of curriculum may be compromised if the school further decreases in size and parents choose larger schools with perceived greater opportunities
- the ability of the school to be able to continue to be financially secure and to attract and retain high quality staff. It has the second highest cost per pupil of the schools in the Lewes area at £5,523.

Rodmell: Federation - the school enters into a federation with another local school

Benefits of this option:

- the continued PAN of 9 would help ensure that the LA can provide sufficient primary places in the area and alleviate pressure in Lewes and Newhaven
- the buildings and ground will continue to be used for education
- there would continue to be a rural village school
- a federation would help share good practice between the schools, including the sharing of continued professional development, staff and expertise and help sustain performance at Rodmell. There are many examples, both nationally and locally where such a federation has led to significantly improved results
- a strong federation governing body would provide clear strategic direction and expertise to the school and the good governance of Rodmell would likewise support another school.

Disadvantages of this option:

- to sustain improvement at Rodmell a local school deemed at least securely good with would be required and would need to be identified very quickly
- the school may still be required to reduce the number of classes to reduce costs
- there would still need to be restructuring in order to reduce costs and reduce share of schools' budget; the costs of operating a school of this size on this site will still be high
- federation will not increase the roll and the school will still be running at a high under capacity rate.

Risks to pursuing this option:

- the agreement of a local school to enter into a federation with Rodmell needs to be secured so that the governing body might consider how to effect savings and reduce costs of this very small financially vulnerable school
- 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.

Rodmell: 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 within 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
- KS2 pupils in particular would receive the benefit of larger schools with greater curriculum opportunity
- better value would be achieved as Rodmell is high cost due to low numbers
- risk of future contraction of school roll with attendant teaching and leadership capacity reduction putting standards at risk will be removed.

Disadvantages of this option:

- the Diocese will lose the only voluntary aided church school in the area and this would reduce choices for parents
- 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
- closing the school is likely to be unpopular with staff, parents of pupils at the school and the local community.

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

Benefits of this option:

- the school would become part of a self sustaining MAT and the expertise of the MAT cluster would be the catalyst for securing improved outcomes
- 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
- belonging to a MAT does not guarantee sustained improvement in performance and outcomes
- conversion to academy processes may deflect energy from improving outcomes

Risks to pursuing this option:

- Rodmell would not be attractive to a sponsor given the high cost of maintaining the site as well as the unpredictability of roll
- no academy sponsor has shown any interest in taking on Rodmell as part of a multi-academy trust
- 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.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

Consideration of the options for the two schools presented above and following discussions with Headteachers and governors of the individual schools and the other schools in the Lewes area the following recommendations are put forward for approval. These recommendations will provide sufficient pupil places in the Lewes area at good or outstanding schools, enable the local authority to meet parental preferences for schools, and ensure that schools are sustainable both now and in the future. The Diocese of Chichester is fully supportive of these proposals. The Diocese of Chichester's policy is to support schools with capital funding realised from the disposal and sale of schools closed throughout the Diocese and the Diocese would look to reinvest in locations impacted. However, this is not a guarantee and is dependent on legal commitments. The Diocese of Brighton and Arundel is also supportive of these proposals; the Diocese is keen to ensure that there is not an oversupply of places in Lewes which would have a negative effect on a school such as St Pancras which is offering a good education to a significant number of disadvantaged pupils, many where English is not their first language.

Recommendation 1:

Pells Cof E Primary School - The local authority takes forward statutory processes to consult on the closure of the school by 31 August 2017 (option 3)

In addition to the benefits detailed in option 3 the reasons for this recommendation are:

- The school has suffered from low preferences for many years
- Having received its second RI Ofsted grade if the school cannot secure a good or higher at the next inspection it will go into special measures
- Federation is unlikely to increase the popularity of the school and none of the local schools have expressed a desire to federate with Pells
- Amalgamation with other schools has also been explored but no other school has space to accommodate all the Pells pupils on their school site, and a split site school would be difficult to manage
- No other school has expressed an interest in amalgamation with Pells
- The governing body of the school, the Lewes Co-operative Learning Trust and local schools are committed to seeking the best education for the pupils at Pells and are willing to work together to achieve this if the school closes
- Closure of the schools will mean that the displaced pupils will apply to other local schools. In the short term this will create pressure in some year groups. Local schools who are part of the Lewes Co-operative Learning Trust have agreed to go over PAN in the short term to accommodate the displaced pupils
- The longer term pupil forecasts include Lewes District Council's housing proposals for the town, including proposed developments at North Street and Old Mall Farm (combined total 565 dwellings). The forecasts, which are based on demographic projections of future births indicate that there should be sufficient capacity in the town to accommodate the likely demand for places in the longer term
- Discussions are ongoing with the Diocese of Chichester to use any capital receipts from the school sites/buildings to improve facilities at other church schools in the town.

Recommendation 2:

Rodmell CofE Primary School - The local authority takes forward statutory processes to consult on the closure of the school by 31 August 2017 (option 3)

In addition to the benefits detailed in option 3 the reasons for this recommendation are:

- Pupils come from Lewes or Newhaven to attend this school and very few from the village itself
- There is capacity within the local area to accommodate the displaced pupils and in many cases pupils would be attending a school closer to their home address
- The school is too small to be sustainable in the future
- Federation with another school would not provide sufficient financial benefits to make the school more sustainable
- The school currently has a deficit budget
- Discussions are ongoing with the Diocese of Chichester to use any capital receipts from the school sites/buildings to improve facilities at other church schools in the town.

Recommendation 3:

St Pancras Primary School - The local authority should enter into discussion with the school and the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton to explore Multi Academy Trust solution for this small school.

Recommendation 4:

The Lewes Co-operative Learning Trust, whilst at an early stage, has the potential to further develop partnership working across Lewes schools and should be used as a catalyst for partnership working across schools in the town to improve outcomes for all pupils. The Trust has already indicated that they acknowledge the short term pupil pressures that the closure recommendations would bring and are collectively committed to working with the local authority to resolve these issues and to work together to support the needs and improve outcomes of all children in the town. The Trust is already actively supporting Pells by providing leadership support following the departure of the substantive Headteacher in Deember 2015. All schools in the town are part of the Trust with the exception of Wallands, St Pancras and Hamsey.

Recommendation 5:

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. There is good evidence within the Lewes area, especially at Wallands' School that demonstrates how quality early years provision on a school site can impact on outcomes for children as they progress through the early years foundation stage. This good practice should be further shared with schools and all schools within the Lewes area should explore how they can further improve relationships with early years settings to support transition and early year foundation stage outcomes.

APPENDIX A - Lewes Area: Additional Data

Table 1:

Surplus/Shortfall in School Places by Academic Year

DfE No	Lewes Schools	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 %
3094	Pells CE Primary School	140	87	53	38%	140	91	49	35%	140	97	43	31%	140	93	47	34%	140	86	54	39%	140	85	55	39%	140	89	51	36%
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	270	262	8	3%	270	251	19	7%	240	238	2	1%	240	238	2	1%	210	205	5	2%	210	205	5	2%	210	205	5	2%
3041	Southover CE Primary School	345	339	6	2%	375	342	33	9%	420	349	71	17%	420	357	63	15%	420	356	64	15%	420	369	51	12%	420	380	40	10%
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	140	121	19	14%	140	119	21	15%	140	115	25	18%	140	113	27	19%	140	104	36	26%	140	99	41	29%	140	97	43	31%
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	420	436	-16	-4%	420	447	-27	-6%	420	427	-7	-2%	420	421	-1	0%	420	402	18	4%	420	400	20	5%	420	400	20	5%
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	210	209	1	0%	210	205	5	2%	210	199	11	5%	210	193	17	8%	210	183	27	13%	210	176	34	16%	210	169	41	20%
	Lewes - To be decided	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	8	-8		0	16	-16		0	20	-20		0	41	-41		0	59	-59	
	Lewes Total	1525	1454	71	5%	1555	1455	100	6%	1570	1433	137	9%	1570	1431	139	9%	1540	1356	184	12%	1540	1375	165	11%	1540	1399	141	9%
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	105	97	8	8%	105	98	7	7%	105	99	6	5%	105	104	1	1%	105	101	4	4%	105	96	9	9%	105	91	14	13%
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	170	166	4	2%	170	175	-5	-3%	210	182	28	14%	210	183	27	13%	210	184	26	13%	210	188	22	10%	210	190	20	9%
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	63	50	13	21%	63	48	15	24%	63	55	8	12%	63	56	7	11%	63	60	3	4%	63	62	1	1%	63	65	-2	-2%
	Surrounding Area Total	338	313	25	7%	338	321	17	5%	378	336	42	11%	378	343	35	9%	378	345	33	9%	378	346	32	8%	378	346	32	8%
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	1863	1767	96	5%	1893	1776	117	6%	1948	1769	179	9%	1948	1774	174	9%	1918	1701	217	11%	1918	1721	197	10%	1918	1745	173	9%

Lewes To be decided total 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 'Lewes 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 Schools Census

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

Capacities take account of where bulge classes are provided

The proposed future increases in capacity from 2016/17 at Southover CE Primary (to 420) and Iford and Kingston (210) are shown in the table

Table 2:**Early Years Foundation Stage Attainment Data 2011/12 to 2014/15**

		Good Level of Development							
		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
DfE No	School	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
3094	Pells CE Primary School	19	37%	8	0%	8	63%	13	69%
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	47	75%	30	50%	30	57%	30	77%
3041	Southover CE Primary School	45	62%	45	40%	44	68%	59	73%
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	16	81%	20	65%	13	77%	19	84%
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	60	58%	57	56%	52	65%	61	70%
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	32	38%	30	23%	29	90%	30	90%
	Lewes Total	219	59%	190	45%	176	69%	212	76%
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	13	46%	13	54%	14	64%	16	81%
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	20	40%	18	61%	19	74%	31	81%
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	10	30%	7	71%	8	63%	8	50%
	Surrounding Area Total	43	40%	38	61%	41	69%	55	76%
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	262	56%	228	47%	217	69%	267	76%
845	East Sussex Total:	5391	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 and 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 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 Yr 2	Reading	Writing	Maths	Total No of Pupils Yr 2	Reading	Writing	Maths	Total No of Pupils Yr 2	Reading	Writing	Maths
3094	Pells CE Primary School	16	63%	63%	75%	16	81%	69%	88%	15	73%	60%	80%	11	82%	73%	82%
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	35	71%	69%	83%	28	82%	64%	93%	60	88%	80%	93%	30	90%	87%	87%
3041	Southover CE Primary School	45	78%	67%	87%	45	80%	62%	89%	45	87%	60%	87%	45	78%	67%	82%
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	11	100%	82%	100%	12	92%	83%	92%	19	79%	84%	95%	18	83%	83%	89%
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	63	71%	67%	78%	63	79%	70%	87%	62	74%	76%	82%	60	87%	82%	88%
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	30	97%	87%	93%	26	81%	81%	85%	29	86%	72%	86%	30	90%	80%	83%
	Lewes Total	200	78%	71%	84%	190	81%	69%	88%	230	81%	72%	87%	194	85%	78%	86%
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	14	79%	36%	79%	16	81%	69%	81%	16	81%	75%	81%	15	80%	73%	87%
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	21	100%	100%	95%	19	100%	89%	95%	23	78%	70%	74%	23	100%	91%	96%
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	12	42%	42%	58%	10	80%	80%	80%	6	50%	67%	100%	7	71%	14%	100%
	Surrounding Area Total	47	79%	66%	81%	45	89%	80%	87%	45	74%	71%	81%	45	89%	73%	93%
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	247	78%	72%	83%	235	83%	71%	88%	275	79%	69%	79%	239	86%	77%	87%
845	East Sussex Total:	4,980	74%	62%	75%	5,207	76%	64%	76%	5362	79%	69%	79%	5467	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 October 2015 and 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

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
3094	Pells CE Primary School	18	44%	9	44%	13	77%	10	50%
3040	South Malling CE Primary School	24	67%	31	77%	30	83%	43	88%
3041	Southover CE Primary School	48	83%	48	90%	48	94%	47	91%
3342	St Pancras Catholic Primary School	16	75%	25	80%	18	94%	24	88%
2072	Wallands Community Primary School	62	77%	64	80%	62	84%	67	79%
2073	Western Road Community Primary School	28	82%	30	47%	30	87%	30	93%
	Lewes Total	196	75%	207	75%	201	87%	221	85%
2060	Hamsey Community Primary School	7	71%	9	56%	12	100%	7	86%
3077	Iford & Kingston CE Primary School	24	92%	21	81%	22	91%	24	88%
3334	Rodmell CE Primary School	5	80%	9	44%	10	40%	7	57%
	Surrounding Area Total	36	86%	39	67%	44	83%	38	82%
	Lewes and Surrounding Area Total	232	77%	246	74%	245	87%	259	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 December 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