

Appendix B: Summary of Consultation Views and Feedback

A full report responding to the consultation and presenting the results is available on the ['Have your Say'](#) Consultation Hub.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
	Vision	122	146	35	20	90	413
	Principles	68	143	46	29	127	413
	Values	90	157	54	21	91	413
School Organisation	There will be one model of strong and sustainable education for all types of schools and Key Stages	42	80	55	94	142	413
	Establishing a model of Primary provision for children from 4-11 years	37	133	99	50	94	413
	Securing sufficient places in all phases and types of schools	120	183	52	9	49	413
	Maximising the proportion of children being offered a place at one of their three preference schools	122	176	62	17	36	413
	Building capacity at Specialist Support Centres to improve local provision for children with SEND being taught in mainstream schools	117	155	83	24	34	413
	Ensuring the Alternative Provision offer is flexible and meets the needs of all pupils using it	116	157	98	12	30	413
	Primary schools will be viable and of a sufficient size to support outcomes of children	39	42	22	44	266	413
	Primary schools will be readily accessible to their pupils	149	137	31	23	73	413
School Improvement	There will be effective challenge and support to all schools and settings	111	170	69	15	48	413
	Monitoring all schools and categorising Local Authority (LA) schools annually to ensure Council resources are targeted where they are most needed to make the biggest difference	71	173	89	18	62	413
	Enhancing the support provided to schools who are deemed not yet 'Good' by Ofsted or the County Council	104	210	64	8	27	413
	Making additional services available to all schools and settings through a comprehensive traded portfolio of services	75	173	106	20	39	413
	Working in partnership with Ofsted and the RSC where schools are judged 'Inadequate' to support them to improve	107	196	65	11	34	413
	Strong leadership will be brokered and commissioned in West Sussex and beyond to provide school-to-school support	85	166	80	30	52	413

Appendix B: Summary of Consultation Views and Feedback

School Organisation

The majority of comments on School Organisation showed a real concern about the statements made in relation to small schools, including many observations about the impact on communities, travel to different schools and parental choice. These comments were repeated throughout the survey and in the letters of representation.

Many parents choose small schools for their children due to the needs, personality, emotional capacity or previous experiences of their children. Outcomes can be good with the right leadership, teaching and learning capacity and support.

The statements suggest a rigidity that does not allow for local adaptation to suit the needs of the location, creative teachers or the children. It is not clear what is meant by "one model" in questions 1 and 2. I agree that there should be general guidelines and achievement expectations but there should be flexibility to allow for innovative, inspirational teaching beyond the minimum "3Rs".

I understand that to be financially viable schools need to look at becoming 1FE but feel County should support schools such as us who wish to do that. I also feel there is a need for small village schools such as [REDACTED] should support these schools if parents want these schools to remain open.

It is unclear from the documents how the "typical" minimum of 210 pupils has been arrived at. Why is a smaller school not viable? There are many ways to ensure the viability of smaller schools, for example federations, whilst retaining their character and high level education which parents often prefer. Approximately 26% of WSCC primary schools have a capacity of less than 200 pupils. The strategy would imply 26% of schools are not viable, where will these children go?

It is that by implication the small rural schools that are integral to the county's rural communities would be under threat. This would be bad for the pupils, bad for families and bad for communities. For example, the proposed travel arrangements are simply unworkable for average families.

I do however feel that having separate infant and junior schools is effective and allows the infant phase to create a strong foundation through good early years provision. The Junior schools can also present a clear vision around growing up and moving on. I feel this suggested move is all about end of key stage results in infant settings and how junior schools perceive them.

The collaboration stage with schools and stakeholders is critical and time should be spent in each setting observing how things are done and with what resources, discussing funding and most importantly gaining a measure of children's overall wellbeing and engagement in learning, before decisions are made about viability based on pupil numbers. My concern is that the outcome of this collaboration will have no bearing on final decisions about the future of small schools.

As far as the evidence I have examined shows. Bigger schools can produce good outcomes and bad. Small schools can produce the same. Performance depends on leadership and management not size.

Strong partnerships in clusters of schools can provide the efficiencies needed to face the current financial and educational challenges.

I agree that there needs to be a basic framework for schools but I don't agree that one model works for all schools. What works for one school does not necessarily work for another school.

School Improvement

Particular points on School Improvement were that one visit was not considered sufficient; the targeting of resources should be more flexible so that some schools don't lose out. School-to-school support was considered positively, however, there were concerns about the capacity in the school providing the support. It was emphasised how school leadership is key to making a difference. Finally there was uncertainty about the level of traded services and the cost.

Local Authority should have sufficient expertise, knowledge and skills to undertake a role to give proper professional support to all of its schools. If "school-to-school" support means leadership of one school giving help to another, there is the potential danger of the school delivering support to suffer and decline in its own standards because of the loss of effective leadership. It is extremely difficult for one person to lead two schools effectively as responsibilities double and the leader has half the time perhaps to spend in each place.

If the LA wishes to be in top 25% then frequent scrutiny and support is key. So much can happen in a single academic year, ranging from a change in the SLT to pupil mobility for various reasons. Really good support from the LA is always appreciated and will help promote a "working together" approach.

With overall reduction in real terms education finance, it makes sense to utilise peer support, to share good practice and ideas. However the cost to the individual schools can be high when supply teachers have to be bought-in to cover teachers visiting other schools.

If we lose this termly visit, I believe that more schools will be vulnerable, as the advisor brings skills of knowing a wide range of OFSTED information across the county and are vital to our development and school improvement. They also have a professional relationship with colleagues in schools and it is this that ensures recruitment and retention of school leaders.

This will work as long as the services are comparable with those which can be purchased outside the LA, offering the best quality for the best value for money.

I am not convinced that the LA dictating the size and organisational structure of schools will improve school performance. What matters in schools is effective leadership and sufficient funding. School leaders are in the best place to determine what works in a school. A more proactive leadership programme of support and challenge to school leaders would probably have a greater impact on the vision outlined at the start of the consultation.

this will depend on how much support is taken from good schools in order to free up resources to support weaker schools. We could support the idea in theory but the devil is in the detail: if the balance is not right, the strategy could result in the loss of "effectiveness" by good schools matching the gain by weak schools

This could be a high negative impact if it fails to identify schools that have begun a slow decline in either performance or numbers. This is not always immediately obvious. The LA will need to have very good on the ground intelligence about what is happening in each school.

Partnership working has to be brokered carefully to ensure compatibility and can be counterproductive if both parties do not share a similar ethos.

Would school to school support be funded by the local authority? If not, it is unreasonable to expect schools that are already financially stretched to be in a position to support other schools in place of the local authority.

This is a positive model, that could help to support the smaller village schools by allowing them to benefit from the resources available while still sustaining the quality in a smaller setting.