



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Earlier Intervention for School Improvement

**A report on the work of eleven Teaching
School Alliances**

November 2014

Alison Chapman - Queen Katherine School

Contents

Introduction	3
Aims of the overall project	3
Starting Points and Original Plans	4
Key Themes	5
Developing systems using technology to collect and share data	5
Identifying and diagnosing needs	7
Intervention at student level	10
Implementation of School to School Support	11
Learning conclusions and next steps	13
References	15
Acknowledgements	15
Appendix – Summaries of projects	16

Earlier Intervention for School Improvement

Introduction

In July 2013, the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) commissioned eleven Teaching School Alliances (TSAs) to design and implement projects to investigate how to identify and intervene earlier with schools that need to improve. The projects were to be completed by July 2014. The NCTL wanted to learn more about how partnerships were using data sharing in targeting school improvement and school to school support in order to prevent a decline in standards. It was intended that the learning from these projects could be shared at a national level for other groups to adapt and apply to their own school situations.

The Importance of Teaching White Paper (2010) outlined the move to a system in which schools themselves lead school improvement. In a self-improving system such as this, Gilbert (2012) asserted that teachers and schools must take collective ownership for their improvement and that they need to be more accurate and effective in their self-evaluation. Schools may need to become more accountable to each other and work to create the appropriate climate for this. Many schools, academy chains, collaborations, Local Authorities (LAs), dioceses and Teaching School Alliances (TSAs) are working together to support school improvement and devising systematic ways of ensuring that the self-improving school system is effective and sustainable.

This report summarises what the eleven alliances did and what they learnt as they undertook projects to work towards these goals. Drawing on reports written by the alliances and the evidence they presented, the original aims of each of the projects are summarised, themes identified, significant learning drawn out and some reflections offered. The findings and the lessons will be of interest to all school improvement stakeholders.

Aims of the overall project

The main focus of the project was to investigate the use of data and information sharing by groups of schools and localised partnerships to support school improvement. The aims of the project were to enable Teaching School Alliances:

- to further develop and test local approaches for identifying schools that would benefit from support.
- to further develop and test local approaches for sharing information that enables identification of support
- to further develop and test local approaches for brokering support for identified schools

- To enable other Teaching School Alliances and local areas to learn from and with alliances doing this work

The key questions posed were:

- What information and data is being used to identify needs early, before the challenge has become acute?
What are the triggers or signs that support is needed?
- What processes have enabled data sharing and who looks at the data and assesses need?
- How are the decisions made about what support and where the support comes from?
- Who is accountable for the decisions and monitoring the impact and quality of support?
- How has trust and confidence in these local arrangements been developed?

The projects planned by the eleven alliances varied in their objectives and complexity. Some of the projects were ambitious with plans for large collaborations and mature groups working together to secure school improvement, other projects focussed more on how individual schools raise attainment for young people.

Starting Points and Original Plans

Several projects investigated approaches to recognising a potential decline in standards before external scrutiny confirmed it. Others concentrated more on putting support in place and securing improvements.

The original plans centred around four main themes. The Teaching School Alliances (TSAs) that explored each of them are named in the brackets:

- **The use of technology to develop systems to collect and share data between a group of schools** (Bartley Green TSA, Outwood TSA, Plymouth TSA, South West TSA, The Queen Katherine TSA);
- **Developing and applying approaches for diagnosing need both within tight structures (eg academy trusts) and less formal school clusters** (Blue Flag TSA, Bradford Birth to 19 TSA, Denbigh TSA, Outwood TSA, Salop TSA, The Queen Katherine TSA);
- **Developing sustainable and systematic systems for the implementation of school to school support, including methods to measure impact** (Ashton on Mersey TSA, Herts and Bucks TSA, Plymouth TSA and The Queen Katherine TSA);

- **Research and evaluation of specific interventions and group/ student level**
(Outwood TSA, South West TSA, Bradford Birth to 19)

The next section will outline some of the learning and approaches that alliances took under each of these themes

Key Themes

Developing systems using technology to collect and share data

A number of the projects focussed on developing effective systems for collecting and sharing data and using it to inform school improvement priorities.

Easton et al (2013) identified some conditions for effective data sharing: data needs to be up to date, accurate and the schools sharing data needed to develop trust in feeling confident in knowing who would see and how the data would be used. Bartley Green, Salop and Plymouth teaching school alliances all underestimated the time it would take to create the system that would meet their specification for the collection of appropriate data and this meant that their projects made less progress than planned. Another, unforeseen challenge that had to be overcome was the inconsistencies between schools in the way data was collected, interpreted and used in target setting systems.

Bartley Green

Bartley Green's project implemented training for senior leaders and data managers to ensure there was a shared understanding across the alliance and consistency in the way data was being interpreted by schools.

Plymouth

The Plymouth project developed a self-evaluation audit tool (SEAT) which is now an integral part of the school improvement toolkit in Plymouth. Governors receive training on its use and the online nature of it ensures that the data reflects changes without a long time lag. This accurate collection of data and sharing across the large group of primary schools has led to more effective school improvement discussions at monthly 'RAG review' meetings. As the data collection system is accurate it enables the early identification of schools in need. There has been a reduction in the number of primary schools in Plymouth below the floor target, There are a range of reasons for this but the ongoing monitoring is considered to be one of the contributory factors.

Salop Teaching School Salop

Salop Teaching School's online data collection tool was designed so that it draws in data from a number of sources such as RAISEonline, census, Ofsted, performance tables and the schools' own data. Trialling has show that a range of evidence can be used to inform future school improvement priorities, increasing confidence in the approach.

Effective sharing of data allows tracking of the achievement trends of schools and can give indicators as to whether a school is improving or in decline. Bubb (2014, p3) however, quotes Robert Hill as saying, "knowing a school is more than looking at its data" and a number of the projects have articulated that their identification of improvement needs will take into account information from data and local intelligence about a school. One of the main challenges linked to data sharing has been to develop clarity and trust.

Much of the data used is publicly available, however local intelligence could be from school self-evaluation, information received locally in the Local Authority or from neighbouring schools. There are sensitivities when schools are uncertain about what discussions are taking place especially when schools are in the same local region and possibly competing for pupil numbers. Many of the projects said progress had been delayed because they underestimated how long it would take to build trust and to reassure leadership teams, especially headteachers and governors about the purpose and protocols for the sharing of information and discussions about schools. A number were concerned about having their, 'dirty washing' aired in meetings with or without them present.

Cumbria (The Queen Katherine Teaching School Alliance, QKTSA)

In Cumbria, the vision is for every school to sign data sharing agreements permitting their school data to be discussed by a Local Alliance of System Leadership (LASL). Relatively few people attend LASL meetings, but all school clusters are represented. A launch event, information document and a series of question and answer sessions were held for schools to learn about the purpose of the LASL and how their data would be used. These have somewhat reduced the anxiety, however it has taken eighteen months for sixty five percent of all Cumbrian schools to sign up. The members of each LASL are currently volunteers who are passionate about system leadership. In 2015/16, the membership will change so that the clusters vote for who they wish to represent them on the LASL. It is hoped that more schools will sign up once clusters have voted for their representation and positive messages about school improvement successes spread as the system matures.

Identifying and diagnosing needs

A number of the projects focussed on identifying need. Accurately identifying the areas requiring support before they become acute issues is vital if early intervention is to be successful. Increasing the accessibility of accurate data, soft intelligence on schools and identifying more general shared priorities has therefore been a strong focus in setting up systematic systems for school improvement work. For most, this was stage two of their project following the implementation of a consistent system for data collection.

Two of the projects where the progress had been made in identifying need, The Queen Katherine TSA (QKTSA) and Denbigh TSA, found the engagement of all school improvement stakeholders in the area was a key ingredient.

Denbigh Teaching School Alliance

Milton Keynes has a Strategic School Effectiveness Partnership Board and the membership is the Local Authority and local Teaching School Alliances. The success of this board is that each partner has distinct responsibilities built on their strengths. The Local Authority has sharper systems for identifying schools at risk. There are some key triggers to aid this: data on school performance, significant staffing changes, especially a change of headteacher and schools in areas of deprivation. At the meeting the Local Authority identifies the schools in need, commissions the support from the Teaching Schools and monitors the impact on standards in the school. The Teaching Schools broker the support from system leaders, deploy and evaluate the support.

An additional success linked to the identification of areas for improvement across all of the secondary schools in Milton Keynes. Denbigh worked collaboratively to form subject networks. Raising standards at KS4 and KS5 in English and mathematics had been identified across all the schools. Subject networks were reinstated, funded by the LA to share effective practice and to support the implementation of the new curriculum. The subject leaders have reported increased confidence and reassurance by being able to talk to peers, and found the networks a useful sounding board. Many have shared resources and offered ideas to those with particular challenges.

Cumbria, The Queen Katherine TSA (QKTSA)

In Cumbria each Local Alliance of System Leadership (LASL) covers about two hundred schools overall. The LASL meets twice per term to discuss progress and identify any new schools that require support. All of the school improvement stakeholders are represented at the meetings. The Local Authority provide current data for each school and identify a rising, stable or declining trend discussing the priorities. If a school is at risk of going into or already in an Ofsted category then a lead person is identified, usually a National Leader of Education (NLE), a Local Leader of Education (LLE) or LA general advisor and they take the lead brokering appropriate support as required from the system leaders available within the LASL. In a similar way to Denbigh, the LASL may identify a priority across a number of schools and a lead person is identified to coordinate support and professional development across the region. The LASL will expect to receive a progress report for each of the identified issues at every meeting until the group and school feel support is no longer required.

Ashton on Mersey

Ashton on Mersey designed a project with five strands focussing on the schools within their Multi-Academy Trust (MAT). Each strand involved sharing professional practice and exploring new systems. The benefit would also be seen by a wider audience with actions that could be replicated elsewhere.

Strand 1 was based on formalising a systematic structure for school improvement meetings and ensuring that staff from schools at middle and senior leadership levels were involved.

Strand 2 was sharing headline data from the dashboard and having subject network dashboards where subject leaders from different schools could analyse and discuss subject specific issues, responding to what the data highlighted. This in particular allowed for the professional development of middle leaders in the analysis of data and how to link the outcomes to teaching and learning.

Strand 3 was commissioning of a report in the autumn 2014, based on the learning from sharing information and monitoring progress across a group of schools.

Strand 4 is a project where the senior teams across schools work together for a common method of gathering data which in time should reduce the over-reliance on one member of staff in each school.

Strand 5 is the extension of this learning and how to share the best practice across an alliance, MAT and then a region.

The Blue Flag Teaching School

The Blue Flag Teaching School project brought together all education stakeholders, the Local Authority (LA), Anglican and Catholic Dioceses and TSAs to work collectively in identifying and intervening for schools in need. A Change Team board was developed where each stakeholder was represented and each body had a role to play within the infrastructure and there were agreed principles, processes for identification and the commissioning of support and set charges were agreed for all teaching school staff across the alliances. To summarise, the model built on the strengths of each partner; the LA and dioceses identified schools in decline requiring support and maintained their monitoring role and the teaching school alliances work as a network to plan and broker the most appropriate support

The alliances in these projects all had a commitment to share the responsibility for improvements with all stakeholders. Hill et al (2012, p8) suggested that this shared commitment and sense of responsibility formed more quickly where there are statutory responsibilities or hard governance arrangements (eg Local Authorities, Multi Academy Trusts (MAT) and chains) as these are directly accountable for school performance. They proposed that it will take longer for other groups with softer governance relationships such as teaching schools to be effective in holding each other to account for the standards in schools. The Ashton on Mersey project focussed on schools within their Multi Academy Trust whereas Denbigh TSA and QKTSA's projects have softer governance based on mutual respect. All of these projects had made progress with groups of schools and LAs working together to drive school improvement and trying to ensure that no school is lost in the system. With continuing reduction in financial resources in Local Authorities, there is a greater emphasis developing on peer to peer challenge and support. Easton et al, (2013) found that those who were involved in peer challenge had a greater understanding of the areas of need due to the external partner identifying where support was required. In most cases this acted as confirmation but for others introduced new priorities. A number of the projects expressed the desire to develop peer evaluation as the next phase of this work.

Intervention at student level

Having identified specific issues, some projects reported on the effectiveness of school improvement interventions at student level.

South West Teaching School Alliance

The South West Teaching School Alliance developed projects after using a locally developed internal Reasonline tool to identify priorities. One project focussed on a small group of disengaged year 11 boys who were at risk of becoming NEET. A breakfast 'Learning Café' was set up to complement the after school café that had been established in the previous year. Specific students were invited to the breakfast café as a way of settling the students for the day, having some nutritional food and a conversation with a mentor about the day, homework and student welfare issues. At the end of the year, all six students had training destinations, most improved their attendance and one saw a reduction in poor behaviour incidents. When questioned about what they perceived made the most difference to their learning, the breakfast and after school learning café's received 83% positive scores compared to 50% for mentoring, 33% GCSE podcasts and 16% for revision sessions and revision days.

The Outwood Grange Alliance

The Outwood Grange Alliance focussed on the progress children make over KS2. Their initial findings identified that pupils make accelerated progress in years 5 and 6 but slower progress in years 3 and 4. Across their schools most catch up interventions were implemented in years 5 and 6. The project initiated a new approach for teachers that meant a new data tracking system was developed that monitored progress over the whole KS2 journey instead of teachers only being concerned with the progress of the children in their class for one year and then transferring to the next teacher. A range of actions during the year supported this change where there is a culture of collective accountability and the staff work in key stage teams to appreciate their contribution rather than as individual teachers.

The key learning from this project was:

- Transition work is required as children move into year 3 to catch up any who are not making expected progress.
- Six half termly data inputs per year, consisting of RAG ratings against KS2 aspirational progress levels. Any pupils below green receive support in order to bring their progress back to a green level.
- More children now receive intervention in years 3 and 4 than previously
- The focus is of the long term journey instead of a single year. If slow progress is not identified until years 5 or 6, then it is often too late to catch up or accelerate beyond expected progress.

Implementation of School to School Support

In order for England to truly become a self-improving school-led system, it needs to fully embrace school to school support and to build the capacity of teachers and leaders to deliver training and support other schools (Hill et al, 2012). As this grows and all schools recognise that working with system leaders can be beneficial no matter how good the school is, there will be even more demand for support from within the school system. A number of the projects were keen to consider deployment procedures and ways to build capacity within the alliances, whether that be through training more system leaders, involving new partners in research groups, aligning deployment protocols across a large number of schools or ensuring that once the injection of funding or external support to a school or project had been removed, then the good practice can be sustained in the long term.

The Herts and Bucks Teaching School Alliance

The Herts and Bucks Teaching School Alliance focussed on investigating school to school support with one partner school over a period of a year. The project was a package involving support in the following areas:

Performance management target setting and a review of all teaching and learning responsibilities (TLRs)

Curriculum planning

Behaviour intervention and support for vulnerable students

Leadership and the development of teaching and learning

The key learning from this project was that the teaching school needed to build capacity across the alliance in order to be able to facilitate and sustain the support required in so many different areas and for the length of time. At the time, the support was coming from mainly one school but this meant that other schools could not benefit as the few system leaders in that school had their own responsibilities in the home school as well as the supported school. The Alliance also learnt that you need system leaders with different areas of knowledge and contexts in order to provide high level support.

South Cumbria (QKTSA)

In South Cumbria (QKTSA) there are three teaching schools who are all members of the South LASL. The project has seen the three teaching schools becoming more involved together as collectively they take responsibility to try to support school improvement for all of the schools in the South LASL, whether they are members of the alliances or not. During June 2014, the trust and relationships improved and the most appropriate system leaders are now being deployed for the area of need, even if that means being deployed to a different teaching school. Deployment forms have been created centrally and adopted across all of Cumbria, building on best practice and forms the LA previously used. This has been important because deployments are now being made across teaching schools and LASLs, and the procedures for deployment, monitoring the impact and evaluating the quality of support should be the same across Cumbria. The next challenge is to agree a pricing structure consistent to all.

Other key recommendations for effective school to school support from projects were:

The need for sensitivity when working with those in a supported school, to coach and support them to increase their confidence to raise standards. The leaders in the supported school discussed the interventions with their staff before working in a supported role to ensure they had a positive attitude to engage with the training or support. There was also a need to establish a clear and detailed needs analysis of the situation prior to activating support and it was crucial to put in place measurable and realistic targets for support process.

Learning conclusions and next steps

The reports from the early intervention research projects engaged in by eleven teaching school alliances all suggest that the full benefits and longer term impact of their work will take longer than just one year to be realised. From the initial outline ideas, a number of the projects were changed as the first plans had been too ambitious or school circumstances changed during the year (Bradford Birth to 19, South West TSA, Salop TSA, Ashton on Mersey). Very few of them completed the full scope of the original project and most found that they had underestimated the time it takes to develop data programmes that meet differing demands and audiences; develop honest and trusting partnerships where there is a willingness to share sensitive school information and to build sufficient time into the implementation of interventions for there to be measureable impact.

Overall the schools reported many benefits of working together and they are committed to strengthening the partnerships and continuing school improvement work. All of the projects involved elements of working together and sharing experience and expertise. The key to the successes of this research overall has been spending the time to develop effective communication and trust between partners and in some cases the importance of this and time it takes had been underestimated. Once those relationships have been built then positive steps to improvement happened fairly rapidly.

Those who had stronger governance such as being members of a multi academy trust (Ashton on Mersey, Outwood TSA) appeared to overcome the issues of developing trust much quicker than those who were working within an alliance and collaborative partnership. Other partnerships have had to adopt clear lines of communication, ensure all partners feel they have a voice and set clear roles, responsibilities and protocols for holding discussions based on school performance (QKTSA, Plymouth TSA, Blue Flag TSA).

For many projects the first step was to create consistent and fit for purpose systems for sharing data about schools and ways that could ease this collection, analysis and access to up to date data. A number who embarked on this style of project found that professional development was required to ensure there was an agreed understanding of the use and interpretation of data before being able to use the data to identify priorities

for improvement (Bartley Green TSA, Plymouth TSA, Ashton on Mersey, Herts and Bucks TSA).

Another key finding is the shift beyond continuing professional development to accountability and the importance of all schools being linked to a collaborative group. This move to peer evaluation is not new to those in a teaching school alliance, as they are used to reporting on progress against the national key performance indicators. Many partners originated in clusters as supportive networks that shared CPD opportunities rather than being challenging about the standards in their school. A number of the projects working across regions and in conjunction with local authorities found that many of the schools requiring support were not linked to a teaching school alliance or collaborative cluster and not all school partners were fully engaged in the self-improving school system. This provided barriers which slowed down the process (Bradford Birth to 19, South West TSA, QKTSA)

Where projects involved a large number of schools, the ones making the most progress embraced all school improvement stakeholders working together including LAs, Teaching Schools and Dioceses. Each of these need to have defined roles that builds on the distinct contribution each partner can bring to the group. In most cases LAs and dioceses led on the early identification of schools with a declining trend and the teaching school alliances developed the action plans and brokered and deployed the support. Both groups had a monitoring role to ensure the quality of the support was effective and the impact on standards led to rapid improvement. (Denbigh TSA, QKTSA, Plymouth TSA, Blue Flag TSA).

The final key learning point is the requirement to build capacity in order to sustain long-term school-led improvement. It is important that there is not over-reliance on a small number of people and the development of teacher leaders should be ongoing from an early stage of the teaching career in order to secure a high quality supply of leaders for the next generation. Staffing changes are inevitable as circumstances change, promotions, retirements and school priorities flex. We must not let the system flounder by not having enough leadership capacity to be freed to support the system with the long term aim that every child is educated in a good or outstanding school. Leaders at all levels are required to have an impact on educational standards and we must ensure that the infrastructure can build on the strengths and learning we have in order to meet the future demands. (Bradford Birth to 19, Herts and Bucks TSA, Plymouth TSA, Ashton on Mersey, QKTSA).

For all of the projects there are some next steps as the findings only scratched the surface of what is possible. All of them were committed to taking the work forward, with many anticipating positive effects on collaboration and standards that would become more evident over the next year.

References

Bubb, S. (2014). School Improvement Symposium. Earlier Intervention for School Improvement. Crown.

DfE (2010). The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper. Crown.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175429/CM-7980.pdf

Earley, P., Higham, R., Allen, T., Howson, J., Nelson, R., Rawar, S., Lynch, S., Morton, L., Mehta, P. and Sims, D. (2012). Review of the school leadership landscape. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Easton, C., Hetherington M., Lamont E., Phillips, L., Walker F. (2013). Evaluation of the sector-led peer challenge programme 2012/13. (LGA Research Report). Slough: NFER.

Gilbert, C. (2012). Towards a self-improving system: the role of school accountability. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Hill, R., Dunford, J., Parish, N., Rea, S., Sandals, L. (2012) The Growth of Academy Chains: the implications for leaders and leadership. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to the following for contributing towards this report:

Mike Collins - National College for Teaching and Leadership

Stephen Wilkinson – Executive Headteacher at The Queen Katherine School

Dave Beards – Bartley Green Teaching School Alliance

Geoff Butler – Herts and Bucks Teaching School Alliance

Candy Garbett – Salop Teaching School Alliance

Vicky Beer – Ashton on Mersey Teaching School

Emma Foster – Outwood Grange Alliance

Christian Bunting – Bradford Birth to 19 Teaching School Alliance

Aparna Sharma – Blue Flag Teaching School

Andy Squires – Denbigh Teaching School Alliance

Pete Nash – Plymouth Teaching School Alliance

Paul Brooks – South West Teaching School Alliance

Appendix – Summaries of projects

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Ashton on Mersey Teaching School Trafford, Manchester
Original Plan
<i>Either</i> The success of By Schools for Schools has brought substantial progress in developing systematised processes for brokerage (between peers), commissioning and funding – enhancing a system led approach to school to school support. This has brought coherency to the system (all 10 LAs have participated) and information is becoming more shared – though there is some way to go & this project will provide impetus. Ashton would use their position as a founding member of Greater Manchester Teaching School partnership to form a joint working group <i>Or</i> Taking a more local approach, work within Trafford to develop this approach in the Primary phase with alliance partners and across the LA.
Key Actions and learning
Strand 1 was based on formalising a systematic structure for school improvement meetings. Strand 2 was sharing headline data from the dashboard and having subject network dashboards where subject leaders from different schools could analyse and discuss subject specific issues. Strand 3 is the commissioning of a report to be written in the autumn 2014, which is based on the learning from sharing information and monitoring progress across a group of schools. Strand 4 is a project where the senior teams across schools work together for a common method of gathering data. Strand 5 is the extension of this learning and how to share the best practice across and alliance, multi academy trust and then a region. Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none">• De-personalise the data and meetings so it is not about the success of an individual but fact.• A common approach for data gathering is required.• Support subject leaders in having the capacity to challenge themselves about what the data is showing.

Conclusions and next steps
All of the strands require a further implementation year to assess the full impact. Strand 4 should inform any further developments.

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Bartley Green Teaching School Alliance
Birmingham
Original Plan
Develop a standardised 'data dashboard' for partnership schools with consistent headings for comparing data that can be used to inform the prioritisation of resources for school to school support.
Key Actions and learning
<p>Prior to the project starting the ten schools in the Teaching School Alliance all worked with different methods of collecting and analysing data. This meant it was very difficult to draw down and make any meaningful comparisons.</p> <p>The project focussed on a systematic system for collecting data on: progress, levels of attainment in English, mathematics, science, humanities, modern foreign languages, behaviour, attendance and closing the gap data. The aim was that after a pilot, the data collection system would be ready to automatically collect data for schools from September 2014.</p> <p>In reality the project took longer as training and presentations were needed to be made to all headteachers, data managers and key members of SLT. This identified some inconsistencies in data usage, accurate target setting and school self-evaluation. Data clinics were used to support this training.</p> <p>Key learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation in school data systems • Variation in how staff at senior level understood the data • Inconsistencies in the role of school data managers • Required to establish data sharing protocols • Data managers need to be able to advise SLT.
Conclusions and next steps
<p>By the end of the year, the following had been achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data sharing protocols in place, all data is now going to be analysed by the

- Teaching School Centre and shared with the headteacher group
2. A move to total transparency, all school data is shared with everyone
 3. The Teaching School Alliance is able to self-evaluate all the schools within the alliance.

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Blue Flag
West Sussex
Original Plan
To work with the LA, Dioceses and TSAs in West Sussex to join up their roles into a coherent and effective framework that exploits each body's strengths and matches the characteristics of David Hargreaves' maturity model. Clarification the roles of each body, and exploration the infrastructure and methodology needed to work together efficiently and effectively will be carried out along with investigation developing models from similar areas across the country.
Key Actions and learning
Structure for case studies of StSS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What happened? Change? Evidence to support this 2. Effect on those involved 3. Effect on the schools, anything unexpected/ 4. Lessons learnt 5. What successes can be replicated elsewhere?
Conclusions and next steps
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To introduce peer support 2. Schools to be categorised using the LA system 4 – Special Measures; 3 – Requires improvement; 2/1 – at risk of RI; 2/1 – Self-regulating school. 3. Work with the LA to identify schools with a declining trend 4. Source ongoing appropriate support 5. Spot signs of decline before the data shows it and it impacts on performance.

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Denbigh Teaching School Alliance
Milton Keynes

Original Plan
Collaborative explore with the LA how to identify schools, before they reach intervention and the key signs and indicators which would allow early intervention and prevent schools slipping into a category. We will develop mechanisms for doing this, through pupil performance data, staff turnover and teaching and learning data, currently much of this data is held by the LA. We would look to develop a mechanism for effectively sharing this data to enable early support through a data dashboard.
Key Actions and learning
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic School Effectiveness Partnership team consisting of LA and TSAs meet fortnightly to assess progress and table any school improvement requests. 2. LA – accurate in identifying the risk and monitor, TSAs broker, deploy and monitor the support. 3. Reinstated subject network meetings for English and mathematics. 4. Increased confidence for the subject leaders through sharing good practice 5. Successful relationship building for TSA and LA.
Conclusions and next steps
<p>Funding being available to support deployments increases the success.</p> <p>Next steps to assess impact over a sustained time, extend the early identification to all schools.</p>

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Herts and Bucks Teaching School Alliance
Hertfordshire
Original Plan
<p>Working with the schools across Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire, there is good overall school performance but some variable performance, especially linked to FSM and SEND capacity. St Clement Dawes School is an established school for providing StSS. In order to ensure this is sustainable over time, this project focussed on developing capacity and established systems.</p> <p>The plan is to generate robust and systematic practice that guarantees quality School to School Support (StSS) characterised by due diligence based on effective needs analysis. Through building leadership and SLE capacity together with effective communication systems the funding will enable the development of</p>

bespoke research and development to facilitate early intervention prior to potential formal requests to improve

Key Actions and learning

Phase 1

- The intervention offer plan needed refining

Phase 2

- Streamlined performance management and allocation of Teaching and Leadership Responsibilities (TLRs)
- Review of the curriculum and reporting procedures to governor
- Developed behaviour interventions and support for vulnerable student
- Developed mock Ofsted inspections for teaching and learning, using LA Advisor support.

Phase 3

- New leadership team
- Developed Teaching & Learning professional development
- introduced coaching skill to middle leaders
- pastoral changes
- improved communication and use of data.

Conclusions and next steps

1. The LA and Teaching School Alliances in Herts and Bucks are working together.
2. Need to build capacity so that deployments can be made
3. Carry out a needs analysis, do not just take the schools word for truth
4. The staff receiving the report need supporting in order to be open to gaining the most from it
5. Sensitive approach to those being supported in school, develop a professional relationship
6. Formal relationships and agreements strengthen the support.
7. Ensure that all stakeholders are involved, recognising the contribution they can make, including the LA.
8. Engage with all stakeholders – parents, governors, staff, unions and students
9. Build sustainability into the programme so there is a long term perspective.

Teaching School Alliance & Region

Outwood Grange Alliance

Wakefield

Original Plan
<p>Implement an approach, tried and tested at secondary phase, into primary. The systematic use of data and director / leader intervention will ensure improved outcomes and gain trust and buy-in to established successful approaches. A specific focus for identifying where early intervention is needed across three primary schools.</p>
Key Actions and Learning
<p>There was a specific focus on overall progress at KS2. The baseline data showed that there was accelerated progress in years 5 and 6 but slower progress in years 3 and 4. The project developed a data system to track the learning journey across KS2 rather than just in separate year groups. The overall aim being that teachers should be jointly accountable for the total progress across the key stage rather than for a single academic year.</p> <p>What was done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed data tracking following KS1 through to KS2 • Headteacher and assessment leads discussed and shared the principles • Training for class teachers • Calendar for 6 termly data inputs • Focussed meetings to analyse data • Parent briefings • Governor briefings. <p>The main objectives were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop systematic approaches to identify needs that were consistent across the three schools • Develop a culture of collective accountability where teachers are responsible, accountable and appreciate how their contribution impacts over the learning journey a child and not just a year • Teachers react and increase the progress in years 3 and 4. <p>Learning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition work needed at year 3 and for this to be monitored closely through a RAG rating to ensure all pupils are making the expected progress. 2. More children in years 3 / 4 received interventions than in previous years and this raised the awareness with SLT as well as the teachers of which individual children need support. 3. Ofsted recognised the systematic assessment for identifying underachievement early and tackling those at risk. 4. Focus on the longer term development journey over a key stage rather than just one year.
Conclusions and next steps

Further review the impact and monitor over another year to ensure the benefits and system is effective and embedded.

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Plymouth Teaching School Alliance
Plymouth
Original Plan
Plymouth currently have a data sharing protocol amongst all 64 Alliance schools; and have also developed a 'Self Evaluation Audit Tool' (SEAT) which is being used by all schools. This project will focus on developing this into an online real time audit tool enabling early intervention and design of preventive programmes that target need.
Key Actions and learning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the SEAT and the data from it being used at the school to school partnership board. • The SEAT being consistently implemented across the schools in the alliance and also in Devon and Cornwall. • The number of schools below floor targets reduced from 19 to 2.
Conclusions and next steps
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistency of the data, ensuring the data is accurate and accessibility over a region are the main contributors to the success. 2. Next steps: 3. Ensure governors are trained to use the SEAT. 4. Use the SEAT to identify collective CPD needs. 5. Sharing the successes with other schools.

Teaching School Alliance & Region
Salop Teaching School Alliance
Shropshire
Original Plan
Developing a method of early school intervention that identifies clearly what performance measures are used as a trigger that involves both LAs disclosing

<p>information that they hold on their schools. We would then look at other factors that might place schools at risk of underperformance i.e. change of leadership at Headteacher level as well as in specific subjects. It should also be possible to place alongside this a self-referral process for school leaders and Governors as a result of their own self-evaluation.</p>
<p>Key Actions and learning</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a data dashboard, devise what data and what indicators are required • Populate the data base with a data set to check the system is fit for purpose • Set clear protocols for data sharing and the usage policy • Test the dashboard enables the easy identification of priorities
<p>Conclusions and next steps</p>
<p>Year 1 was the set up and testing year. Year 2 the dashboard will be used to analyse the summer 2014 results and identify school improvement priorities.</p>

<p>Teaching School Alliance & Region</p>
<p>South West Teaching School Alliance</p>
<p>Devon</p>
<p>Original Plan</p>
<p>Share currently successful RAISEonline tool with Torbay and Plymouth Teaching School alliances; Develop our ICT protocols to include sharing and tracking information about the quality of teaching and a range of ICT tools to support data tracking and sharing. Two schools will also be Identified in the alliance where data points to underperformance of groups and/or whole cohorts and focus on these to show the impact of data tools / SLE deployment and intervention.</p>
<p>Key Actions and learning</p>
<p>School 1 targeted the challenge for the most able. An initial focus was with KS4 lessons and how much time was allocated to learning that would support students in achieving the A*/A grades at GCSE level.</p> <p>The school found a clear link between lessons that catered for those higher level learners and those with higher aspirations but when the teaching and learning did not cater for higher level skills, then the quality of work quickly diminished and</p>

<p>students took less pride in their work and effort reduced.</p> <p>The second school focussed on a small group of disengaged year 11 boys who were at risk of becoming NEET. A breakfast 'Learning Café' was set up to complement the after school one that had been established in the previous year. Specific students we invited to the breakfast café as a way of settling the students for the day, having some nutritional food and a conversation with a mentor about the day, homework and student welfare issues. At the end of the year, all six students had training destinations and one saw a drop in poor behaviour incidents and most improved attendance.</p>
<p>Conclusions and next steps</p>
<p>School 1 have been developing strategies to try to solve this problem. It is too early to measure any impact at such an early stage.</p> <p>School 2 will implement the project again and target a slightly higher number of students who are at risk of underachieving or becoming NEET.</p>

<p>Teaching School Alliance & Region</p>
<p>The Bradford Birth to 19 Teaching School Alliance</p> <p>Bradford</p>
<p>Original Plan</p>
<p>To roll out a successful approach to secondary school to school support to primary. Focused on school self-evaluation and peer 'inspection' 'against Ofsted criteria to predict Ofsted judgements and focus support early if required. The main focus being 'how data is used to identify which schools require intervention'.</p>
<p>Key Actions and learning</p>
<p>Developed three joint practice development groups, each with a different focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increasing the attainment of children from areas of deprivation and poverty b. Successful parental engagement c. How joint practice development has impacted on the early literacy development strategy

<p>Learning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project is ongoing; it takes much longer than anticipated to set up groups appropriately 2. Do not underestimate the time it takes to build trust between schools in order to share sensitive data 3. The matching of schools who can work together is a sensitive process and the success of the project depends on getting this correct 4. You must build capacity to support long term joint practice development 5. Share research amongst participants 6. You must be sensitive to existing collaborations, having the new structure of a Teaching School should not break collaborations that have worked successfully prior to the Teaching School Alliance being formed.
<p>Conclusions and next steps</p>
<p>Too soon to report on the activity as it took the whole year to build the infrastructure, relationships and trust between partners and schools. It is anticipated that it will be another year before the impact of this ongoing project can be evaluated.</p> <p>The infrastructure is now in place with data sharing, the next plan will be to develop the work of the three groups in 2014/15.</p>

<p>Teaching School Alliance & Region</p>
<p>The Queen Katherine Teaching School Alliance</p>
<p>Cumbria</p>
<p>Original Plan</p>
<p>Through developing the infrastructure of Local Alliances of System Leaders (LASL's) involving all school improvement stakeholders, integrate data sharing protocols and sharing of local intelligence and school self-evaluation to be proactive in identifying school improvement need before it becomes acute. Develop and implement a consistent system across the county for brokering and deploying support. Evaluate the impact of this on school improvement case studies at the end of year 1.</p>
<p>Key Actions and learning</p>
<p>The most significant benefits of the CASL/LASL infrastructure this year has</p>

been:

1. The clear vision of the LASL to support school improvement to ensure that all schools are improving and the vision being that in the future there will be no school with an Ofsted grade lower than 'good'.
2. Agreement of data sharing protocols and schools signing up to the memorandum of understanding.
3. Identification of needs has become more proactive and systems in place to monitor and respond to schools before external scrutiny
4. Clear protocols and systems in place to deliver, monitor and evaluate school improvement work within the LASL. Each school identified on the watch list has a named person who is then accountable for the school improvement work and reporting on the progress at the LASL.
5. Further development of communication and trusting relationships to act quickly where schools require it,

Conclusions and next steps

1. Time to monitor and evaluate the success of the identification, support and impact of the LASL driving school improvement in the county.
2. Each LASL to lead on a priority, English, mathematics and closing the gap.



Department
for Education

© NCTL (2014)

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Regional.Cohesion@education.gsi.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus