



Education
Endowment
Foundation

Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership

Evaluation report and executive summary
July 2017

Independent evaluators:

Meg Callanan, Dr Javiera Cartagena Farias, Ruth Hudson and Ellen Greaves



The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) is an independent grant-making charity dedicated to breaking the link between family income and educational achievement, ensuring that children from all backgrounds can fulfil their potential and make the most of their talents.

The EEF aims to raise the attainment of children facing disadvantage by:

- identifying promising educational innovations that address the needs of disadvantaged children in primary and secondary schools in England;
- evaluating these innovations to extend and secure the evidence on what works and can be made to work at scale; and
- encouraging schools, government, charities, and others to apply evidence and adopt innovations found to be effective.

The EEF was established in 2011 by the Sutton Trust as lead charity in partnership with Impetus Trust (now part of Impetus - Private Equity Foundation) and received a founding £125m grant from the Department for Education.

Together, the EEF and Sutton Trust are the government-designated What Works Centre for improving education outcomes for school-aged children.



J.P.Morgan

For more information about the EEF or this report please contact:

Danielle Mason

Head of Research and Publications
Education Endowment Foundation
9th Floor, Millbank Tower
21–24 Millbank
SW1P 4QP

p: 020 7802 1679

e: danielle.mason@eefoundation.org.uk

w: www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk

About the evaluator

The project was independently evaluated by a team from NatCen: Meg Callanan, Dr Javiera Cartagena Farias and Ruth Hudson. The descriptive analysis of school-level attainment data was carried out by Ellen Greaves at the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS).

The lead evaluator was Meg Callanan.

NatCen Social Research

Address: 35 Northampton Square, London, EC1V 0AX

Email: info@natcen.ac.uk

Tel: 020 7250 1866

Contents

About the evaluator.....	2
Contents.....	3
Executive summary.....	4
Methods	10
Findings	15
Conclusion.....	32
References.....	35
Appendix 1 Descriptive information on pupil attainment	36
Appendix 2 Demographic and school level characteristics for Bournemouth and comparison areas.....	40
Appendix 3: Impact initiatives.....	42

Executive summary

The project

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership ('the Partnership') was a pilot collaboration between Teach First, Teaching Leaders, and The Future Leaders Trust. It was a new initiative that aimed to work with primary and secondary schools and the wider community in two socially deprived areas of Bournemouth (Boscombe and West Howe) to improve educational outcomes of children by:

- placing and developing high quality teachers in participating schools;
- delivering individual leadership development programmes (Teach First, Future Leaders, Teaching Leaders Fellows, NPQML and NPQSL) in a co-ordinated way and aligning 'impact initiatives'—leadership projects required of programme participants—within and between schools; and
- uniting a broad community of stakeholders outside the schools to identify common goals and work towards area-based change and improved educational outcomes.

The Partnership was funded by J. P. Morgan and the Education Endowment Foundation and was a three-year programme which commenced in schools in September 2013 and finished in August 2016, following a nine-month set up period.

This pilot involved six secondary and three primary schools that met the providers' eligibility criteria relating to high levels of pupils living in deprivation. Schools had to contribute to the programme costs, but at a subsidised rate. This is a mostly qualitative pilot evaluation designed to explore the feasibility and perceived impacts of the model, and identify barriers and facilitators to its implementation. In addition, it aimed to track attainment in participating schools over time relative to schools in similar areas.

Key conclusions

1. The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model is not suitable for trial because of difficulties in engaging sufficient schools with all elements of the model.
2. Aligning projects undertaken by participants of the different leadership programmes was challenging, despite being a key aim of the model. Of the four school-led projects taken forward, none involved participants on all three of the individual programmes.
3. Stakeholders thought a longer timescale was needed to embed area-based change and questions were raised over whether schools have the capacity and are best placed to take the lead on area-based change.
4. Average attainment in participating schools has not changed dramatically since involvement with the pilot. However, given the small-scale and area-based nature of the project, it would have been difficult to identify impact with confidence.
5. The programme changed and developed over the course of the three-year pilot. Initiatives of this type are likely to need to continuously adapt, making it difficult to specify the core components for future evaluations.

What are the findings?

Findings from the qualitative evaluation identified two main challenges to delivering the in-school elements. First, fewer schools participated in the Partnership than originally planned. The costs of investing in the leadership programmes were identified as a barrier by schools, despite the subsidies. Schools also reflected that their staff CPD needs meant they did not always have candidates at the appropriate stage of their careers to place on the programmes. Despite these barriers, 17 Teach First

participants were placed in the schools over the three years, and a further 26 staff participated in programmes from Teaching Leaders and the Future Leaders Trust.

Second, participants in recruited schools struggled to align the projects undertaken by participants as part of the individual leadership programmes in the way envisaged. Staff highlighted the need for better timeframe alignment between Partnership activity and the timings of the individual leadership programmes. Furthermore, staff did not have the capacity to fully contribute to whole-school initiatives, and there need to be clear mechanisms to encourage and enable staff to engage fully with the programme.

Beyond the in-school elements, the project aimed to work with the broader community. Stakeholders reflected at the end of the pilot that a longer timescale was needed to embed area-based change. Questions were also raised over whether schools have the capacity to take the lead on area-based change.

The data collected on average attainment in the Partnership schools does not show any changes since involvement with the pilot. This is the case for both primary and secondary schools. This data, however, should be treated with caution and should not be interpreted as showing that there has definitely been not been an impact. This is because the small-scale and area-based design of the pilot did not allow for the use of a randomised controlled trial or the construction of a well-matched control group that could have allowed a fair comparison with the results of schools that did not receive the intervention.

At its current stage of development, the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership is not ready for trial because of lower than anticipated levels of school recruitment, limited evidence to support the feasibility of collaboration across the leadership programmes, and the need for further development to specify the core components of the programme.

How was the pilot conducted?

The Partnership project team recruited two primary schools and six secondary schools to the pilot in the first year of the programme. A further primary school joined the pilot in the second year of implementation despite not having participants on the leadership programmes. This was a small scale 'test and learn' pilot, and, as such, the evaluation focused on a qualitative assessment of implementation and feasibility, mostly through interviews with participating schools and the project team.

Table 1: Summary of pilot findings

Question	Finding	Comment
<i>Is there evidence to support the theory of change?</i>	No	The three-year pilot did not provide sufficient evidence to suggest that the programme can improve outcomes for pupils.
<i>Was the approach feasible?</i>	No	Difficulties recruiting and engaging schools in the pilot and aligning impact initiatives across leadership programmes suggests the model is not feasible in its current format.
<i>Is the approach ready to be evaluated in a trial?</i>	No	Lack of evidence to support the theory of change and challenges in the implementation of the pilot indicate that the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model is not ready to be evaluated in a trial.

Introduction

Intervention

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership was a pilot collaboration between teaching charities Teach First, Teaching Leaders, and The Future Leaders Trust.¹ All three charities work in schools in highly deprived areas and have strict eligibility criteria focusing on schools needing their interventions the most. In this pilot, they aimed to work together in primary and secondary schools—and the wider community—in two socially deprived areas of Bournemouth (Boscombe and West Howe).

Bournemouth is an area of interest to funders and providers who have not previously worked in the area due to its diversity in student outcomes. It has a selective system, but a relatively high proportion of schools perform around the Government's 'floor standard'. The pilot aimed to test the feasibility of improving the educational outcomes of children in these communities by:

- placing and developing high quality teachers in participating schools;
- delivering leadership development programmes in a co-ordinated way and aligning impact initiatives within and between schools;² and
- uniting a broad community of stakeholders to identify common goals and to collaborate to achieve area-based change and improve educational outcomes.

The five leadership development programmes offered to participating schools were:

- The Future Leaders Trust

Future Leaders Programme

A programme for senior staff aspiring to headship involving ongoing mentoring and coaching. The course includes a two-week summer residential, a series of weekend workshops, and a week-long study tour. Participants are required to complete an impact initiative and the expectation from the programme is that they will reach headship within three years.

National Professional Qualification for Senior Leadership (NPQSL)

A one year accredited qualification (from the National College for Teaching and Leadership) for senior leaders involving over 40 hours of face-to-face workshops.

- Teaching Leaders

TL Fellows

TL Fellows is a two-year programme for secondary school middle leaders providing coaching and training. Participants complete an Impact Project focused on pupil impacts in their area of responsibility. The training is delivered outside of school hours and includes two residentials (one five days and one three days).

National Professional Qualification for Middle Leadership (NPQML)

An accredited qualification (from the National College for Teaching and Leadership) for middle leaders, delivered over 12–18 months. Participants attend training and complete a final assessment that involves working on a school improvement priority.

- Teach First

Graduates are placed in schools serving low-income communities and work towards their PGCE and qualified teacher status. Participants are supported by subject mentors and a Teach First Leadership Development Officer (LDO).

¹ Teaching Leaders and Future Leaders merged in November 2016 (after the pilot) to become Ambition School Leadership.

² 'Impact initiatives' are projects carried out by staff participating in the leadership programmes. For example, on the Future Leaders programme this involves a 'whole-school impact initiative', while on the Teaching Fellows programme this is a two-year impact initiative focused on their area of leadership responsibility.

In addition to the leadership programmes, the Partnership aimed to co-ordinate and support participating staff to align the impact initiatives that formed part of their leadership programmes and work together in a co-ordinated way. 'Impact initiatives' were projects carried out by participating staff in areas of school improvement that related to their areas of responsibility. They formed part of the assessment requirements for the Future Leaders, TL Fellows, NPQML, and NPQSL programmes (with some variation in focus depending on the programme) and typically involved analysis of school data to identify an area for improvement, delivery of an intervention, and an assessment of impact.

As the project developed, an 'Innovation Day' was added to the timeline to support the alignment of impact initiatives. This was held in the autumn term of the second year to support participating schools to identify and plan their collaborative impact initiatives. At the end of the second year, a showcase event was held and schools were invited to present their collaborative impact initiatives to a panel of judges to pitch for a share of £50,000 to take the ideas forward in the third year of implementation.

The pilot aimed to develop and test an 'area-based collaborative model' in which schools would work with a broader community of local stakeholders (such as local employers, children's centres, and local authority staff) in Boscombe and West Howe to agree shared goals and achieve wider area-based change. Each participating school identified an in-school lead to act as the main co-ordinator and point of contact for the pilot. The Partnership was supported by a full-time programme manager whose role was to support the alignment of impact initiatives and foster and develop partnerships between participating schools and wider community stakeholders.

The Partnership was funded by J. P. Morgan and the Education Endowment Foundation and was a three-year programme following a nine-month set-up period. Set up began in November 2012 with the main activity in schools commencing in September 2013. The pilot completed in August 2016. Participating schools had to contribute to the costs of core programmes but benefitted from a subsidised rate.

Background evidence

The attainment gap between pupils from more and less advantaged backgrounds remains a persistent issue in England. In 2013 at the commencement of this pilot, 37.9% of pupils eligible for free school meals achieved five GCSE A*–C grades compared to 64.6% of more advantaged pupils (DfE, 2015). In this context, the Partnership pilot was established to test an 'area-based change' approach to improving the attainment of disadvantaged children, drawing inspiration from successful place-based initiatives to improve educational outcomes in the U.S. (for example, the Strive Together Community and the Harlem Children's Zone).³

The programme also set out to build on the existing evidence of the importance of school leadership (Day *et al.*, 2009) by exploring the extent to which collaboration between three educational professional development charities committed to improving outcomes for the most disadvantaged children could move from 'individual action to collective working' to produce change.

In a separate EEF pilot, the Partnership model of collaboration and alignment across leadership programmes to improve attainment outcomes (without the area-based component) is being evaluated in an efficacy trial with 14 schools across England.⁴

³ Further detail of Harlem Children's Zone can be found at <http://hcz.org/about-us/> and the Strive Together Community at: <http://www.strivetogether.org/>

⁴ Available at <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/our-work/projects/achieve-together/>

This process evaluation was designed to explore the feasibility and implementation of the Partnership as an area-based model of change. This is a small scale ‘test and learn’ pilot, and, as such, the evaluation has focused on a qualitative assessment of implementation and feasibility. The evaluation was also formative, intending to contribute to the development of the project. Findings were shared with the project team at points throughout the project.

Research questions

This process evaluation aimed to:

- explore the feasibility of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model and identify the facilitators and barriers to implementation;
- track the development of the pilot over the three years of implementation;
- explore perceived impacts and views on the facilitators and barriers to impact;
- assess the readiness for trial of the model and identify lessons for future development; and
- identify formative findings that could inform the development of this and similar projects.

In addition, the pilot evaluation aimed to track attainment in participating schools over time relative to schools in similar areas.

This report does not evaluate the five individual leadership development programmes (Teach First, NPQML, NPQSL, TL Fellows, and Future Leaders) that formed the foundation of the Partnership model as this was beyond the scope of the evaluation (see Allen, R. *et al.*, 2013, Mujis, D. *et al.*, 2010, and Future Leaders, 2010 for evaluations of individual programmes). Rather, the focus was on the added value of the Partnership model—specifically the collaboration and alignment across the leadership programmes, and the collaboration with community stakeholders to improve attainment at an area level.

Ethical review

The project underwent an ethical review with NatCen’s Research Ethics Committee and received approval in October 2013, prior to the commencement of data collection.

Project team

The pilot was delivered by the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team. This was led by a full-time project manager who was responsible for day-to-day liaison with the schools, overseeing the delivery of the pilot, and facilitating area-based collaboration. The project manager was supported by a data analyst who carried out analysis of local attainment data to assist in the identification of the three area-based goals:

1. tackling unequal outcomes for students whose first language was not English—‘English as an Additional Language’ (EAL) students—who were found to have poorer outcomes than the national average in Boscombe;
2. improving school readiness and the transition between Early Years settings and school in West Howe; and
3. tackling the issue of pupils leaving school ‘Not in Education, Employment or Training’ (NEET) across both West Howe and Boscombe.

In the second and third years of the pilot an education consultant was employed to support participating schools to deliver their impact initiatives. Within each school a staff member was nominated as the within-school lead to act as the day-to-day liaison with the Partnership and to co-ordinate Partnership activities.

The leadership programmes were delivered by the individual charities in their usual way. This was their first time working in Bournemouth schools.

The NatCen evaluation team, led by Meg Callanan with support from Dr Javiera Cartagena Farias and Ruth Hudson, was responsible for the qualitative process evaluation, including in-depth interviews with staff and stakeholders.

The descriptive analysis of school-level attainment data was carried out by Ellen Greaves at the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS).

Methods

Recruitment of participating schools

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team was responsible for recruiting schools to the pilot. The original intention was to recruit up to fourteen primary and secondary schools in the Boscombe and West Howe areas of Bournemouth—areas the charities had not operated in prior to the pilot. Recruitment was lower than expected with two primary schools and six secondary schools participating in the first year of the programme, out of 14 eligible schools approached.

Eligibility

Initially, pilot participation was dependent on schools participating in two or more of the five leadership programmes within the scheme (Teach First, Future Leaders Programme, NPQSL, Teaching Leaders Fellows, and NPQML) as the logic of the pilot was to explore the impact of these programmes working collectively. To support engagement in the pilot, schools received a discount on the costs of the Teaching Leaders and Future Leaders programmes.

In the second year, maintaining the engagement of participating schools proved challenging. The two primary schools participating in the first year took no further part in Partnership activities (although their staff continued on the leadership programmes). For the purposes of this evaluation, ‘engagement in the pilot’ is defined as schools that both participated in core pilot activities (such as impact initiatives) and maintained communication with the Partnership project team. Schools that continued to employ Teach First staff, or those that engaged with the individual leadership programmes of the participating charities but did not engage in the collective impact initiatives or maintain communication with the Partnership team, are deemed to have disengaged from the pilot. Four secondary schools (under two executive heads) maintained their engagement while two further secondary schools took no further part. In light of lower than anticipated levels of recruitment, eligibility in the second year was relaxed to include an additional primary school that had no staff participating in any of the leadership development programmes (but wanted to participate in the impact initiatives and wider area-based change activities) as it was considered to be an important school to engage with to support the wider aim of the pilot to achieve area-based change.

The following table provides an overview of school participation in the pilot across the three years.

Table 2: Number of schools participating in the pilot

	Year 1 (2013/2014)	Year 2 (2014/2015)	Year 3 (2015/2016)	Total no. schools in target area
Primary schools	2*	1 (joined in Year 2)	1	24
Secondary schools	6	4	4	14
Total	8	5	5	38

* Did not participate in Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership activities in Years 2 and 3.

Across the participating schools, the number of staff participating in the various leadership programmes offered by the educational charities varied.

Table 3 provides a break-down by school of staff participating in the programmes in the first year of the pilot.

Table 3: Leadership programme participation

	School type	Teach First	Teaching Leaders	Future Leaders	Total
School 1 & 2	Secondary	5	1 (Fellows)	0	6

	(2 schools co-located)				
School 3 & 4	Secondary (2 schools co-located)	4	1 (Fellows)	1 (Future leaders)	6
School 5*	Primary	0	0	0	0
Schools not participating in AT activities after year 1:					
School 6	Secondary	4	4 (NPQML) 2 (Fellows)	3 (NPQSL)	13
School 7	Secondary	2	2 (Fellows)	4 (NPQSL)	8
School 8	Primary	1	3 (NPQML)	2 (NPQSL)	6
School 9	Primary	1	2 (NPQML)	1 (NPQSL)	4

*Joined the pilot in the second year of implementation.

No additional staff were recruited to the Teaching Leaders or Future Leaders Programmes after the first year of the pilot, although Teach First continued to place new Teach First participants in schools, with 13 Teach First teachers in Year 2 and 11 in Year 3. The lower than anticipated levels of school engagement in the pilot, and the drop in engagement after the first year, are discussed in full later in this report.

Data collection

Qualitative data collection

A longitudinal qualitative research design was used to explore implementation, delivery, and perceived impacts. Depth interviews were conducted with key stakeholders in each of the three years of the pilot to track the progress and development of the pilot over time.

The intention was to speak to all within-school leads in the first year of the pilot and to capture a broader range of perspectives from participating staff in the second and third years of implementation. Particularly in the first year, challenges in engaging schools in the evaluation meant not all within-school leads participated in interviews. Table 4 provides an overview of data collection across the three years.

Table 4: Achieved interviews

	Year 1 (2013/2014)	Year 2 (2014/2015)	Year 3 (2015/2016)
Achieve Together Partnership project manager	1	2	2
Schools 1 and 2	1	1 interview 1 (group x 4 staff)	1
Schools 3 and 4		6	3
School 5	-	2	1 (group x 3 staff)
Leadership programme coaches	3	-	-
Community stakeholders	4	3	3
Achieve Together Partnership consultant*	-	1	1

Schools not participating in the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership activities after year 1:			
School 6	-	-	-
School 7	-	-	-
School 8	1	-	-
School 9	1	-	-
Overall total	11	16	11

*Employed in the second and third years of the pilot.

Although efforts were made to seek feedback from the schools that disengaged from the pilot after the first year, no further interviews were carried out with these schools. This limits what evidence the process evaluation can present about the reasons why these schools chose not to engage in the impact initiatives and wider area-based change components of the pilot in the second and third years of implementation.

Thirty-eight interviews were conducted in total, 23 by telephone and 15 face to face. Interviews lasted between thirty minutes and one hour and were audio recorded and transcribed. A member of the research team also observed the innovation day and the showcase event (discussed in the findings) in the second year of the pilot.

Data was analysed using the Framework approach—a systematic and comprehensive approach to data management that facilitates within and between case analyses of qualitative data (Ritchie *et al.*, 2013).

Descriptive attainment data collection and analysis

Information on the academic performance of schools involved with the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership, before and after involvement with the pilot, was gathered from publicly available school performance tables.⁵ For primary schools, the measure of performance that is consistent over time is the Key Stage 2 (KS2) average points score. For secondary schools, it is the percentage of pupils achieving at least five GCSEs at grades A*–C at Key Stage 4 (KS4, including English and maths), and the percentage of pupils achieving the English Baccalaureate. For each performance measure, the average for all schools involved with the Partnership was calculated for each academic year. The sample includes three schools at the primary level (as the one infant school does not have KS2 data) and six secondary schools.

The trends in attainment over time for schools involved with the pilot show how average attainment has changed since the pilot. These trends cannot be attributed to the pilot, however, as establishing causal effects requires a suitable comparison group to represent the trend in attainment that would have occurred in the absence of the pilot. For example, there are national trends in performance measures, and changes in school funding over the period, which could have influenced pupil performance differentially across schools in high- and low-income neighbourhoods. The small-scale and area-based nature of the pilot prohibited a randomised controlled trial or the construction of a well-matched comparison group that was similar in every way except for participation in the pilot.

However, to provide some sense of the relative attainment of the schools involved, average attainment for these schools is shown alongside the average attainment of schools in Bournemouth *not* part of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership, and schools in three similar local authorities—Torbay, Medway and Wirral. Average attainment for these groups of schools in each academic year was again computed from publicly available school performance tables. These comparisons take account of national trends in performance measures and differences across areas

⁵ <https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/download-data>

to some extent, but the analysis remains descriptive as there are likely to be many characteristics of Bournemouth that make it distinct from these comparison areas.

The three local authorities (LAs) were chosen in advance to match features of Bournemouth LA as closely as possible. First, fourteen LAs with selective school systems (as in Bournemouth) were considered. From this set, six coastal LAs were selected. From these, Poole was excluded because it has a middle school system (unlike Bournemouth), while Lincolnshire was too large. Of these three local authorities, Torbay most closely resembles Bournemouth in demographic characteristics: it has a large proportion of retired households, and is similar in pupil composition with few ethnic minority students and a similar distribution of pupils eligible for free school meals across schools. All three local authorities are shown in the following figures to give balance to the descriptive information.

Statistical analysis (which would inform whether differences in attainment between the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership schools and other groups of schools are statistically significantly different) was not planned or conducted for this evaluation. This is primarily because the area-based nature of the pilot means that the intervention group has a sample size of one. This is also because even statistically significant differences could not be interpreted as causal as the small-scale pilot made it impossible to construct a credible comparison group of schools which are identical in every way to the intervention schools aside from access to the pilot.

Analysis of costs

Information on costs was collected from the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team at the end of the pilot. The cost analysis reports on the costs of the model assuming no subsidies or pilot funding that would not be available outside the EEF and J. P. Morgan funded pilot.

Timeline

Table 5 provides a breakdown of key pilot and evaluation activity across the three years. Wave 2 interviews were originally planned for the autumn term of 2014, but postponed to the spring 2015 to allow for key project activities to take place before data collection.

Table 5: Timeline

Pilot Year	Date	Pilot activity	Evaluation activity
Year 1 (2013/2014)	Summer 2013	Schools recruited to the pilot	
	Autumn 2013	Pilot commences Achieve Together manager builds relationships with community stakeholders and becomes chair of the Boscombe Regeneration Board's Youth sub-committee	
	Spring 2014		Evaluation interviews (wave 1)
	Summer 2014	Area-based data analysis carried out and area-based goals identified.	
Year 2 (2014/2015)	Autumn 2014	Innovation day held to develop school impact initiatives	
	Spring 2015	Schools develop their impact initiatives	Evaluation interviews (wave 2)

	Summer 2015	Schools pitch for innovation funds to deliver their impact initiatives Early years school readiness workshops held	Evaluation interviews (wave 3)
Year 3 (2015/2016)	Autumn 2015– Summer 2016	Schools develop and deliver impact initiatives Early identification of pupils at risk of NEET trialled in two participating schools	
	Summer 2016	Achieve Together show-case event	Evaluation interviews (wave 4) Cost data collected
	Autumn 2016		Analysis of interview data and descriptive school-level attainment data

Findings

Participants

In total, nine schools—six secondary and three primary—participated in the pilot, all located in the West Howe and Boscombe areas of Bournemouth. Of the nine schools, five continued to play an active part in the initiative, while four did not engage with any activities beyond placing staff on the three leadership programmes.

Two of the primary schools were substantially larger than the national average of 275 pupils while one was smaller.⁶ The six secondary schools that participated were typically smaller than the national average of 939 pupils.⁷ Schools involved in the pilot were situated in highly deprived areas, meeting the charities' eligibility criteria. The percentage of pupils eligible for and claiming free school meals (FSM pupils) ranged from 13.4% to 22.5% across the participating secondary schools in the academic year 2013/2014, with two of the four schools above the national average of 18.3%.⁸ The percentage of EAL pupils is also lower than the national average (13.6%) across participating secondary schools, ranging between 7.8% and 16.8% (with two schools above the national average).

Evidence to support theory of change

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership set out to explore whether three educational charities offering leadership development programmes to teachers could work together to improve outcomes for children in two disadvantaged areas of Bournemouth by:

- placing and developing high quality teachers in participating schools through Teach First placements, and leadership development training for middle and senior leaders;
- delivering leadership development programmes in a co-ordinated way and aligning impact initiatives within and between schools;⁹ and
- uniting a broad community of stakeholders to identify common goals and collaborate with schools to achieve area-based change and improved educational outcomes.

Evidence from the pilot evaluation on the extent to which each of these core aims were met, the feasibility of the programme, and its readiness for trial form the basis of the rest of this report.

Placing and developing high quality teachers in participating schools

The placement and development of high quality teachers in participating schools within a specific geographic area (to affect area-based change) was a key element of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership. This required schools to engage with the pilot by placing their staff on the leadership programmes offered, to participate in aligning impact initiatives across them, and to contribute to wider area-based goals.

This was the first time Teach First had placed participants in Bournemouth schools: seventeen placements were made in the first year of the pilot. The placement of high quality teachers in the participating schools, as well as access to training for middle and senior leaders, was perceived as beneficial in an area struggling to recruit high calibre staff.

⁶ Source for national statistics:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/552342/SFR20_2016_Main_Text.pdf

⁷ For national statistics, see <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/schools-pupils-and-their-characteristics-january-2016>

⁸ Source for national statistics:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207670/Main_text-_SFR21_2013.pdf

⁹ See note 2.

The intention was to recruit 14 schools in the pilot area, but only nine schools were recruited. Five of these participated in all elements of the programme throughout the three years. The number of staff participating in the leadership programmes across the schools also varied, as reflected in Table 3.

The evaluation identified the following barriers to participation:

- Eligibility criteria and engaging schools with the programme

In addition to the schools having high levels of pupils living in deprivation and the overall attainment of the local authority being low, eligibility for the pilot was dependent on schools committing staff to two or more of the five leadership programmes within the scheme as the logic of the Partnership was to explore the impact of these programmes working collectively. “When trying to achieve ‘area-based’ change, this presented a challenge because schools that were in the area (and therefore important to engage to affect area-based change) were not always able to place staff on the programmes. Programme costs and the relevance of the programmes to staff development needs were raised as barriers to participation:

‘As I explained, that model wouldn’t work ... in my school ... Although we were offered the courses at a reduced cost they were still very expensive’ (headteacher, Year 2).

In response, the Partnership project team relaxed the eligibility criteria in the second year to include a primary school that had no staff participating in the leadership programmes. While this enabled the school to participate in the wider pilot, it raises questions over whether an area-based change model, which needs engagement from schools in a specific geographical area, is feasible where participation is dependent on eligibility criteria (e.g. leadership programme participation) that schools may not be able, or willing, to meet.

- Cost

Participating schools received a 50% discount on the costs of the Teaching Leaders and Future Leaders programmes. While this was an attractive element of the programme that encouraged participating schools to take part, cost remained a concern with both the cost of the programmes and the investment of time required by schools to support Teach First staff placed in the schools (despite schools receiving funding towards supporting Teach First participants), raised as considerations:

‘The other costs which were not appreciated at the time of signing up was the amount of staff resource—experienced staff resource in coaching and releasing the student teacher to go into other schools and so on’ (headteacher, Year 1).

- Staff turnover limiting the benefits of investment in the programmes

During the course of the pilot, schools encountered issues with staff participating on the programmes leaving the school during (or immediately on completion) of the programmes. This was a frustration to school leaders because of the investment made in their training, and this acted as a disincentive to further investment:

‘How I’m feeling as a headteacher is I’m not sure I would invest so heavily in the future because having four [staff] ... going and I’ve got to replace them and there’s the recruitment ad and all the rest of it. Why would I do that?’ (headteacher, Year 2).

This issue raises questions over whether the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model is a sustainable long-term approach to improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils if issues with staff turnover discouraged ongoing investment in the leadership programmes.

- Alternative leadership programme providers

Schools highlighted that other providers were offering the National Professional Qualification for Middle Leadership (NPQML) and the National Professional Qualification for Senior Leadership (NPQSL), and there were examples of schools accessing these programmes through these alternatives. One school reflected that it would be beneficial for the Partnership to work with all providers of these programmes rather than limiting participation to schools engaging with specific providers and to have a good understanding of the local market of leadership programmes at the start of the project.

- Lack of clarity and understanding of Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership aims and purpose
In the first year of the pilot, schools and community stakeholders consistently reported a lack of clarity and understanding of the aims and purpose of the pilot:

'I think, for me, how it works in practice, even though I went to the initial meeting with the PowerPoints and how it all pulls together, until you're actually in it and you really realise, actually, you know, it does all link, it's not so clear' (headteacher, Year 1).

This may have contributed to the drop in engagement from Year 1 to Year 2 as schools struggled to understand the added value of the model, although they continued to engage in the individual leadership programmes.

- Changes in school leadership
A new headteacher in one of the participating primary schools after the first year of the pilot reduced the school's level of engagement. School staff continued to participate in the programmes but took no further part in Partnership impact initiatives or area-based change.

Delivering leadership development programmes in a co-ordinated way and aligning impact initiatives within and between schools

Alongside developing high quality teachers, the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model aimed to support collaboration between the leadership programmes and, in particular, the alignment of impact initiatives to achieve whole-school change. This section reports on this component of the pilot and looks specifically at how the impact initiatives developed over the three years.

Progress in Year 1

The first year of pilot implementation showed minimal progress in relation to collaboration across the leadership development programmes. Participating schools reported that the concept of collaborative working across the programmes had not yet fully embedded:

'Is there a joined up feeling and approach to it?' No ... we participate in all three aspects of the programme. I was expecting to have something that was far more joined up. I was expecting to have a visit from somebody who would say, "Right, you know these are the projects that are being done. What are the ends of your school? Is it in your school?" There's been none of that, none of the joined up thinking' (headteacher, Year 1).

Progress in Years 2 and 3

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership team were in regular communication with the schools, and, in recognition of the lack of progress in relation to collaboration in the first year, the team put in place additional structures to support the collaborative impact initiatives in the second year of the pilot:

- An Innovation Day
At the end of the autumn term of the second year, participating schools were invited to an Innovation Day. The purpose of the day was to feedback to schools what the area-based priority areas were and to support participating schools to identify and plan their collaborative impact initiatives. In advance of the meeting, each school was asked to identify a problem they wished to solve and were given time on the day to explore possible solutions with a view to developing and piloting their impact initiatives over the spring and summer terms.
- A showcase event at the end of the summer term
At the end of the second year of implementation, a showcase event was held at which participating schools were invited to present their collaborative impact initiatives to a panel of judges to pitch for a share of £50,000 to take the ideas forward in the third year of implementation. Working towards this showcase was largely viewed positively by schools who felt it gave projects a focus and goal.

- Support of an education consultant

In May of the second year, an education consultant was brought in to work with the schools more intensively to support the development of the impact initiatives. This was in recognition of the fact that the schools did not have as much capacity as was necessary to progress their initiatives and needed further support to develop them. The consultant met regularly with project teams and provided additional project management support to prepare teams for the showcase pitch. This input was viewed very positively by schools. It was felt that progress was much faster with this external oversight and support:

'To have someone that was keeping you focused and on track and everything is hugely important, because otherwise the fear would be that this may not be the priority and take a bit of a back seat' (teacher, Year 2).

The fact that the education consultant had previous experience as a senior leader in a Bournemouth school facilitated this relationship.

By the end of the second year, four projects had been formulated and awarded a share of the £50,000 impact initiative fund. A brief summary of each project is provided here, and further detail can be found in Appendix 3.

- Differentiation for Inclusion

This project aimed to close the attainment gap between EAL and non-EAL students by developing an immersion CPD programme for teachers, providing welcome packs for students in different languages, providing in-class support via specialist TAs, and addressing a research gap on the barriers to learning encountered by EAL students by funding a Masters course of study for the Teach First member of the project team. The project received £10,000 of funding and was led by a staff member on the Future Leaders programme supported by a Teach First participant.

By the end of the pilot, the project team reflected that teacher confidence in teaching EAL students had improved as a result of the training provided but that further investment in training and refinement of the CPD package would be needed beyond the lifetime of the pilot to embed the strategies and find robust ways of tracking impacts.

The feasibility of sustaining progress made during the pilot was viewed as strong by the project team because the project was led by a senior member of staff (participating in the Future Leaders programme) who would ensure that the area of work remained a high priority within the Academy Trust and retained the engagement of the senior leadership team.

- Careers profile

This project aimed to reduce the risk that students would become Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) when they left school by creating a careers 'profile' for every student in Year 10 to improve the fit between career aspirations and careers advice and work experience offered by the school. The project received £3,000 of funding.

Initially developed by two Teach First participants with support from the education consultant, by the final year of the pilot delivery of the project had been transferred to a pastoral member of staff with responsibility for careers development. Consequently, no staff participating in the leadership programmes had further involvement raising questions over the feasibility of the Partnership model of impact initiative alignment across programmes.

In terms of achieving its ultimate aim of reducing the number of NEET young people, the project lead reflected that it would not be possible to assess the impact on this for a further two years, that is, when data on students identified as NEET after leaving the school at the end of Year 11 would become available.

- **Aspire mentoring**
This project aimed to improve the attainment of disadvantaged students by partnering with an established mentoring charity to train a number of mentors in the Bournemouth community to work with disadvantaged girls in Year 9. The project received £15,000 of funding to pay for the mentoring charity to set-up and support the delivery of the pilot to 50 pupils in Year 9 in the final year of the pilot.

Largely as a result of staff leaving the school, responsibility for implementation of the project in the final year of the pilot was passed to a staff member with overall responsibility for mentoring across the school. Consequently, no staff participating in the Partnership leadership programmes had further involvement with the project.

The fundamental challenge for this project was sustainability beyond the lifetime of the pilot as the support of the mentoring charity was funded via the pilot. The school had no funds to continue the relationship in the future. However, the school hoped to maintain a positive relationship with the local employer who provided the mentors and explore ways they could continue to work together in the future.

- **Maths outdoor learning environment (MOLE)**
This project (delivered by the only primary school participating in the impact initiatives) aimed to improve the teaching of maths problem-solving and therefore pupil attainment in maths by creating a maths outdoor learning environment (MOLE) and developing a CPD package for teachers to improve the quality of their teaching. The project received £22,000 of funding and was led by the three Key Stage leads (Foundation, KS1, and KS2).

With the ultimate aim of improving attainment in maths, staff reflected that by the end of the pilot it was too early to judge whether the MOLE had achieved this because construction was not completed until the end of the pilot period and only a few trial lessons had been held in it. However, the focus on maths problem-solving across the school, and the series of CPD sessions held with all staff, were felt to have raised the profile of maths problem-solving across the school, improved staff confidence in teaching problem-solving, and developed the way the school approached CPD.

Uniting a broad community of stakeholders to identify common goals and collaborate with schools to achieve area-based change and improved educational outcomes

The unique component of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership was the focus on area-based change. This section reports on this component of the pilot.

The first year was a development phase for the area-based change component of the pilot. The Achieve Together Partnership project manager made links with the two regeneration partnership boards in Boscombe and West Howe, becoming the lead on the Education and Attainment strand of the Boscombe Regeneration Partnership, and feeding into the children's education component of the West Howe's Skills strategy.

The Achieve Together project manager also developed relationships with a range of community stakeholders including staff working in Community Regeneration and Children and Young People's services at Bournemouth Borough Council. A data analyst was also employed by the Achieve Together Partnership team to analyse key local datasets to inform the identification of priorities.

By late autumn 2014 (in the second year of the pilot), analysis of school attainment data for children living in Boscombe and West Howe had been completed and three priority areas selected and agreed with the regeneration boards as the focus for area-based change:

1. tackling unequal outcomes for EAL students who were found to have poorer outcomes than the national average in Boscombe;

2. improving school readiness and the transition between Early Years settings and school in West Howe; and
3. tackling the issue of pupils leaving school and having NEET status across both West Howe and Boscombe.

These targets were shared with schools at the Innovation Day late in the autumn term 2014, and three of the projects selected by schools aligned with these areas:

- tackling unequal outcomes for EAL students—the Differentiation for Inclusion project; and
- tackling NEETS—the Careers Profile and the Aspire Mentoring projects.

In addition to the school impact initiatives, other activities to support area-based change included:

- A school readiness and transition project
To tackle the 'school readiness' target, a link was established between the primary school participating in the Partnership and the local children's centre. A focus on language and speech development and parental involvement was agreed as a first step to addressing the issue of 'school readiness'. Towards the end of the summer term of the second year of the pilot and during the autumn of the third year, a staff member from the children's centre ran a narrative storytelling programme with children in the school nursery class to support their language development. The Achieve Together Partnership lead reflected positively on this component of the pilot and positive outcomes included a perceived improvement in school readiness and the identification of a child with speech and language needs that had not been identified previously.

Workshops were also held over the summer of 2015 at the children's centre for parents whose children would be starting school in September, looking at how they could support their children at home. These were felt to have had limited success because of the challenge of reaching the most hard-to-reach families:

'We did the school readiness workshop over at the Children's Centre in the summer holidays last year, which was reasonably well attended. Not really by the parents that we'd have wanted to come' (teacher, Year 3).

In the final year of the pilot, no further plans had been made to continue with the school readiness workshops in the summer holidays and the primary school involved reflected that a change in provider at the children's centre had slowed progress with this strand of activity. Beyond the narrative storytelling session in the autumn term, no further activities had taken place, although the primary school and children's centre were still in contact:

'It's all gone really quiet now. I think there's a lot going on over at the children's centre ... it hasn't built up into a big thing like we hoped it would and I'm not quite sure why' (teacher, Year 3).

From a wider community stakeholder perspective, the role the Partnership had played in supporting this relationship between the school and the children's centre was welcomed. However, some concerns were raised that the Early Years sector was not an area of expertise for the Partnership (perceived as a school-focused programme) and that this aspect of the project could have been maximised had it taken greater account of the work already ongoing in this area in Bournemouth to maximise opportunities to add value and contribute.

- Early identification of students at risk of NEET
To tackle young people becoming NEET, an arrangement was brokered between the Council's Youth Service and two of the Achieve Together Partnership schools to identify and work with pupils at risk of becoming NEET prior to them leaving school. The Youth Service welcomed this opportunity to build better relationships with the schools and intervene early to

prevent students becoming NEET (this was identified as a gap in provision after the closure of Connexions services). By the end of the pilot, although the approach was still at an early stage of development, positive outcomes were reported including supporting one student into a traineeship. Longer term, the Youth Service hopes to extend this approach to other secondary schools across Bournemouth and the headteacher of the schools concerned had committed to working with other schools to get their buy-in.

- Engagement with wider regeneration boards

The Achieve Together Partnership project manager remained the lead on the Boscombe Regeneration Partnership 'Education and Attainment' strand (which during the pilot broadened its scope to include youth) throughout the three-year pilot. A Partnership headteacher also joined this group (facilitated by the project manager) to further improve the links between the regeneration boards and the schools. This increased school engagement was welcomed by community stakeholders and attributed directly to the Partnership:

'I don't think that we would've had the engagement of ... the secondary schools, because they're just exceptionally busy. So I think the role of Achieve Together has been bringing together all of us and identifying what that common aim ... So it's ... worked really well at facilitating that' (community stakeholder, Year 3).

As a result of this engagement from one of the Partnership headteachers, an initiative developed to explore an integrated strategy to tackle cannabis use among young people, linking with the youth service and the police. By the end of the pilot, this had led to the development of a 'crib sheet' to provide greater clarity and accountability over what actions should be taken in response to various scenarios around drug use and young people:

'So it's been more about people understanding roles a bit more or knowing who to contact and sort of breaking down barriers so there's a better understanding all round of what the different roles are' (community stakeholder, Year 3).

The intention was to share this document with all Bournemouth schools once it had been agreed by all stakeholders.

The work with the regeneration boards also led to a stronger emphasis on the need to hear the voices of young people. At the end of the pilot (July 2016) an event was held in Boscombe that brought together a group of students from two of the participating secondary schools and a range of community stakeholders to discuss areas of concern raised by the students in a survey about their community. The intention was to use this event to develop 'pledges of positive action' from both young people and community stakeholders that would be taken forward beyond the lifetime of the pilot.

Evidence to support the theory of change: descriptive information on pupil attainment

Descriptive information on the academic performance of schools involved with the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership was compared with non-participating schools in Bournemouth and with attainment figures from three similar local authorities. The trends in attainment for Partnership schools cannot be interpreted as a causal effect of the pilot. This is because the small-scale and area-based design of the pilot prohibits the use of a randomised controlled trial or the construction of a well-matched comparison group that would provide the benchmark for attainment in the absence of the pilot. The trends in attainment for Partnership schools are therefore descriptive, providing information on how attainment has changed over time, but not attributable directly to the pilot. In summary:

- Descriptive data shows that attainment in Partnership schools (on average) has not changed dramatically since involvement with the pilot, for primary or secondary schools.

- Average attainment at the end of primary school for Partnership schools increased slightly over time—both before and after the pilot—which is in line with primary schools in other similar local authorities.
- Attainment at the end of secondary school—measured by the percentage of pupils achieving five A*–C GCSEs or achieving the English Baccalaureate—was also largely in line with schools in similar local authorities, although slightly higher for the percentage of pupils achieving five A*–C GCSEs. There was no evidence of a large increase in attainment after the pilot began.

More detail on the attainment data analysis can be found in Appendix 1.

Feasibility

This section reports on the feasibility of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership, exploring the feasibility of each component of the pilot and the barriers and facilitators to implementation.

Feasibility of collaboration across the leadership programmes

Across the four impact initiatives delivered by the participating schools, there was minimal collaboration across the three leadership programmes raising doubts about the feasibility of this core component of the model. By the final year of the pilot, only the Differentiation for Inclusion project involved an element of collaboration as it was led by a member of staff on the Future Leaders programme and was supported by a Teach First ambassador. In all other cases, projects were delivered by staff not involved in the leadership programmes with support from the Partnership education consultant.

Issues that were raised by participating schools and the project team as factors that undermined collaboration were:

- Alignment between the three leadership programmes
The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership did not give sufficient consideration to the links between the three leadership programmes, particularly in terms of articulating how the impact initiatives would align across programmes. The leadership programmes are of varying lengths and have different reporting requirements making it challenging for alignment of projects across the course of the three-year pilot. Some participating staff reflected that they had already decided on, and begun, their individual impact initiatives before they became fully aware of the Partnership and any expectation that they would work with colleagues across the other leadership programmes. In one case, for example, a teacher had agreed and begun work on her impact project for the Teaching Leaders programme before the Innovation Day took place late in the autumn term. This limited the extent to which she was in a position to work collaboratively with colleagues on the other programmes:

'I think that because [my impact project] was all sort of decided very early on in the year, and it was only after that that Achieve Together seemed to really start to take place, and that's when I feel that the two colleagues who are heading up the kind of Achieve Together project—I think, they'd planned their projects later' (teacher, Year 2).

To give the Partnership approach the best chance of success, schools reflected that a structure needed to be put in place prior to the autumn term in which the programme commenced. In particular, teachers wanted time built into the school timetable for regular collaborative meetings to take place between participating staff which would require timetabling in the summer term of the previous year. Teachers also wanted opportunities earlier in the year to be brought together as a Partnership group to clarify aims and expectations, preferably before their CPD programmes commenced:

'From the beginning it would have been good to link up with Teach First and Future Leaders and everyone else doing a similar course as part of Achieve Together. Meet up, have explained to us what Achieve Together are, what they're doing, what they want from us ... So, something at the beginning before our courses started would have been fantastic, and I think that would have just got the ball rolling with us all working together, and having links between our projects' (teacher, Year 2).

- The feasibility of collaboration

Participating school staff raised questions over the feasibility of collaboration across the leadership programmes where staff were working in different departments and held different responsibilities:

'My only concern is, I suppose, if the leaders decide to do their projects in their subject areas, if they haven't got Teach First or Teaching Leaders ... in their subject areas, that makes it difficult for them. But at the same time, if they broadened their projects to include all subjects, to, you know, maybe to focus on literacy, which is something we should all be doing, it could tie together' (teacher, Year 2).

Ultimately this concern proved justified because in the case of two of the impact initiatives—Aspire and the Careers Profile—responsibility for delivery was moved away from staff on the leadership programmes to staff whose responsibilities were a better 'fit' with the projects. Collaboration was more successful where the project fitted well with staff members' existing expertise (in the case of the Differentiation for Inclusion) or had a whole-school focus, making it applicable to all staff (in the case of the MOLE).

- The feasibility of Teach First participants contributing

Teach First is a two-year programme and staff reflected that participants are on a steep learning curve developing their teaching practice, particularly in their first year. Some concerns were voiced that a Teach First participant in their first year might struggle to fully engage in an across-school impact initiative, and that it might be more appropriate for them to get involved towards the end of their second year of practice:

'Definitely last year, there was no way I would have been able to be in part of the project and actually we did get approached by Achieve Together and it was one of our senior leaders who said they're not going to be involved this year because they've got too much on' (Teach First participant, Year 2).

This view is supported by the fact that by the end of the pilot, only one Teach First participant (who was in their third year of teaching by the final year of the pilot) remained engaged with the impact initiatives.

In terms of implementation, the following factors were felt to have contributed to limited collaboration across the leadership programmes.

- Clarity of aims, roles and responsibilities

Stakeholders reflected that further clarification on roles and responsibilities within the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model, particularly in terms of responsibility for co-ordinating and overseeing the collaboration across the three programmes, was needed. The role of the Partnership within-school lead (the main contact point for the Partnership project team and the individual responsible for co-ordinating Partnership activity within their school) was seen as critical to the success of the collaborative approach, but further work was needed to clarify this role, particularly in relation to how the impact initiatives were identified and then how staff would be supported and co-ordinated at a school level.

Particularly in the first year of the pilot, schools reported being unclear about what the Partnership was and how it would work and this meant the pilot got off to a slow start:

'I had such confusion about why I had the initial meeting with the people from Achieve Together and the principal, I was confused during that meeting ... I continued to be confused as to what it was ... It just was a bit wishy at the start and therefore time was wasted ... I just think ... [it] just needed to be sharper' (teacher, Year 3).

- Project team change

During the course of the pilot, there was a high level of change in the Partnership project teams. In part, this was a result of staff leaving participating schools and this had caused some disruption and delays to project development:

'There were supposed to be meetings [after the Innovation Day] but as I said, I think it's probably fallen by the wayside ... I think I can remember conversations happening at the Innovation Day, where dates were tentatively arranged, but I literally have not heard a word about it since ... I think that maybe that's because the Senior Leader's moving on' (teacher, Year 2).

- Staff capacity to participate

Across the five schools participating in the programme there was variation in the capacity staff had to engage with the collaborative impact initiatives. This worked most successfully when staff were given adequate time 'off-timetable' to meet on a regular basis. In cases where limited (or no) time was scheduled for staff to take their projects forward, staff reported finding it difficult to find time to meet because of clashing timetables and other commitments. Ultimately, this slowed progress on some of the impact initiatives as meetings were irregular and ad-hoc:

'[My colleague] and I were just sort of grabbing time wherever we could really. I think with hindsight what we should do with any sort of future projects like that, or recommend any future project, is actually making sure there's dedicated time set aside at regular intervals because ... I think it ended up being a lot larger than we first anticipated' (teacher, Year 2).

The limited capacity of staff to deliver impact initiatives alongside their full-time teaching roles raises doubts over whether the model is feasible without time being allocated within the school day for staff to meet, collaborate and deliver the initiatives. The role of the education consultant, who provided support to project teams towards the end of the second year and throughout the final year of the pilot, was valued because the role provided external oversight and a fresh perspective, but also because the role took on a large part of the project management that school staff did not have the capacity for internally. Without this role, schools reflected that the projects would have become side-lined and progress would have been much slower.

- Senior Leadership Team (SLT) engagement

Senior leadership engagement and commitment to the Partnership and its aims was viewed by school staff as critical to the success of the programme. In one school, for example, the Partnership impact initiative was actively supported by the headteacher who released three members of staff from their teaching timetables so they could meet regularly to take the project forward. In addition, the headteacher gave the project a whole-school focus for one half-term to assist the Partnership team to pilot their project and roll-out a CPD programme focusing on problem-solving in maths. In other schools, however, SLT engagement was less evident. In one case, for example, a senior member of staff who was designated as the Partnership lead did not participate in the project beyond attending the Innovation Day. Staff reflected that this limited their scope to progress the project because decisions that could be expedited by a senior member of staff could not be made and the project lacked leadership:

'In the end it's myself and ... the other Teach First who end up doing everything because other people just don't reply to emails or whatever ... And because the SLT obviously, you know, are quite senior it's hard for me to say, "Why aren't you coming to the meetings?"' So I

don't know.. But.. the trouble [with] the sort of team not really being there.. and maybe just [my colleague] and I not really taking it seriously enough, we got to about March [in the second year] and suddenly it was like, 'Oh right, no, we're actually quite far behind with this project'. (teacher, Year 2).

The Partnership impact initiatives that were most successful at achieving a good level of engagement from the SLT were those that focused on an issue that the school already recognised as a priority:

'We've had a big focus on maths in the school and for me it was a way of ... hopefully doing a project that was going to have a positive impact on learning and progress ... and that's the difference—that it came from us. It's not something that's kind of been imposed externally' (headteacher, Year 2).

- **Accountability**

School and project staff reflected that further consideration needed to be given to how project teams were held to account for the progress of their projects as there was a risk that the projects would be side-lined without clearer structures. One suggestion was to embed delivery of Partnership impact initiatives into existing performance management structures so progress would be regularly reviewed and staff held to account:

'It's really something that everyone who's doing performance management needs to know about because schools will not do anything if it doesn't feed into their performance management. So, unless I've got a target that [says] I need to address this in school or I need to do more of this on leadership ... they're not going to let me do it because my pay is all related to whether I meet my performance management targets' (education consultant, Year 2).

In recognition of this issue, more robust project management processes were put in place by the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team in the final year of the pilot. The education consultant met with the project teams on a monthly basis and held termly meetings with the headteacher in each participating school. Pilot funding allocated at the showcase event was also made dependent on sufficient progress being shown each term. These additional measures (and in particular the support of the education consultant) helped to maintain the momentum of the projects in the final year of the pilot:

'It's been very good to have somebody from outside having a completely different perspective and sort of questioning us and making us think a bit more perhaps about things. So much goes on in school anyway ... It would be side-lined ... I don't know that we'd have been able to keep to the deadlines with just the three of us because [the education consultant] did other things for us to help us with it' (teacher, Year 3).

- **Timing of Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership activities**

Collaboration across the leadership programmes was undermined by a misalignment between the timing of Achieve Together activities and the three leadership programmes. For example, the three themes chosen for the focus of area-based change (discussed earlier) were not identified until the second year of the pilot after a period of relationship-building and data analysis in the first year. It was therefore not possible for staff that commenced their leadership programmes in the first year of the pilot to align the projects they were carrying out within their leadership programmes with the area-based goals.

Feasibility of area-based change

Reflecting on the area-based change component of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership, there was a general consensus that some positive developments had taken place, but progress had been slower than anticipated. The evaluation found the following barriers and facilitators to implementation:

Facilitators to area-based change

- Pre-existing regeneration partnership boards

Both Boscombe and West Howe had established regeneration partnership boards with engagement from a range of stakeholders in each community. The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership was therefore able to capitalise on this existing infrastructure rather than build new partnerships from scratch. The fact that the Partnership took the lead on the Education and Attainment strand of the Boscombe Regeneration Partnership has been received positively by community stakeholders because of the additional capacity brought to the area and the role the Partnership played in engaging the schools with the work of the board.

- Mutually beneficial aims

The Partnership project manager observed that partnerships built to affect area-based change were most successful when they were mutually beneficial to both parties:

'There always needs to be an advantageous reason for both stakeholders to work together ... so if we can find a way of working that addresses two, or three, or four stakeholders' existing targets ... that's when people will engage' (Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project manager, Year 1).

The partnership between the primary school and the children's centre to run school readiness workshops and a narrative storytelling programme was an example of this type of partnership because it supported the school to prepare children for the Foundation Stage and helped the children's centre reach its targets for engaging with families in the West Howe area. Similarly, the partnership between the local authority's youth service and the secondary school, to identify young people at risk of becoming NEET, was also mutually beneficial, supporting both the school and the LA to reduce the number of NEET young people leaving the school concerned.

Barriers to area-based change

- Achieve Together Partnership staff changes

Stakeholders identified staff changes within the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team as contributing to delays in the area-based change component of the programme. The project manager changed part way through the first year and this inevitably led to some delays and a sense of disjointedness during the early stages of the pilot:

'I think from an operational point of view, there's been a change in programme manager. So, which has, you know, had an effect on implementation. I think they had to change in October... And engaging with those additional community partners, they haven't been, you know, haven't been able to do as proactively as they would have liked, so in the last few months, I know that they've been intensively trying to do that' (community stakeholder, Year 1).

- Timescales

Community stakeholders and schools felt that progress on the community-based components of the Partnership proved to be slower than originally anticipated. The first year of the pilot effectively became a scoping and set-up year, with relationship-building and data analysis the

focus. Consequently, the priorities for area-based change were not identified until the end of the first year, limiting the period for taking these forward to two years. The project manager and other stakeholders reflected that two years was not sufficient time to affect area-based change, and stakeholders called for a longer timescale of at least five years:

'To be honest with you, I feel like we could probably do with another two years. Three years isn't a long time; it takes a good year to get everything up and running, to know you're focusing on the right thing. It takes a year to implement it and then you're winding down' (community stakeholder, Year 3).

- Translating school-based impact into area-based change

By the end of the pilot, stakeholders reflected that the school-based impact initiatives remained largely school focused, and the links between these initiatives and wider area-based change were not strong. School staff reported little engagement with outside stakeholders in the development and delivery of their projects, although going forward there were some plans to extend the projects to reach a broader audience. In the case of the Maths Outdoor Learning Environment (MOLE), for example, the school hoped to develop a CPD package that could then be marketed and sold to other schools. Similarly, the Differentiation for Inclusion team were also considering the possibility of developing their CPD package for a similar purpose.

- School capacity and sustainability

In reflecting on the success of the area-based change component of the partnership at the end of the pilot, the project manager questioned whether schools have the capacity to take the lead in area-based change:

'When I was asked ... how could it have been done better it would have been ... "well don't involve schools or teachers because they're a bottleneck" ... teachers are really, really, really busy and their job is to teach not to engage with the [community stakeholders]' (Achieve Together Partnership project manager, Year 3).

As a result of this capacity issue, the project manager questioned the sustainability of the area-based change component of the model, reflecting that while the individual impact initiatives developed during the pilot would be sustained, he did not feel that the pilot had left a legacy of wider area-based change that would grow and develop beyond the end of the pilot. Reflecting on the lessons learnt from the pilot, he argued that area-based change needed to be led by other community stakeholders with input and support from schools.

Readiness for trial

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model of area-based change is not ready for trial for the following reasons:

- Recruitment and school engagement
Lower than anticipated levels of school recruitment to the pilot and the challenges of recruiting sufficient schools within a specific area able and willing to meet the eligibility criteria for participation suggest that a trial of this model is not currently feasible.
- Limited evidence to support the feasibility of the model
Limited alignment and collaboration across the leadership programmes raises doubts over the feasibility of this model as a means to improve the attainment of disadvantaged children and affect area-based change.

The findings of this evaluation suggest that schools have limited capacity to take the lead on an ‘area-based change’ approach to improving attainment. Before a trial is considered, this issue would need to be addressed and further consideration given to how schools and community stakeholders could work together within the model.

- **Specificity of core components**
The pilot changed considerably over the course of the three years, with additional features introduced as the Achieve Together project team responded to how the pilot developed on the ground. Specific features, including the Innovation Day and the education consultant role, were introduced in the second year of the pilot and further work is needed to specify the core components of the programme and articulate these clearly before a trial could be carried out. In particular, a trial would need to specify:
 - the proportion of schools within a specific geographic area required to participate to affect area-based change;
 - the minimum number, and mix, of staff participating within each school to achieve across-programme collaboration;
 - expectations of the time staff would be required to commit to aligned impact initiatives and Achieve Together activities; and
 - which elements of the model are essential for success—for example the £50,000 impact initiative fund, the role of the education consultant, and so on—and which are optional.

If a trial is to be considered in the future, careful thought should be given to its length given the findings from this evaluation that impacts sought by schools were often long-term and not evident within the lifetime of the three-year pilot.

Cost

This section provides an estimate of the total cost of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership. It reports on the core project costs (incurred by the project team), the costs associated with participating in the leadership programmes, and the costs associated with delivering the Achieve Together impact initiatives where these were externally funded additionally to the programme impact initiatives. It also provides an assessment of staff time required by participating schools.

Cost of leadership programme participation

For Schools 1 and 2, the cost of participating in Teach First was £10,600 per staff member over the first two years. They received £2,500 for mentoring participants and so this has been deducted from the overall fee of £10,600, resulting in a cost of £8,100 per staff member. With five members of staff participating in the intervention across the two schools, this amounts to a total cost of £40,500. This has been equally distributed across the 3 years of the programme to identify a per year cost of £13,500 on average. In Schools 3 and 4, four members of staff participated in Teach First, resulting in a lower per year cost of £10,800.

Table 6: Cost of leadership programme participation by school/combined schools

Cost of leadership programme participation (average per year across three years)			
	Schools 1 and 2 Cost (£)	Schools 3 and 4 Cost (£)	School 5
Teach First	13,500	10,800	0
TL Fellows	2,386	2,386	0
Future Leaders	0	500	0

Travel/subsistence for staff attending Achieve Together events	0	167	0	
Cost per year	15,886	13,853	0	
Total cost (over 3 years)	47,658	41,559	0	
TOTAL				89,217

Impact initiative costs

In addition to the leadership programme costs, the funders contributed a £50,000 innovation fund which was used by participating schools in the third year of the programme to further develop existing impact initiative ideas or to deliver them at a larger scale. Table 7 provides a breakdown of these costs. These costs have been excluded from the cost per school and per pupil analysis because they would not necessarily be incurred if the pilot were rolled out. They are nonetheless included here for information because the funding contributed to activities that were part of the intervention and could therefore have affected the achievement of pilot outcomes.

Table 7: Impact initiative costs

Impact initiative	Costs (£)
Maths outdoor learning	22,000
Careers profile	3,000
Aspire mentoring	15,000
Differentiation for inclusion	10,000
Total	50,000

Core project costs

Finally, the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership project team incurred a number of costs for set-up and delivery of the pilot. Table 8 provides a breakdown of these, including staff salaries. These are higher than the ongoing costs as they include contributions towards one-off fixed costs establishing the services in the area (such as setting up the Teach First regional office). Where costs fell in particular years of the pilot these have been attributed to specific years of the pilot. Other costs (such as online resources, travel and subsistence, accommodation, and so on) were assumed to be evenly distributed across the three years.

Table 8: Core Achieve Together programme costs

Achieve Together core costs by Year			
Item	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Year 3 (£)
Venue, refreshments, and materials for Achieve Together events	476	476	476
Staff salaries	62,394	82,098	63,215
Travel and subsistence for project team	2,099	2,099	2,099
Print, stationary and post	895	895	895
Consultancy	2,014	2,014	2,014
Training	292	292	292
Communications	181	181	181
Staff accommodation, rent, rates, and service charges	5,801	5,801	5,801
Online resources	1,131	1,131	1,131
Sub-total	75,283	94,987	76,104
Total	246,374		

Total cost and cost per pupil

Table 9 summarises the full costs of the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership (including costs presented in Table 6 and Table 8), and Table 11 provides an assessment of cost per pupil. The cost per pupil is based on 740 pupils across the five participating schools who were directly targeted by the impact initiatives (as broken down in Table 10). The cost per pupil includes the direct costs incurred by schools in participating in the leadership programmes and the core programme costs. As a result, the estimated yearly cost per pupil was low at an average of £151.

Table 9: Cost summary

Pilot year	School	Core costs	Leadership programme cost (£)	Total yearly cost (£)
Year 1	Schools 1 & 2	75,283	15,886	98,722
	Schools 3 & 4		13,853	
	School 5		0	
Year 2	Schools 1 & 2	94,987	15,886	118,426
	Schools 3 & 4		13,853	
	School 5		0	
Year 3	Schools 1 & 2	76,104	15,886	99,543
	Schools 3 & 4		13,853	
	School 5		0	
		246,374	89,217	
			TOTAL	335,591

Time required to participate in Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership

In estimating the amount of time spent on Partnership activities it is helpful to break it down by programme component because of the variability in programme participation across the schools.

Leadership programmes

Table 12 provides a breakdown of the time required to participate in each of the leadership programmes offered through the Partnership and an estimate of the time required to participate in the collaborative impact initiatives.

Table 12: Estimate of time required for leadership programme and impact initiative participation

Programme	Duration	Time within the school day (hours)	Time required outside the school day (hours)
Teach First	2 years	85	291 ¹⁰
Teaching Leaders NPQML	12–18 months	0	27
Teaching Leaders Fellows	2 years	32	140

¹⁰ This includes the time that participants spent at the six-week summer institute.

Future Leaders NPQSL	12–18 months	56	0
Future Leaders	3–4 years	211	171
Impact initiatives	3 years	210	21

Conclusion

This section summarises the key findings of the evaluation and draws out the lessons learnt from the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership pilot.

Key conclusions

1. The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership model is not suitable for trial because of difficulties in engaging sufficient schools with all elements of the model.
2. Aligning projects undertaken by participants of the different leadership programmes was challenging, despite being a key aim of the model. Of the four school-led projects taken forward, none involved participants on all three of the individual programmes.
3. Stakeholders thought a longer timescale was needed to embed area-based change and questions were raised over whether schools have the capacity and are best placed to take the lead on area-based change.
4. Average attainment in participating schools has not changed dramatically since involvement with the pilot. However, given the small-scale and area-based nature of the project, it would have been difficult to identify impact with confidence.
5. The programme changed and developed over the course of the three-year pilot. Initiatives of this type are likely to need to continuously adapt, making it difficult to specify the core components for future evaluations.

Interpretation

The Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership was set up to develop and test the feasibility of improving the educational outcomes of children by delivering leadership development programmes in a co-ordinated way, aligning impact initiatives, and working with community stakeholders to achieve area-based change. The following lessons can be drawn from this process evaluation of the three-year pilot.

- Recruiting schools and engaging them in the programme
Fewer schools participated in the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership than originally planned. The cost of the leadership programmes was identified as a barrier by schools, particularly where staff turnover limited the extent to which schools benefited from the investment. Schools also reflected that their staff CPD needs meant they did not always have suitable candidates to place on the programmes to make the Achieve Together model feasible.
- Aligning impact initiatives across programmes
Aligning impact initiatives across the three leadership programmes was challenging, raising questions about the feasibility of the model. None of the impact initiatives taken forward had project teams incorporating staff involved in all three leadership programmes, and only one project incorporated staff from two of the programmes.

Staff highlighted a mismatch between Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership activity and the timelines of the leadership programmes, participating staff not having the capacity to fully contribute, and limited mechanisms to hold project teams to account as factors contributing to the challenge of aligning impact initiatives. Other factors that created challenges included staff turnover and a mismatch between the impact initiatives selected and the roles and responsibilities of staff participating in the leadership programmes.

- **Area-based change**
Progress on the area-based change components of the programme was slower than anticipated. Progress was made in some areas, such as improving school readiness by increased partnership working between a children's centre and a primary school addressing the problem of NEETs through a scheme to identify students at risk earlier, and in forging links between local regeneration partnerships and schools. However, stakeholders felt a longer timescale was needed to embed area-based change and questions were also raised over whether schools have the capacity to take the lead on area-based change, or are better suited to a more secondary role supporting other stakeholders taking the lead.
- **Descriptive attainment data**
Descriptive data shows that attainment in Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership schools (on average) has not changed dramatically since involvement with the pilot. However, because the small-scale and area-based design of the pilot prohibited the use of a randomised controlled trial or the construction of a well-matched comparison group that would provide the benchmark for attainment in the absence of the pilot, the trends in how attainment has changed over time cannot be directly attributed to the pilot.

At its current stage of development, the model is not ready for trial because of lower than anticipated levels of school recruitment, limited evidence to support the feasibility of collaboration across the leadership programmes, and the need for further development to specify the core components of the programme.

Formative findings

The findings from the evaluation suggest that adapting the Achieve Together Bournemouth partnership in the following ways would facilitate greater collaboration across the leadership programmes and foster area-based change:

- incorporate a planning phase into the model (prior to leadership programme commencement) to allow for data analysis, identification of area-based priorities, and understanding the landscape of local providers prior to programme start;
- consider how area-based goals and impact initiatives align with existing school priorities to maximise the engagement of senior leaders within participating schools;
- provide opportunities at the outset for school-based Achieve Together teams to meet and clarify aims and expectations of impact alignment (prior to programmes commencing);
- incorporate regular timetabled project team meetings into participating staff timetables and secure senior leadership commitment to invest this time;
- incorporate Achieve Together project aims into participating staff members' performance management to increase accountability;
- continue to provide a structure to support impact alignment, including the support of an educational consultant to provide external oversight and challenge; and
- consider lengthening the timescale from three to five years to allow sufficient time for area-based change.

Future research and publications

A separate evaluation of the Achieve Together model of collaboration and alignment across leadership programmes to improve attainment outcomes (excluding the area-based goals of the Bournemouth

partnership) was evaluated in a separate efficacy trial with fourteen schools across England. This evaluation is available from the EEF website.¹¹

¹¹ <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/our-work/projects/achieve-together/>

References

Allen, R. and Allnutt, J. (2017) 'The impact of Teach First on pupil attainment at age 16', *British Educational Research Journal* (forthcoming).

Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., Brown, E. *et al.* (2009) 'The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes', London, DCSF. Retrieved from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11329/1/DCSF-RR108.pdf>

DfE (2015) 'GCSE and equivalent attainment by pupil characteristics, 2013 to 2014' (revised), SFR 06/2014, issued 29 January 2015.

Future Leaders (2015) 'Future Leaders Trust 2015 Impact Report', available from http://www.future-leaders.org.uk/documents/160/ImpactReport2015_TzHlcwB.pdf

Mujis, D., Chapman, C., Collins, A. and Armstrong, P. (2010) 'Maximum Impact Evaluation – The impact of Teach First teachers in schools, an evaluation funded by the Maximum Impact Programme for Teach First Final Report', University of Manchester, Manchester.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., McNaughton-Nicholls, C. and Ormston, R. (2013) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, London: Sage.


Appendix 1 Descriptive information on pupil attainment

This appendix provides further detail on the descriptive information on pupil attainment summarised in the report.

Descriptive information on the academic performance of schools involved with the Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership provides some indication of the early impact of the pilot on pupil attainment. As discussed in the main body of the report, this analysis must be interpreted as descriptive only, rather than causal, given that the small number of schools involved prohibits the construction of a credible comparison group of schools. The following figures show the average attainment at the end of primary school (KS2) and end of secondary school (KS4) for schools involved with the Partnership a number of years before and after it began (in September 2013). Note that the sample sizes are three schools at the primary level (as the one infant school does not have KS2 data) and six secondary schools.

The average attainment of schools in Bournemouth *not* involved with the pilot (22 primary schools and 8 secondary schools) is presented for comparison, along with attainment in three similar local authorities: Torbay, Medway, and Wirral. These three local authorities were chosen in advance to match with features of Bournemouth local authority because of their school system (selective) and geographic location (coastal). Poole was excluded because it has a middle school system, while Lincolnshire was too large. Of these three local authorities, Torbay most closely resembles Bournemouth in demographic characteristics, with a large proportion of retired households, and is similar in pupil composition with few ethnic minority students and a similar distribution of pupils eligible for free school meals across schools. These characteristics are presented in Appendix 2. All three local authorities are shown in the following figures to give balance to the descriptive information, however.


Appendix Figure 1: Average KS2 average points score for Achieve Together Partnership schools and comparison areas



Source: KS2 performance profiles.

Figure 1 shows the average points score at KS2 for Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership ('Achieve Together') schools in Bournemouth in a black solid line, and non-Partnership schools in Bournemouth in a dashed black line. Schools involved in the Partnership have lower higher attainment at KS2, on average, than primary schools not involved in the Partnership, both before the start of the pilot, and afterwards. There is some suggestion that attainment was diverging between these two groups of schools in the 2014/2015 academic year, but this is not possible to conclude with the small number of schools involved and because there may be differences in school characteristics of the two groups which influence attainment aside from participation in the pilot. Relative to other similar local authorities, Partnership schools have a similar trend in average attainment across the period. This suggests that Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership schools have not increased attainment according to this measure relative to schools in similar areas since involvement with the pilot.


Appendix Figure 2: Average percentage of pupils achieving 5A*-C GCSEs (including English and maths) for Achieve Together Partnership schools and comparison areas



Source: KS4 performance profiles.

Figure 2 shows the average percentage of pupils achieving at least five GCSEs at grades A*-C (including English and maths) which is a commonly used standard of attainment in England's school system. In comparison to other schools in Bournemouth and schools in all other comparison areas, Partnership schools have a lower level of attainment prior to the academic year starting in September 2012, but higher thereafter. This may suggest that the Partnership (which began in September 2013) sustained the high-performance of Partnership schools relative to other groups of schools. However, as discussed above, there may be other factors that influence the trends in attainment aside from participation in the pilot. In addition, this variation could purely be driven by the small number of schools involved. For example, two of the six Partnership schools experience a large increase in the proportion of pupils achieving this standard of attainment between the academic year 2010/2011 and 2015/2016 with one of these schools seeing the largest increase in 2012/2013. One Partnership school experienced a decrease in attainment over the period, while the three remaining schools have relatively steady (but typically improving) attainment.

Appendix Figure 3: Average percentage of pupils achieving English Baccalaureate for Achieve Together Partnership schools and comparison areas



Source: KS4 performance profiles.

Figure 3 shows an alternative measure of attainment at KS4—the average percentage of pupils achieving the English Baccalaureate (or EBACC), an increasingly common standard of attainment in England’s school system. In comparison to other schools in Bournemouth, Partnership schools have a consistently lower level of attainment throughout the period. The difference between the two groups of schools has remained roughly constant over time, although slightly narrowed in later years. Partnership schools in Bournemouth have relatively low attainment according to this measure relative to average attainment across similar local authorities, although again this narrows slightly, or remains roughly constant, over time. This suggests that Partnership schools have not increased attainment according to this measure relative to schools in similar areas since involvement with the pilot.

In summary, the descriptive data on school performance at the end of primary and secondary school suggests that attainment in Partnership schools has not consistently increased since involvement with the pilot from September 2013, or has increased relative to schools in similar local authorities. Attainment at the end of secondary school, measured by the percentage of students achieving at least five A*–C GCSEs (including English and maths), is higher than in other areas after involvement with the Partnership, but this is driven by large increases in two schools that predate the start of the pilot, and achievement in EBACC is not similarly affected. These trends in attainment are descriptive rather than causal, as a causal effect requires that all differences between groups of schools are eliminated to isolate the impact of the pilot.

Appendix 2 Demographic and school level characteristics for Bournemouth and comparison areas

Appendix Table 1: Demographic information for Bournemouth and selected coastal local authorities

ONS group classification	Bournemouth (%)	Medway (%)	Torbay (%)	Wirral (%)
Ageing City Dwellers	1.7	0.1	4.5	2.4
Ageing Rural Dwellers	0	0.2	2.1	0.1
Ageing Urban Living	24.9	4	24.7	11.3
Asian Traits	0.2	2.3	0	0
Aspirational Techies	0	0.2	0	0
Aspiring and Affluent	0.5	0.1	0	0
Challenged Asian Terraces	0	1.1	0	0
Challenged Diversity	3.7	5	7.7	7
Challenged Terraced Workers	0.2	4.4	3.2	8.6
Comfortable Cosmopolitans	24.9	0.6	1.3	0.3
Constrained Flat Dwellers	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.6
Ethnic Dynamics	0.5	0.8	0	0
Ethnic Family Life	0.2	0.7	0	0
Farming Communities	0	0.1	0.9	0.2
Hard-Pressed Ageing Workers	3.7	3.8	8.7	5
Industrious Communities	0.8	6.7	3.6	4.6
Inner-City Students	2.9	0.2	0	0
Migration and Churn	1.3	9.7	1.3	6.7
Rented Family Living	2.7	13.8	0	0.2
Rural Tenants	0.5	1	4	0.2
Semi-Detached Suburbia	2.2	18.3	10.6	23.2
Students Around Campus	4.4	0.2	0	0
Suburban Achievers	17.7	3.9	9.4	13
Urban Professionals and Families	5.7	21.4	15.7	11.4
White Communities	1.2	1	1.7	5.2
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: ONS Output Area Code Clusters and Names (based on 2011 Census). Available from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/geography/products/area-classifications/ns-area-classifications/ns-2011-area-classifications/datasets/index.html>

Appendix Table 2: School measures for Bournemouth and selected coastal local authorities

School measure	Bournemouth	Medway	Torbay	Wirral
% FSM (average)	17.7	19.7	23.5	25.9
% FSM (25 th percentile)	8.6	10.0	13.0	9.9
% FSM (50 th percentile)	15.9	15.8	19.9	19.6
% FSM (75 th percentile)	23.9	25.3	31.5	40.9
% FSM ever (average)	25.1	26.4	29.8	34.7
% FSM ever (25 th percentile)	13.6	15.2	19.1	14.3
% FSM ever (50 th percentile)	24.7	23.9	26.7	28.1
% FSM ever (75 th percentile)	34.6	35.4	39.2	55.7
KS2 average point score (average)	27.8	27.3	27.8	28.0
KS4 5 A*-C GCSEs (average)	58.8	57.8	50.7	56.4
KS4 5 A*-C GCSEs (25 th percentile)	47.0	41.0	0.0	41.0
KS4 5 A*-C GCSEs (50 th percentile)	61.0	57.0	52.0	59.0
KS4 5 A*-C GCSEs (75 th percentile)	67.5	94.0	99.0	89.0

Source: KS2 and KS4 performance profiles for academic year 2012/2013. Note that only the average for KS2 average point score is presented (rather than with the 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles) to preserve the anonymity of schools.

Appendix 3: Impact initiatives

This appendix provides further detail on the four Achieve Together Bournemouth Partnership impact initiatives.

Differentiation for Inclusion

This project aimed to close the attainment gap between EAL and non-EAL students by developing an immersion CPD programme for teachers, providing welcome packs for students in different languages, providing in-class support via specialist TAs, and addressing a research gap on the barriers to learning EAL students encounter by funding a Masters course of study for the Teach First member of the project team.

By the end of the second year, the project team had developed a training package designed to provide teachers with strategies to support EAL students. Using an 'immersive' approach designed to improve empathy and understanding, the training session was initially taught in a foreign language without any teaching aids or support, and then aids were introduced to illustrate how EAL students could be supported. The project received £10,000 of funding to take it forward in the third of year of the pilot. The project was led by a staff member on the Future Leaders programme.

By the end of the pilot a total of 80 staff across the two co-located schools had received the training and EAL champions had been identified in each faculty to disseminate the learning. Alongside the development of the CPD package, the Teach First participant's Masters course was used as an opportunity to carry out primary research into the barriers to inclusion faced by EAL students at the school. The expectation was that findings from this research (which were being formulated at the end of the third year of the pilot) would be incorporated into the CPD package that had been under development to further refine and improve its effectiveness.

Ultimately, the project hoped to improve the attainment of EAL students who had been identified as underperforming by improving teaching strategies. The project team reflected that teacher confidence in teaching EAL students had improved as a result of the training provided, but that further investment in training and refinement of the CPD package would be needed beyond the lifetime of the pilot to embed the strategies and find robust ways of tracking impacts:

'That's been a challenge this year, definitely ... we've looked at ways that we can develop [measuring impact] and improve that for next year, sort of like with teacher logs and student logs and things. So we've developed those, and that will be part of the CPD package ... so we will be able to track those individual students who've received lessons from the teachers who ... received the training' (teacher, Year 3).

The feasibility of sustaining progress made during the pilot was viewed as strong by the project team because the project was led by a senior member of staff (participating in the Future Leaders programme) who would ensure that the area of work remained a high priority within the Academy Trust and retained the engagement of the senior leadership team.

Careers profile

This project aimed to reduce the risk that students would become Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET) when they left school by creating a careers 'profile' for every student in Year 10 with the aim of improving the fit between career aspirations and careers advice or work experience offered by the school. The project received £3,000 of funding for the final year of the pilot.

Initially developed by two Teach First participants with support from the education consultant, by the final year of the pilot delivery of the project had been transferred to a pastoral member of staff with

responsibility for careers development. Consequently, no staff participating in the leadership programmes had further involvement, raising questions over the feasibility of the Partnership model of impact initiative alignment across programmes. In one case, the Teach First participant left the school, and in the other, they took on other responsibilities that were more aligned with their subject specialism.

In the final year of the pilot, the profile was developed to capture a range of information on students including their predicted grades, their career interests, and their family networks. Drawing on the expertise of another member of staff, the profile was digitised to make it more accessible, up to date, and to facilitate data analysis. Because of the time required to develop and digitise the profile, Year 10 students did not complete it until April of the final year of the pilot, but the plan going forward will be to complete the profile at the end of Year 9 so that it can be used to ensure work placements are tailored to the career interests of the students.

Although at an early stage of development, the member of staff responsible for placing students in work placements had already found the profile valuable:

'I mean like I say we only got students on it from April, so I had to use it really from April onwards, but particularly graphs and looking at who was matched, it was just really interesting for me... So to actually be able to prove not only have I put them in work experience but I put three quarters of them in relevant work experience is a really important thing ... So on the short amount of time I've been able to use it, I anticipate that its usefulness is only going to get better and bigger next year' (teacher, Year 3).

In terms of achieving its ultimate aim of reducing the number of young people who become NEET, the project lead reflected that it would not be possible to assess the impact on this for a further two years at which time data on students identified as NEET after leaving the school at the end of Year 11 would become available.

Aspire mentoring

This project aimed to improve the attainment of disadvantaged students by partnering with an established mentoring charity to train a number of mentors in the Bournemouth community to work with disadvantaged girls in Year 9. The project received £15,000 of funding to pay the mentoring charity to set-up and support the delivery of the pilot to 50 pupils in Year 9 in the final year of the pilot.

Largely as a result of staff leaving the school, responsibility for implementation of the project in the final year of the pilot was passed to a staff member with overall responsibility for mentoring across the school. Consequently, no staff participating in the leadership programmes had further involvement with the project.

Working with an established mentoring charity, staff from a large local employer were trained to provide mentoring support for girls in Year 9 identified as at risk of under-achievement. The first term was spent identifying the cohort of students, gaining parental consent for participation, and training the mentors. To make the logistics of delivering the mentoring feasible in terms of physical space and administration, the decision was made to limit the first cohort of mentees to 25, with a further 25 to be supported in the year after the end of the pilot.

As a result of the set-up required at the start of the year, the first mentoring sessions (which were held once a month after school) did not commence until the second term, limiting the number of sessions to six for the first cohort of 25 girls. The original intention had been to have ten sessions across the year. The sessions covered a range of topics including confidence building, public speaking, communication and revision skills, career mentoring, CVs, and interview skills. Staff reported good engagement from the students with only three or four not attending regularly. They also received

positive feedback on increased confidence and greater awareness of careers and future opportunities:

'It's been really positive. They've all said they really enjoyed it and saying that it's actually opened their eyes to what they could do, and that they don't need to be limited. It's helped them build their confidence, so they're not as afraid to put their hand up in lessons, so, yeah, they've really enjoyed it. They've all said they would recommend it to other students' (teacher, Year 3).

To track impacts of the mentoring, the project team planned to seek feedback from form tutors. They had also developed a set of self-report 'character cards' which aimed to capture change in key areas including resilience, resourcefulness, risk-taking, relationships, confidence, and communication.

The fundamental challenge for this project was sustainability beyond the lifetime of the pilot because the support of the mentoring charity was funded via the pilot and the school had no funds to continue the relationship in the future. However, the school hoped to maintain a positive relationship with the local employer who provided the mentors and explore ways they could continue to work together in the future.

Maths outdoor learning environment (MOLE)

This project aimed to improve the teaching of maths problem-solving—and therefore pupil attainment in maths—by creating a maths outdoor learning environment (MOLE) and developing a CPD package for teachers to improve the quality of their teaching. The project received £22,000 of funding for implementation in the final year of the pilot.

Joining the Partnership in the second year of the pilot (after eligibility was relaxed to allow schools not participating in the leadership programmes to participate), this project was developed by the only primary school that participated in the impact initiatives. Building on a goal of their school development plan to improve maths problem-solving, the project was led by the three Key Stage leads (Foundation, KS1, and KS2) and had strong support from the headteacher.

In the second year of the pilot, a series of CPD sessions were held with all school staff to develop problem-solving strategies and the three Key Stage leads were given 0.5 days off timetable over a number of weeks to take the project forward. In the final year, the first term was used to consult with staff and pupils, develop a brief for the design of the MOLE, and appoint a contractor. The MOLE was finally completed in June 2016 and the first trial lessons were held as the pilot ended. The original intention was to develop the CPD package to support the use of the MOLE in the final year of the pilot. However, this was delayed to allow for experimentation and use of the MOLE to inform the ongoing problem-solving CPD sessions and ultimately the CPD package that would be developed as a result. The expectation is that the CPD package will be developed over the autumn and spring terms of the 2016/2017 academic year.

With the ultimate aim of improving attainment in maths, staff reflected that it was too early to judge whether the MOLE has achieved this aim because it was only completed at the end of the pilot period and only a few trial lessons had been held in it. However, the focus on maths problem-solving across the school, and the series of CPD sessions held with all staff, were felt to have raised the profile of maths problem-solving across the school, improved staff confidence in teaching problem-solving, and developed the way the school approached CPD. The staff who initiated the project remained involved throughout and anticipated taking forward the development of the CPD package beyond the lifetime of the pilot.

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v2.0.

To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2 or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned. The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

This document is available for download at www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk



Education
Endowment
Foundation

The Education Endowment Foundation
9th Floor, Millbank Tower
21–24 Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP
www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk