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Chapter 1 Executive summary

This report is based on an enquiry, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), into the nature of partnerships between higher education institutions (HEIs) and specific schools/groups of schools in Bristol Local Authority.

The two key universities involved in the project are the University of the West of England, Bristol (UWE) (which led the project) and the University of Bristol. The project focuses on what UWE has labelled as ‘enhanced partnerships’ (EPs) with schools. Such partnerships are strategic, sustained, institutional-wide, focused on school improvement and often with a legal basis. The EPs included in the report (as case studies) are either academy or trust schools where the university involved is a formal sponsor. The project has explored the nature of enhanced partnerships; the impact of the partnerships for schools and HEIs across several domains of activity; and the lessons learnt from engagement in such partnerships. Overall, it provides evidence of the positive impact of these enhanced partnerships across a number of dimensions including pupils’ outcomes and aspirations.

The national and local context in which EPs have developed is outlined. Bristol has unique features in terms of the history of underachievement of state school pupils and the extent to which the local authority embraced diversification of the school landscape through supporting the development of trusts and academy schools with external partners, including the two local universities. UWE, in particular, has developed EPs with a range of schools over a number of years and this is explored in terms of vision, mission and strategy; infrastructure; and approach. This includes a set of criteria used to evaluate potential EPs and to review their success.

The report offers eight case studies covering a range of EPs including: a longitudinal case of the first academy in England to have an HEI partner; an all-through trust school; one of the first national challenge trust schools in the country; a federation of academies, including a highly successful school working with previously less-successful schools in very challenging circumstances; a co-operative trust school, working in collaboration with primary schools; and an academy supported by a university and local business leaders in a very deprived area of south Bristol. In each example, positive benefits of the partnership with an HEI are explored. Although the cases are produced by ‘insiders’ who are working directly with the schools and could be seen as ‘advocates’, the impact claims are validated through data collected by an independent researcher who interviewed school leaders and chairs of governors as well as through data in the public domain such as that related to exam results and contextual value added by schools.

Impact of the EPs is analysed across domains including: leadership and governance; student engagement and direct support for students; curriculum development; staff continuing professional development; initial teacher education; research and knowledge exchange; community engagement.

Our data show that enhanced partnership is indeed as distinct from other forms of partnership between schools and HEIs and is seen to be characterised, amongst other things, by:

- proactive and visible engagement in governance;
the generation and/or development of new governance arrangements and capacity;
critical friendship with leadership teams;
a pervading sense of equality amongst partners;
the expectation that the association with a university is a stabilising force.

The cases indicate that in the context of enhanced partnerships, universities should seek to work in more strategic ways with EPs. This would include:

- developing a robust set of criteria to use to evaluate development of particular partnerships and to review those partnerships in operation;
- articulating for stakeholders the potential benefits to schools partners and to the HEIs of enhanced partnerships;
- explicit leadership of such partnerships at a senior level in the higher education institution;
- an appropriate infrastructure for supporting partnerships as institution-wide and involving a range of faculties and professional services;
- explicit allocation of resources to support the work.

Contrary to the spirit and letter of much earlier policy promoting partnerships in education, we have found that the structures and practices of enhanced partnerships contain no trace of an assumed superiority of private business. It is more common to find explicit declarations of the equality of the partners and their mutual dependence.

In light of this, we recommend that further enhanced partnerships be initiated and developed through open and transparent dialogue with the schools themselves and with other stakeholders.

The study indicates the importance of university missions and values – not only in terms of partnership per se, but also in terms of having particular values and a sense of responsibility. It should be a ‘social project’ that seeks social change in specified areas.

We recommend universities consider developing and seeking approval for institution-wide vision/mission statements and strategies for such partnerships, linked to key institutional aims, from which institution-wide action can be planned. We also suggest that such statements, related to enhanced partnerships, should make the values that underpin them explicit.

The study provides evidence of how the alignment of different forms of capital, through enhanced partnerships, can support institutional missions. It also makes the case for the importance of doing so, especially in times of economic challenge.

The study has revealed that enhanced partnerships have involved a great deal of time and energy for all parties, and especially certain key individuals who have promoted certain developments and inspired others. Whilst undoubtedly productive, this volume, breadth and level of reliance on key individuals represents a considerable resource. The importance of individuals to these accounts, as opposed to them as role holders, is the reason we have used names (with permission) rather than, or as well as, role titles in the accounts.

The risk to enhanced partnerships in the current economic and policy context is acknowledged. Such ways of working are also dependent on government policy continuing to value and validate the potential role of universities in supporting school improvement agendas.
Chapter 2  Introduction

2.1  Introduction

This report is based on an enquiry, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), into the nature of partnerships between higher education institutions (HEIs) and specific schools/groups of schools in Bristol Local Authority.

The two key universities involved in the project are the University of the West of England (UWE), Bristol (which led the project) and the University of Bristol. The project focuses on what UWE has labelled as ‘enhanced partnerships’ (EPs) with schools. Such partnerships are discussed in Chapter 3, as strategic, sustained, institutional-wide, focused on school improvement and often with a legal basis. The EPs included in the report (as case studies) are either academy or trust schools where the university involved is a formal sponsor or trust member. Bath Spa University was invited to join the project as it has links with Bristol schools (although not EPs) and during the project developed academy partnerships in other areas (informed by work from the project).

The project has explored the nature of enhanced partnerships (one of which has been established as a formal partnership for many years (Case Study 1), others of which were established more recently); the impact of the partnerships for schools and HEIs across a number of domains of activity; and the lessons learnt from engagement in such partnerships. It was one of eleven funded by HEFCE (http://www.hefce.ac.uk/widen/strategy/links.htm), at a time when HEI engagement with schools was being promoted as part of government policy (see Chapter 3).

2.2  Aims

Using Bristol as a site of developmental enquiry (focusing on schools serving low participation neighbourhoods and/or with low levels of educational attainment) this project aimed to:

- develop and define models of ‘enhanced partnerships’, in their widest sense, between universities and schools;
- engage with other local universities currently working with Bristol schools;
- identify the current range and volume of university/school enhanced partnerships and engagements with Bristol schools;
- establish and/or extend through working with 14-19 area partnerships in Bristol the means to create sustainable and systemic enhanced university partnerships with schools, including engagement with and through FE colleges;
- investigate and develop means to systematically evaluate the impact of enhanced partnerships on outcomes for children, young people and adults in Bristol, including progression to HE by under-represented groups;
- identify factors that help or hinder universities in establishing enhanced partnerships with schools and make recommendations for the future of such activities.
2.3 Process and methodology

A steering group was established at the start of the project to support these aims. It comprised:

**Project Directors from UWE:** Prof Ron Ritchie, Assistant Vice-Chancellor  
Prof David James, Professor of Education  
Prof Lynn Raphael Reed, Head of Department and Professor Education and Social Change.

**Project Co-ordinator:** Guy Keith-Miller, Schools and Colleges Partnerships Service, UWE

**Other UWE**  
Chris Croudace, Director of Widening Participation  
Alison Fletcher, Joint Head of Secondary Education

**University of Bristol**  
Prof Rosamund Sutherland, Graduate School of Education  
Ian Blenkharn, Acting Head WP

**Bath Spa University**  
Prof Stephen Ward, Dean of Education

**Further Education**  
Judy Stradling, Vice-Principal, City of Bristol College

**Bristol Local Authority**  
Jackie Turner, Service Manager 11-19

**School Representatives (from each 14-19 area partnership)**  
Tony Houcke, Gifted and Talented Co-ordinator, Bedminster Down School  
Marius Frank, Headteacher, Bedminster Down School  
Armando Di-Finizio, Principal, Bristol Brunel Academy  
Clare Bradford, Headteacher, Henbury School

An ethical protocol was agreed at the first steering group and shared with participants as appropriate. The case studies were shared with respondents. The importance of individuals to these accounts, as opposed to them as role holders, is the reason we have used names (with permission) rather than, or as well as, role titles in the accounts.

This report brings together data and analysis from three key sources:

**Case studies.** The report (Chapter 4) contains eight case studies. Each is the result of pulling together documentary, observational and interview data. They have drawn, as appropriate, on Ofsted reports, school performance data from the local authority and elsewhere, school documentation and press material. Case studies have been written by HE colleagues, most often in close collaboration with key school leaders. In most cases the HE author had an existing role in the particular EP, made explicit in the accounts. In this sense, the authors could be seen as advocates of the
partnership and hence the decision for ‘independent interviews’ discussed below. Joint authorship of the case studies has been noted where this occurred. In all cases, the accounts have been shared with key individuals (heads/principals, members of the steering group) to check for accuracy and for views on the interpretations we have made. As noted, permission was obtained for individuals and institutions to be named. Case studies were structured around a common template, agreed by the steering group.

**Independent interviews.** The report (including the case studies) also draws directly upon ten interviews (six with school heads/principals, four with chairs of governors of case study schools), commissioned by UWE (with additional funding), but carried out by an independent researcher, Julie Farmer. The interviews used a checklist generated by project team members, which was also approved by the steering group. The main rationale for these interviews was twofold – firstly, to increase the weight of a direct ‘schools voice’ in the report and, secondly, to triangulate with data and analysis already assembled by case-study authors. It is worth noting that there was a high degree of similarity across the responses of the interviewed heads and chairs of governors. We are also confident that the open nature of most of the questions, and hence the ‘unsolicited’ nature of many of the responses, increases the validity of the findings over what might be gained from more traditional data instruments (in which respondents indicate their level of agreement with a provided list of suggestions).

The steering group (see above) met three times, on 12 November, 2009; 24 February, 2010; and 21 July, 2010. Members also exchanged information between meetings via email. The steering group approved the structure of this report and all members have had an opportunity to comment on a draft prior to the completion of this final version.

### 2.4 Other chapters

**Chapter 3** sets out the context in which the project was located. It does this through consideration of the national policy context that existed when enhanced partnerships were established by UWE (and the similar one established by the University of Bristol in the context of the Merchants' Academy [Case Study 8], although they do not use the term ‘enhanced partnership’) and outlines changes over the last few years as EPs have developed locally. The local context is then explored, reflecting on the changes in the local school landscape, the reasons for these changes and the part played by the universities in these developments. This includes a mapping of HE engagements with Bristol schools (see Appendix 6). Given that the majority of EPs reported (seven of the eight) relate to UWE, the specific UWE context is mapped in more detail than that for the University of Bristol, explaining the significance of school partnerships to UWE’s mission and strategy and outlining the approach the university has taken and the infrastructure developed to support such approaches.

**Chapter 4** includes the eight case studies produced for the project. These cover individual schools and two networks. The cases are:
- The City Academy, Bristol – UWE’s longest standing enhanced partnership;
- Trust in Learning school: The Bridge Learning Campus – UWE’s first Bristol-based trust school and Bristol’s first all-through campus;
- Trust in Learning school: Orchard School Bristol – UWE’s national challenge trust school partnership;
- Cabot Learning Federation – a federation co-sponsored by UWE and Rolls Royce that oversees a group of academies;
- Cabot Learning Federation school: Bristol Brunel Academy – the first CLF school with which UWE established an enhanced partnership;
- Cabot Learning Federation school: Bristol Metropolitan Academy – a recent addition to the CLF and a more recent EP for UWE;
- Ashton Park School – the secondary school in the South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust – UWE’s most recent EP;
- Merchants Academy – University of Bristol sponsored academy.

**Chapter 5** offers an analysis of key themes and issues arising from the cases in Chapter 4 together with the independent interview data and other sources.

Conclusions and recommendations are outlined in **Chapter 6**.
Chapter 3  Context

3.1  Introduction

This project focuses on what UWE has labelled as ‘enhanced partnerships’ (EPs) with schools. Such partnerships are:

- strategic;
- sustained;
- institutional-wide;
- focused on school improvement;
- often with a legal basis.

This definition has been tested and validated with others through the project and the nature of such partnerships is illustrated in the case studies and further discussed later in this report. They operate within a range of different forms of school-HEI partnership. Enhanced partnerships normally prioritise a particular HEI partner with a school, but most EP schools have other forms of partnership with other local HEIs as illustrated in the mapping in Appendix 6.

This section of the report sets out the context in which the project was located. It does this through consideration of the national policy context that existed when enhanced partnerships were established by UWE (and the similar one established by the University of Bristol in the context of the Merchants’ Academy (Case Study 8), although the University of Bristol does not use the term ‘enhanced partnership’) and outlines changes during the period of the last few years as EPs have developed locally. The local context is then explored, reflecting on the changes in the local school landscape, the reasons for these changes and the part played by the universities in these developments.

Given that the majority of EPs reported relate to UWE, the UWE context is mapped in more detail than that of the University of Bristol, explaining the significance of school partnerships to UWE’s mission and strategy, and outlining the approach the university has taken and the infrastructure developed to support such approaches.

3.2  National context

The enhanced partnerships that have been established in Bristol by UWE have mainly focused on academy and trust school developments and these are the focus of this report.

Academies were a new model of schooling introduced by the then Labour government in 2000 through the Learning and Skills Act (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/21/contents). Academies were introduced, in the context of a move to the ‘marketisation’ of public services, in part, to give schools independence from local authorities, to increase their autonomy and to promote competition between schools, with the intended purpose of raising pupils’ achievements, especially in ‘disadvantaged’ localities. They were state-funded but ‘independent’. Key to the idea of academies was the notion of sponsors, and universities, as well as businesses and individuals, were seen as potential sponsors. Sponsors had significant influence over the new academies and their governance.
UWE was the first university to sponsor an academy when it became the sponsor of the City Academy, Bristol (CAB) which opened in 2003 (see Case Study 1 below).

The then Labour government promoted the role of universities as sponsors of academies throughout the first decade of the new century (for example, DCSF/DIUS, 2007)) and were supported in this by other agencies such as HEFCE. HEFCE promoted ‘a shift from a widening participation focus to broader and deeper relationships between HEIs and their communities’. An example was in the 2008 Grant letter, in which John Denham, then Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills, stated he was ‘convinced that there is much more that universities can do to help shape the vision, strategies and ethos underpinning educational excellence in our schools and colleges’. (http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/hefce/2008/grant/letter.htm). Other agencies that promoted the involvement of HEIs in the academies include the Specialist Schools & Academies Trust (www.ssatrust.org.uk/Academies/Pages/becominganacademy.aspx); the National Council for Educational Excellence (DCSF/DIUS, 2008); and Universities UK (UUK 2009a & b).

Over the last seven years, a number of universities have sponsored academies including two local partners of UWE, also involved in this project: University of Bristol (see Case Study 8); and Bath Spa University, which became a sponsor of Sarum Academy in Salisbury in 2010.

The academies policy was controversial and led to a number of campaigns against academies (see Hatcher, 2006). Others have analysed the impact of external sponsors on the entrepreneurialism of schools (Woods et al, 2007). The Sutton Trust funded an evaluation of school-HE links in 2008 (Tough et al, 2008) with a focus on widening participation and made a number of recommendations which support the findings of this project including the benefits of long-term programmes; the need for better co-ordination between universities; and the need for activity to be co-ordinated.

In 2007, the then Labour government further diversified the school landscape by introducing ‘trust schools’. This was achieved through The Education and Inspections Act 2006 (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/40/contents), which included the provision for a school to change from being a community school to becoming a foundation school, and to acquire a charitable foundation (or trust) to support the school. This type of school was labelled a trust school. Trust schools can be single schools or groups of schools (a shared trust) working with one overarching trust. Ed Balls, the then Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families, speaking on 14 December 2007 about the announcement that three hundred schools had or were working towards trust status, said, ‘I want every secondary school to be a specialist school, a trust school or an academy, and every one of them should have a university or a business partner.’ Unlike academies, such schools remained part of the local authority family of schools, but had more autonomy than community schools through the establishment of trusts, involving external partners, which had responsibility for governance (either as a majority or minority trust). UWE became a partner of two ‘pathfinder’ trusts in 2007/08, one of these was Bristol based (see Case Study 2). A number of universities were also involved in these early pathfinder trust schools.

Different models evolved related to trust schools; a particularly innovative one was initiated by the Co-operative College which supported and promoted co-operative college-led trusts (CCTs) with broader forms of partnership (Wilson and Mills, 2008). The South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust in which UWE is a partner (Case
Study 7) is an example of such a trust and also of one which included primary schools alongside a secondary school.

Trust schools also proved controversial, especially when initially proposed. In 2009, a parliamentary select committee considered the increasing diversity of school provision, looking at academies and trust schools, and highlighted key issues related to their introduction. One of the authors of this report, Prof Ron Ritchie, provided oral evidence to this committee (House of Commons, 2009, p87).

During the period under discussion, considerable emphasis in policy terms was also placed on increasing access and widening participation to universities. HEFCE played a key role in this policy development with an increasing emphasis on the importance of developing systematic activity between HE and schools sustained over time. A significant set of studies commissioned by HEFCE into the underlying causes of low participation by young people in higher education in certain areas (Raphael Reed et al, 2007b) identified the significance of school experience in determining later pathways. One of these studies looked in great depth at the underlying causes of low participation in Bristol South parliamentary constituency (Raphael Reed et al, 2007a) which is the location of two case studies in this report (Case Study 2 and Case Study 8). It concluded that there was a need to develop not just programmatic interventions, but also ‘respectful and relational practices as the basis for improving educational engagement’. To underpin this, the report argued for the alignment of resources and priorities between schools and universities to support school improvement.

The Sutton Trust funded further research on behalf of the National Council for Educational Excellence (Sutton Trust, 2008) with a particular focus on widening participation amongst disadvantaged young people and schools in poor communities with further recommendations for universities, including encouragement to work with groups of schools (as UWE is doing through Trust in Learning and the Cabot Learning Federation described in the case studies). In 2009 a white paper was published on social mobility which, in Chapter 5 ‘Pathways for All’ refers to the role of universities in linking with schools to enhance the professionalism of teachers and further widen participation to higher education (New Opportunities White Paper - http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.hmg.gov.uk/newopportunities.aspx)

A key policy document in 2009 from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) Higher Ambitions; the Future of Universities in a Knowledge Economy further reinforced the importance of ‘universities at the heart of their communities’ under the last Labour government (http://www.bis.gov.uk/policies/higher-education/shape-and-structure/higher-ambitions).

In February 2010, just prior to the last general election, the then Labour government introduced the notion of ‘accredited sponsors’ and consulted on these. This led to a model for the accreditation of school providers and schools groups, and academy sponsor selection. The Cabot Learning Federation (of which UWE is a sponsor, see Case Study 4) was amongst the first round of providers to be accredited through this scheme.

Recent coalition government policy has broadened the opportunities for schools to become academies – with the offer for any ‘outstanding’ school to be eligible to fast-track to academy status and for any state school to apply for academy status. (http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/academies). This significantly shifts the policy away from one targeting ‘disadvantaged’ areas.
Additionally, the coalition government is proposing ‘free schools’ as an academy variant. Details of this model have yet to be finalised, but it potentially allows new schools to be established by interest groups such as parents or teachers.

Given UWE’s early and now long-standing involvement in academies and trust schools, its engagements have been regularly cited in national publications (as illustrated in the bibliography and resource library, Appendix 8). The university has had opportunities to engage with and influence policymakers at the highest level. For example, the former vice-chancellor, Sir Howard Newby was in regular contact with ministers and chaired a government-initiated group monitoring progress in Bristol schools. UWE staff have had regular dialogue with the relevant government departments and agencies such as SSAT, UUK and HEFCE related to HEI-school partnerships.

As noted above, many other universities have now become actively involved in academy and trust developments.

Appendix 8, a resource library, lists national and local materials that have informed this report and the work which it describes.

### 3.3 Local context

It is significant that UWE recruits approximately 50% of its undergraduates from the local region. Consequently, the success of local schools in supporting young people to aspire to and gain entry to higher education is important to the university, perhaps more so than to universities that recruit more nationally.

Bristol is a city of contrasts, in which there are particularly stark illustrations of social inequality. For example, data related to the percentage of young people progressing to higher education shows that in prosperous wards such as Clifton, Cabot and Stoke Bishop, 99% of young people go on to HE. In the south of the city in wards such as Knowle, it is less than 5% currently going on to HE. Such comparisons have become newsworthy, with a local paper describing the situation as a ‘scandal’ (Bristol Evening Post, 30 May 2009).

Historically, Bristol schools have ‘underachieved’ in national terms and found themselves near the bottom of national league tables, although things are now improving and Bristol is nearer the national average for GCSE results.

The city council has faced government intervention in the past, including the establishment of a partnership board in 2001 (see Appendix 2). A number of Bristol secondary schools have been below the national floor target of 30% GCSEs (including maths and English) and been designated ‘national challenge’ schools (ten in 2007; eight in 2008; five in 2009; and two in 2010). A number of Bristol primary schools, but no secondary schools, are currently in an Ofsted category. Political and officer leadership in the City has been subject to instability over the last ten years (see Appendix 1).

It is in this context, that Bristol City Council has ‘embraced’ the diversification of the school landscape offered through government policies related to academies and trust schools. The council has also benefited from the Private Funding Initiative (PFI) which led to the rebuilding or refurbishment of most of its secondary schools in the first phase of the ‘Building Schools for the Future’ initiative (http://www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/about/aboutbsf.jsp).
This period of diversification and refurbishment has seen a significant improvement in GCSE results in Bristol: there as a 26% improvement between 2007 and 2010 (5+ GCSEs A*-C) and a 15.6% improvement for this indicator including English and maths.

The local authority (LA) averages over the last few years for GCSE results have been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5+ GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</th>
<th>5+ GCSE A*-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol LA</td>
<td>National average</td>
<td>Bristol LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47.1 (Provisional)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data indicates that the improvement in schools with which UWE has enhanced partnerships exceeds the average improvement of the LA shown above (see Appendix 2).

### 3.3.1 Bristol schools and diversifying school landscape

Bristol City Council was one of the first local authorities to support the opening of an academy (see Case Study 1) and has gone on to support more academies than nearly any other city of comparable size. There are now seven, including two independent schools, which became academies in 2009. The local authority also supported the development of trust schools, joining Trust in Learning at the pathfinder stage (see Case Study 2) and the South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust (see Case Study 7) as a founding member. The involvement of local authority officers has been key to strategic and operational aspects of several of the enhanced partnerships, especially in the context of Trust in Learning (Case Studies 2 & 3).

Bristol reflects the broad range of state schools currently supported by government policy. As part of a mapping exercise for this project (see Appendix 6) the variety of types of schools in Bristol were identified and the nature of HE engagement with those schools audited, showing the multiplicity of partnerships with HEIs that exist.

Within Bristol City Council’s area, there are examples of secondary schools which are:

- community (six);
- religious foundation (three);
- academies (seven – including City Academy, Bristol (Case Study 1); Bristol Brunel and Bristol Metropolitan (part of the Cabot Learning Federation – Case Studies 5 and 6); Merchants’ Academy (Case Study 8);
- trust (two – Bridge Learning Campus (Case Study 2) and Orchard School Bristol (Case Study 3) – both majority trusts);
- co-operative trust (Ashton Park – Case Study 7).
One of the trust schools (Bridge Learning Campus) is also Bristol’s first all-through school (see Case Study 2).

3.3.2 Forms of school partnership in Bristol

Bristol also offers examples of many forms of partnership between schools and between schools and external partners as also illustrated in Appendix 6.

School-to-school partnerships can be characterised in a variety of ways, including:
- informal network (City Academy (Case Study 1) and Bristol Brunel Academy (Case Study 5));
- formal network;
- soft federation (Bridge Learning Campus and Orchard School, Case Studies 2 & 3);
- hard federation (Cabot Learning Federation, Case Studies 4, 5 & 6);
- 14-19 area partnerships.

Forms of HEI-school partnership evident in Bristol include:
- schools – HEI – further education – local authority (Trust in Learning schools, Case Studies 2 & 3);
- schools – HEI – other partners (City Academy (UWE and John Laycock – Case Study 1); Merchants’ Academy (University of Bristol and Merchant Venturers – Case Study 8); Bristol Brunel; Bristol Metropolitan (UWE and Rolls Royce as part of the Cabot Learning Federation – Case Studies 4, 5 & 6);
- co-operative trust model (South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust – Ashton Park, primary schools – UWE and various other partners – Case Study 7).

Other significant partners in Bristol academies include the Oasis Community Learning Trust (Oasis Academy John Williams and Oasis Academy Brightstowe) and the Merchant Venturers (Merchants’ Academy (with the University of Bristol); Colston’s Girls’ School and Bristol Cathedral Choir School).

3.4 UWE context

As noted above, UWE has a vested interest in the success of local schools which underpins its commitment to partnerships with Bristol schools. In this section, these partnerships will be contextualised in terms of the wider university vision and strategy.

3.4.1 Vision, mission and strategy

UWE brands itself as a ‘partnership university’ with a strap line of ‘better together’ (see Appendix 3). Consequently, school and college partnerships have been a key feature of the overall university vision and mission for many years (under the last three vice-chancellors) and continue to be prioritised as such.

UWE is also an institution that prioritises widening participation (WP) and makes an explicit commitment to values of social justice. WP has been a key strategic priority for many years and there is evidence of its success in this area (including UWE being awarded Xcel’s ‘Widening Participation Institution of the Year’ award in 2010 – see,
Knowledge exchange is further key strand of UWE’s vision and mission. Partnership work with schools provides a good example of how UWE seeks to engage in KE with partners, co-constructing local solutions to local challenges through working collaboratively and by drawing on or engaging in appropriate applied research.

3.4.2 History of partnerships

UWE’s partnership working with Bristol schools has a long history as noted above. The university has been actively engaging with Bristol schools in a variety of ways over many years through outreach initiatives; through initial teacher education (ITE) and continuing professional development programmes and projects; and other projects and initiatives, including research projects. In some cases the partnerships were formally established through partnership agreements (in the case of ITE work) or other explicit commitments (for example, training schools (Training Development Agency (TDA) funded) or specialist schools (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT)-funded)).

3.4.3 Development of enhanced partnerships

The development of academy and trust ‘enhanced partnerships’ built on earlier work and such partnerships exist in the context of other less formalised partnerships with many schools in the region. In all, UWE regards itself as in partnership with over four hundred schools.

The following table indicates the timescale in which UWE’s EPs have developed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nature of UWE role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Academy, Bristol</td>
<td>2003 opening</td>
<td>Academy sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Brunel Academy</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Educational partner of academy (sponsored then by John Cabot Academy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Brunel Academy</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sponsor, as part of the Cabot Learning Federation (with Rolls Royce) in Sept 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Learning Campus</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sponsor of Trust in LearningTrust in Learning (comprising UWE, City of Bristol College and Bristol LA) acquired by the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Metropolitan Academy</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>As sponsor of CLF of which BMA became part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard School Bristol</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sponsor of Trust in Learning acquired by school as a national challenge trust school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School Year Nature of UWE role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nature of UWE role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Park School</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Member of South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust acquired by Ashton Park and several primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fosseway Special School</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sponsor of Trust in Learning acquired by school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally UWE is a member of the Worle/Westhaven Trust acquired by Worle School and Westhaven Special School in North Somerset in 2008 and a sponsor of the proposed Hans Price Academy (replacing Wyvern School in North Somerset in 2011) as part of the Cabot Learning Federation.

#### 3.4.4 University infrastructure related to partnerships

Since 2007, UWE has had an assistant vice-chancellor responsible for schools and college partnerships (part-time until 2010 and now full-time [with a wider brief than just schools and college partnerships]). The school of education has been critical to the development of an enhanced partnership model, in part through its initial teacher education (ITE), continuing professional development (CPD) and research and knowledge exchange (R&KE) activity, and through the role of individuals, especially, Prof Lynn Raphael Reed. Further support for EPs has come from the then university’s outreach centre; through the admissions service (and its dedicated school partnership team); and through other key contacts in other faculties and services. A bespoke database (Reach) was established to record interventions with schools (particularly related to outreach work) that was maintained through the partnership team in the admissions service. A dedicated part of the university website was developed as an area for schools (and was an early pilot of audience-facing website development for the university). Guides for both staff and students working with schools have been developed and disseminated through the schools & colleges partnership service.

The university continues to place great importance on structures and arrangements to support partnerships. As of September 2010, a new schools and colleges partnership service was created which brings together the outreach team and the admissions partnership team to form a new service with a newly appointed director of service who reports to the assistant vice-chancellor. As part of restructuring of the university’s governance, a new participation, community and public engagement executive has been established that reports to the vice-chancellor’s executive, further prioritising the partnership work within the university.

#### 3.4.5 Development of UWE’s vision and strategy for partnerships

Prior to 2007, co-ordination of university-wide partnership work with schools was limited, with different forms of partnership being developed in different parts of the university, for example through the then faculty of education; the outreach centre; the admissions service partnership team; through other faculties and through some services (see Case Study 1 as evidence of this). In recognition of this diversity, a

1 The SoE which previously had two departments was restructured in July 2010 into a single department led by Prof Raphael Reed.
cross-university schools and colleges partnership group was formed in 2007, chaired by the then dean of education, Professor Ron Ritchie, who was appointed as a part-time assistant vice-chancellor with responsibility for schools and college partnerships at that time. This group comprised representatives of all faculties and relevant services. It set out to audit the nature of UWE’s work with schools and colleges and to promote a more strategic approach and ensure an appropriate infrastructure was established. The group produced a detailed report which went to key university committees. This led to a vision statement and strategy for schools and college partnership work (see Appendix 4), proposals for a new infrastructure and a set of criteria for evaluating new and existing partnerships (see Appendix 5) which were agreed by academic board (2008). These documents were subsequently ‘tested’ through dissemination and workshops at national conferences (UCET, 11/08; SSAT 11/09; 06/10 and HELOA, 01/10) and discussion with the advisory group of the project being reported and endorsed – with one partner, Bath Spa University, using them to create its own bespoke strategy, now approved by its governing body.

The vision articulates the values that UWE brings to its partnership working. It states: ‘As a leading new university, our vision is to be renowned as an institution that works in partnership to make a positive contribution to the development of schools and colleges and their students and staff in Bristol and beyond with a special focus on those institutions serving communities for whom widening participation in education is crucial for social mobility and/or transformation. We will do this through listening to, learning from and working with, partners to generate and share knowledge, expertise and resources related to teaching, learning, curriculum enrichment, learner support, leadership, governance and organisation, with a view to together building educational excellence. We will seek to establish respectful, sustainable, holistic, collaborative and long lasting partnerships with schools and colleges, community groups and other organisations in the region to enhance aspirations and promote opportunities for tertiary education. We will continue to enhance and deliver a distinctive programme of activities which support and enrich learning environments to encourage students to raise achievement and attainment. The aims will be to enhance progression, create a smooth transition to, and better understanding of, being a student at Bristol UWE and in higher education.’

3.5 University of Bristol context

3.5.1 University of Bristol’s vision and strategy for partnerships

The University of Bristol was a founding member of the Russell Group Association for Widening Participation Association and has produced three major strategies in relation to widening participation from 1999 to 2009. The university’s widening participation strategy has explicit links to a range of other institutional documents, notably the university vision and strategy 2009-2016. As part of the university’s commitment to education and the student experience it is stated that a key priority is to:

‘Attract and retain academically gifted and highly motivated students from a wide range of backgrounds, creating a diverse… community.’

It goes onto assert that:

‘We will recruit our students solely on the basis of their ability and potential to succeed within the learning environment that we offer. To this end, we will
ensure that our admissions processes are open, fair and transparent. We will encourage applicants from non-traditional backgrounds and a variety of progression routes.'

The university has worked closely with colleagues in this group to share good practice and research over the last ten years. A major feature of this new strategy will be to build on these existing relationships while also exploring new partners in the business community.

The University of Bristol’s access agreement is founded on a two-fold commitment to:
- sustained enhancement of its key product – the educational experience of its students;
- widening participation in higher education in general and at Bristol in particular.

3.5.2 Regional and national partners

The University of Bristol has been an active partner with other higher education institutions in the south west of England for many years. Part of this collaboration was co-ordinated through the Aimhigher programme, which was established in 2004 and was responsible for delivering regional summer schools, aspiration and attainment raising events and mentors and tutors for local school and college students. In addition the university played a significant role within the Western Vocational Life Long Learning Network (WVLLN), The Higher Education Regional Development Agency (HERDA) and the Higher Education Liaison Officers Association (HELOA).

It had an outstanding outreach programme with the following objectives:

Objectives:
- work within the university and with education partners (including social workers, careers advisers and Aimhigher) to improve the targeting of outreach activities in schools and colleges;
- develop engagement opportunities for other key stakeholders including parents/carers, teachers and HE advisers;
- develop a more expansive outreach programme for learners of all ages including progression opportunities at level two and level three;
- continue the university’s commitment to a collaborative approach to outreach with partners such as Aimhigher, Sutton Trust, Open College Network and the Western Vocational Life Long Learning Network while developing new partners within the business community;
- acknowledge the important contribution of our academics to the university’s outreach programme by ensuring this work is appropriately rewarded and recognised, for example through inclusion in promotion.

Responsibility for both the widening participation strategy and for the admissions principles and procedures rests with the widening participation and admissions strategy group, which is chaired by the pro vice-chancellor (education) and reports to the university’s education committee.

Bristol was established as a university for the city of Bristol and the west of England, yet the number of local students who apply today is relatively low. Whilst the residence of an applicant will not be taken into account when making admissions decisions, the university will continue to work hard to increase the number of
appropriately qualified local students applying from the Bristol (BS) postcode area, as part of its engagement with the community from which it originated and its wish to encourage students who, for family, economic or cultural reasons, intend to live at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional contribution to partnership work&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>WP cohorts</th>
<th>Number of additional events/students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aimhigher events</strong> (campus visits, subject enrichment days &amp; programmes, primary school work etc)</td>
<td>Years 5-12</td>
<td>14 schools and colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bristol Mentoring and Tutoring</strong></td>
<td>Years 10-12 &amp; First year undergraduates</td>
<td>15 tutors 80 mentors 70 mentees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New widening participation events specific to the University of Bristol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>WP cohorts</th>
<th>Number of additional events/students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools and colleges outreach. This will include work with primary and secondary schools as well as FE colleges and community settings. It will also cover events for teachers and careers advisers</td>
<td>Years 4-12</td>
<td>50 schools and colleges 70 participants on teachers’ and careers advisers’ events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature students</td>
<td>Access students of all ages</td>
<td>15 further education colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Bristol scheme</td>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>120 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential events, including summer and Easter schools</td>
<td>Years 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>300 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional open day, timed to meet the needs of non-traditional students</td>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>5,000 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific academic faculty/departmental interventions</td>
<td>A range of interventions to be funded on the basis of competitive bids around specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced publications to highlight financial support packages available to students</td>
<td>Years 12-13 and adult learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional outreach to schools/colleges outside the local Aimhigher area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal adviser scheme (conversion project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and transitional support for applicants with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup> The university was a committed partner in the Aimhigher West Area of the South West region. The figures included in the above table relate to the additional investment that the university intends to make to expand its contribution to this activity. We have assumed that the current level of activity will continue to be funded up to and beyond the end of the current Aimhigher contract and will need to review our strategy if this proves not to be the case.
This table concentrates on the university’s plans in relation to outreach work. However, it should be noted that the University of Bristol’s widening participation strategy also contains plans for the development of a broader range of activities, including researching more flexible progression routes into the university; continued improvement of fair admissions procedures; developing further skills support; and other support mechanisms for existing and new students. In addition, it articulates the university’s plans to draw together and further develop academic research expertise in relation to widening participation, ensuring that the results feed into future widening participation practice.

3.6 Forms of engagement between HEIs and schools

Building on policy and guidance documents and on local experiences, the case studies in this report are organised around the following areas of engagement between HEIs and schools (with indicative examples of practices):

3.6.1 Governance

- existence of formal legal engagement with school (trust or academy);
- involvement of HEI-identified governor as an HEI rep;
- involvement of HEI-based governor in another capacity;
- support for governors, e.g. identification of trust-appointed parent governors and on-going support for them.

3.6.2 Leadership

- direct engagement between HEI staff and school leadership teams in context of school improvement or HEI-school partnership matters, including strategic planning of the partnership;
- provision of leadership development opportunities for the school.

3.6.3 Direct support for students

- HEI involvement in mentoring; student volunteers;
  - staff volunteers;
- information, advice and guidance;
  - HEI staff;
  - HEI students, e.g. careers guidance;
- widening participation activities;
  - HEI based;
  - school based;
- gifted and talented initiatives;
  - HEI based;
  - school based.

3.6.4 Student progression and transition to HE

- compact schemes (such as UWE’s heading higher passport scheme).

3.6.5 Curriculum development

- direct involvement of HEI staff in curriculum development activities;
  - 14-19 diplomas;
  - Support for curriculum innovation and evaluation.
3.6.6 Initial teacher education

- normal ITE placements;
- student associate scheme;
- innovative initiatives;
- direct involvement of school staff in ITE, e.g. interviewing; programme committees, input at HEI.

3.6.7 Continuing Professional Development

- for qualified teaching (QTS) staff;
  - Postgraduate Professional Development;
  - Masters in Teaching and Learning;
  - other accredited programmes;
  - non-accredited programmes;
- other school staff;
  - learning supporter s/HLTA programmes.

3.6.8 Research and knowledge exchange

- use of school as site for research;
  - involving school staff and/or pupils;
  - not involving school staff and/or pupils;
- knowledge exchange/consultancy;
  - funded work;
  - pro-bono work.

3.6.9 Other

- support from other HEI services;
  - finance;
  - human resources;
  - estates;
  - marketing;
  - student services;
  - library and information technology services;
- HEI as venue for school-led initiatives, e.g. 6th form evenings;
- fundraising;
- involvement in prize giving and other formal events.

This framework was used to construct the case studies in Chapter 4 which focus on the forms of engagement involving the key HEI partners for the school. Appendix 6 shows the degree of involvement of other local HEIs in particular schools. This mapping does not include contributions HEIs are making to community engagement (see Case Studies 1, 2, 3, and 8 for example).
Chapter 4  Enhanced partnerships case studies

This chapter comprises case studies that illustrate the nature of enhanced partnerships (EPs) with Bristol secondary schools.

The cases included are:

4.1 The City Academy, Bristol – UWE’s longest standing enhanced partnership;

4.2 Trust in Learning school: The Bridge Learning Campus – UWE’s first Bristol-based trust school and Bristol’s first all-through campus;

4.3 Trust in Learning school: Orchard School Bristol – UWE’s national challenge trust school partnership;

4.4 Cabot Learning Federation (CLF) – a federation co-sponsored by UWE and Rolls Royce that oversees a group of academies;

4.5 Cabot Learning Federation school: Bristol Brunel Academy – the first CLF school with which UWE established an enhanced partnership;

4.6 Cabot Learning Federation school: Bristol Metropolitan Academy – a recent addition to the CLF and a more recent enhanced partnership for UWE;

4.7 Ashton Park School – the secondary school in the South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust – UWE’s most recent enhanced partnership.

4.8 Merchants’ Academy – University of Bristol sponsored academy.

The relationship between the cases and university and other educational partners is shown below.

As discussed earlier, the cases are of different scale and scope according to the nature of the enhanced partnership and the length of time it has existed.

Data related to pupil achievement in the case study schools is appended (Appendix 7).
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4.1 Case Study 1

School: City Academy, Bristol  
Status: Academy  
Partners: UWE and John Laycock  
Author: Ron Ritchie

4.1.1 Introduction

City Academy, Bristol is UWE longest-standing enhanced partnership and began when the academy opened in 2003. UWE was the first university to sponsor an academy.

The new academy, (which now has over twelve hundred students) has proved very successful since it opened. This is evidenced by: headline data re GCSE results, 83% now get five good GCSEs (from 33% in 2004) and 33% get five good GCSEs including maths and English (from 18% in 2006); attendance (improved from 86% in 2002 to 91.9% currently); progression to higher education (now one in three from one in ten in 2003); and expansion of adult learning opportunities (fifteen hundred adult learners associated with the school in 2009/10). Ofsted inspections in 2005 and 2009 confirm the successes of the academy (with eight outstanding grades in 2009, including leadership) despite the composition of its student body (with 65% coming from most deprived groups (IMD data 2007). It currently has a CVA score of 1,036 (the top state school in the Greater Bristol region – value added performance has been in the top 5% of schools nationally for each of the last four years).

4.1.2 Background to the partnership

The enhanced partnership with the City Academy actually goes back to 2000, when discussions began about the then St George School becoming Bristol’s first academy. The academies programme was first launched in May 2000 in a speech given by David Blunkett, the then Secretary of State. He had visited St George School in 1999.

When the academy was opened in September 2003, the sponsors were UWE and John Laycock (the then Chairman of Bristol City Football Club). This meant UWE was the first university in the country to become an academy sponsor. This case study will explore the university’s engagement with the academy over the seven years it has been open.

In many respects, as noted above, the school has proved very successful since it became an academy. Appendix 7 provides additional quantitative data related to the progress the school has made over that period.

The enhanced partnership (EP) with the CAB pre-dates the production of the current university’s current vision and strategy for EPs and before the criteria referred to in our report (Appendix 5) were generated. Consequently, the development has been more ad hoc, certainly in the earlier stages, and only in the last four years or so has it been developed as a more strategic partnership with several parts of the university.
4.1.3 The origins of the partnership

Initially, the driver for the partnership came from the engagement of key UWE colleagues: Bill Marshall, head of finance (HoF) and soon after, the then vice-chancellor, Alfred Morris, and the then deputy vice-chancellor (DVC), David Halton. Bill Marshall and David Halton were key agents in the development and Bill Marshall remains deputy chair of governors.

The partnership came about as the result of involvement of Bill Marshall, who had been a pupil at St George School, in an Aimhigher initiative for sixth formers about universities. The event itself was not well attended (with less than a dozen pupils). However, when the then head, Ray Priest, heard that Bill Marshall was in finance he started a discussion with him about financing a new school building and, in particular, improved sports facilities. During the discussion Ray introduced the information he had about the sponsorship of academies and the fact that the school was seeking support to the value of £2m. Ray and Bill subsequently met regularly and ‘plotted’ a scheme that involved matched funding from UWE and the then Department for Education and Skills (DFES) for refurbishment or a new school. This escalated to discussion with school governors about academies. Originally the funding requirement was £2m, but any sum was to be matched ten times in expenditure by the department. Bill Marshall remembers announcing the academy when the contribution was just £500k and all that would have allowed was a refurbishment. The local MP got involved because, as Bill noted, ‘we knew refurbishment wouldn’t work’. Bill arranged for the then UWE vice-chancellor, Alfred Morris, to visit the school who soon agreed to UWE support. He approached David Halton (then DVC), who was an ex-teacher, who took an interest and got directly involved. UWE primarily offered in-kind support and a small part of the funding (£75,000 from non-public funds) – provided it was matched by others. A second sponsor was identified, who subsequently withdrew, before John Laycock, then chairman of Bristol City Football Club, became involved. The final scheme was therefore multi sponsor, but primarily funded by an individual benefactor.

CAB was the fifth academy supported by the then DFES and the first to involve a university sponsor.

In order to close the funding gap to £2m, UWE took on the role of project management with Bill Marshall as project director for the building. UWE donated the on-costs of the management fee to make the £2m. By this time, the school also had support from The Wallscourt Foundation.

UWE was key to setting up the first board of directors and Bill Marshall worked with lawyers to draft the memorandum and articles. To begin with there were no financial regulations available nationally, so CAB’s were based on those at UWE and also a similar governors structure with: governors (a form of academic board), finance and general purposes committees and estates committee (with the latter running the building project).

The university provided the first chair of governors, David Halton, the then DVC, and John Laycock was deputy. Alfred Morris, the then VC, was made the first honorary president (a role taken on by subsequent VCs).

As the leadership requirements changed (after the academy was formed and the capital project was up and running), John Laycock took over as chair with the two
university governors chairing the academic (DVC) and business meetings (HoF). What resulted was a combination of business skills with public sector governance.

The new governors appointed Ray Priest (the existing head of the school closing to form the academy) as the principal in January 2003 and he was seconded from his existing headship to lead the academy through its implementation phase of development.

4.1.4 Nature of the partnership

The university’s engagement with the CAB has covered a wide range of activities across all domains in the mapping we have provided in Section 3.6 of the report. Indeed, it went further, with extensive support, especially in the early stages of its development, from areas of the university such as finance, estates, marketing and human resources.

4.1.5 Governance

As noted above, the university initially provided the chair of the governors and identified a very senior colleague (a DVC) to take on the role. The head of finance was also appointed as a governor and is currently vice-chair.

A senior faculty of education colleague, Prof Gaynor Attwood, joined the academy governing body as a trustee-appointed governor, when David Halton (DVC) left the university in 2004. At that time, it was decided by the chair and vice-chair, that a governor from the then faculty of education would be desirable. She has played a significant role since that time. Structures were simplified (driven by John Laycock) and two committees were formed, both chaired by UWE colleagues – Prof Gaynor Attwood led learning and teaching; and Bill Marshall chaired the finance committee.

In recent interview data, the principal Ray Priest considered Gaynor did a particularly good job at bringing a disparate group of staff, parents and community governors together on the committee. She was also, in his view, key to post-16 developments and the growth in numbers (from one hundred to over three hundred). Gaynor encouraged better engagement with post-16 data and ensured the school’s focus was not exclusively on GCSE results. This was relevant to ensuring improved progression to HE. As well as attending the full governors meetings and chairing the committee, she has been involved in a variety of ways with the school, including numerous exclusion panels (fixed term and permanent) for pupils and staff. Ray regards her as having an ‘astute awareness of issues’ – ‘seemingly quite detached, but humane and compassionate’.

Ray sees Bill Marshall’s judgment on financial matters as ‘completely sound’ and he is ‘absolutely honest’ – he did not let financial constraints inhibit desired developments – the recently opened vocational centre is, in Ray’s view, a good example. Ray considers Bill has encouraged CAB to challenge the then government’s department for education (and its predecessor departments) regarding what is possible, and often set precedents for others. Bill provided ongoing, frequent and direct support for the CAB’s finance officer. He also linked in other financial expertise as needed, for example regarding VAT issues.

4.1.6 Leadership

A very significant decision, taken by the first governors of CAB, was for Ray Priest to become principal. In other academies, it was usual to appoint a new principal who
had not led the replaced school. CAB governors showed confidence in Ray by giving
him the role.

Ray says he was significantly supported from the beginning of the CAB project,
especially by David Halton, the UWE DVC, who was the first chair of governors of the
academy. This support came through David acting as a personal mentor for Ray and
providing, through his ‘direct style’ (in Ray’s view) both support and challenge. David
was less involved in the wider aspects of the school, but key to the approach to
leadership that Ray subsequently developed. Ray described David as a risk taker.
He considers David’s contribution was significant to the governance structure and
linking senior leadership roles to that structure. The identification of the composition
of the governing body was a joint decision between David and the key financial
sponsor, John Laycock. David ensured the governing body included appropriate
‘educational’ governors – four in the first instance. The VC, then Alfred Morris, was,
as noted above, made the president of the school – to ensure the university’s
sponsorship was always explicit.

There has been regular contact between various parts of the university and the CAB,
through Ray Priest, throughout the life of the academy. Senior school of education
colleagues have met with him and senior CA staff regularly to review progress on
initiatives and explore new innovations. Initially, Ray and other senior colleagues
linked closely with the then dean, Professor Joan Whitehead and Professor Lynn
Raphael Reed from the school of education. This included planning the nine-day
induction to the new academy for staff (five days) and students (four
days). A similar
programme, focused on attitude change and ‘what makes an effective learner’ was
provided for staff and students. Ray regarded the induction as very significant.

The university did not provide any formal support for leadership development, which,
in hindsight, Ray thinks was a gap in the support the school could have gained from
the partnership.

Ray saw UWE colleagues’ contributions to the school’s developing approaches to
quality assurance as very positive.

Other parts of the university were directly involved in delivery in the early stages
because of the school’s lack of capacity at that time – human resources,
procurement and marketing were key examples.

In December 2006, in recognition of Ray Priest’s significant contribution to education,
he was awarded an honorary doctorate by the university that was presented at an
event at the school at which students also received recognition and a teacher had
her recently achieved MA acknowledged.

Ray supported the university in a variety of ways. In 2009, for example, he joined a
team in St Vincent and the Grenadines, working on a leadership programme for
aspiring school leaders. In June 2010, Ray was invited to give the Bolland Lecture at
the university, which is its most prestigious annual lecture. At this event, it was also
announced that he had been appointed as a visiting professor at the university. His
input, supported by three Somali students, who shared their experiences of the
CA, was very well received.

Ray Priest has had links with other local universities including Bath Spa and the
University of Bristol.
Ray regards UWE’s work with CAB as groundbreaking and noted how often it was referred to within the developing academies programme and influenced developments, through, for example:

- engagement with the Academies Division and the Independent Academies Association;
- the inspection process that related to academies;
- political engagement, including direct links with the prime minister’s office;
- development of the academies programme across the city;
- influencing the change agenda in Bristol around raising 14 – 16 year-olds’ attainment, consideration of how the school dealt with admissions, exclusions and SEN.

### 4.1.7 Student engagement

In Ray Priest’s view, a key role of UWE was ‘opening young people’s eyes’ (to opportunities for higher education). UWE students have been regularly involved in mentoring young people at CAB, formally and informally in groups and with individuals. He believes this and other outreach activities discussed below have had a significant impact on CAB young people’s aspirations.

There is an annual student voice survey at CAB (conducted since 2003) which, amongst other areas, has sought information about young people’s aspirations. Since 2003, data show those who aspired to HE has risen from about 55% to 89% last year. Another outcome of these surveys is that CAB students are less ‘worried’ now than was previously the case about being perceived as ‘a keener’ (in Ray’s words) – 73% (compared to an early figure of 30%) now say they are unconcerned about what others think about them working hard at school and put their learning first. Having UWE students constantly in the school was seen, by him, as important in influencing CAB students’ attitudes.

There have been many UWE-initiated engagements with young people at the CAB over the last few years, but, apart from the student voice data, referred to above. There has been limited formal evaluation of the overall impact of these engagements indicating positive impact. The increase in the number of applicants to HE from CAB over that period (from one in ten in 2003 to one in three in 2009) is, however, evidence of the probable impact of such outreach work on young peoples’ aspirations and motivation. Anecdotal evidence from teachers and, significantly, from the principal, reinforces the perceived benefit to CAB of UWE outreach activities. There has been a significant focus on work with black and minority ethnic (BME) students, including, recently, successful work-shadowing initiatives and dissemination conferences at UWE. CAB students have been regular participants in UWE’s summer schools. Post-16 induction sessions for CAB students have taken place at UWE for a number of years.

Revision classes have been arranged through UWE, including, for example an ICT-focused initiative through the business school. There have been sessions for Y11 students at UWE.

Ray Priest noted that there have been some difficulties with CAB students’ behaviour at UWE, but he noted, in interview, that UWE has never let this influence the university’s commitment to supporting CAB students.
Ray Priest also noted the accessibility of VCs (he has worked with three from UWE) and their preparedness to work to support individual CAB students when he has sought their support.

Other UWE-led outreach activities have included subject-specific talks and attendance at various summer schools, targeted at different age groups. Due to space limitations at CAB, the university has, for a number of years, provided accommodation, facilities and speakers for the registration and induction of the new intake of its 6th form.

Work with parents and school staff, as well as students, in the journey towards preparing for higher education is critical, in Ray Priest’s view. Each year UWE provides a speaker for the annual higher education parents evening to answer questions and concerns in this area. Smaller workshops are delivered throughout the year on a number of subjects including: why go to university, how to apply, writing personal statements, finance and budgeting etc. All activities relating to preparation for HE can be credited and used to complete UWE’s heading higher passport scheme.

4.1.8 Curriculum development

UWE provided consultancy support for CAB’s Project 7/Creative Connections (curriculum development initiatives), especially through Prof Lynn Raphael Reed. Ray Priest acknowledges the university’s contribution (again led by Lynn Raphael Reed) to student researcher developments at CAB. This has involved support for student-led research and the sharing of that through annual conferences, involving students from other local schools as well (including Bristol Brunel Academy, Bristol Metropolitan Academy and John Cabot Academy).

As noted above, Prof Gaynor Attwood (CAB governor and senior member of the school of education at UWE) was particularly significant to 14-19 curriculum development and was a key member of the area partnership board which supported local collaboration.

4.1.9 Research and knowledge exchange

UWE colleagues were commissioned in 2008, to carry out an evaluation of the curriculum initiative, Project 7.

A joint CA/UWE ‘Research4Learning Partnership’ was established in 2008 by Dr Bruce Butt from CAB and Prof Lynn Raphael Reed from UWE, which in the opinion of Ray Priest and other CAB senior staff, has been successful. The success of this initiative links with the professional development work discussed below and the new masters in teaching and learning (MTL) developments. For several years now, CAB colleagues have been involved in personal action research projects for which they receive support, including time allocations, from the school (see below).

The international dimension of research activity is ongoing. Ray referred to the link with Dr Russ Quaglia, from the University of Maine, related to the eight conditions needed for raising student aspirations and attainment. He cited UWE’s contribution to supporting some of these conditions, for example, related to student leadership opportunities.

3 See Bristol Brunel Academy, Case Study 5.
CAB and UWE (through the business school) set out to develop a CAB-based foundation degree, which Ray Priest regarded as ‘a great initiative but [one that] stumbled due to problems with staffing at our (CAB) end’. He was complimentary about the input from UWE into this initiative, despite its failure to develop. He recognised, however, that CAB learnt a lot about partnerships from the process.

CAB was an important host for three successive groups of Latvian educational leaders when they visited Bristol as part of a leadership development programme led by UWE and funded by the British Council and the Latvian Government during 2008 and 2009.

UWE was instrumental to the opening of a CAB vocational/enterprise ‘centre’ in 2009. The original centre was for 12 units and related vocational education, but it ended up as an employment service those starting up in business. Post-16 students on a business-based course do an internship of six weeks in a local company.

4.1.10 Staff professional development

Since the partnership between UWE and CA began, teachers and other staff have had opportunities to engage in HE-provided professional development that led to HE credit. For a number of years, UWE and Bristol Local Authority (LA) worked collaboratively on a bespoke master of arts (MA) for Bristol teachers that focused on raising achievement in city schools (RAICS). A number of CA teachers registered for and were successful in gaining this MA (see below).

The following draws on an account provided by Dr Carolyn Bromfield, MA programme leader at UWE:

‘In September 2007 a new phase of CPD began at CAB based around several harmonizing research strands. Together these combined to establish a research culture at the academy which complements its existing commitment to fostering lifelong learning through its core values. Correspondingly UWE’s own undertakeing to define its role through the notion of knowledge exchange within the community allowed the partnership to develop in such a way that academic research and the practicalities of teaching and learning did not just coexist, but became mutually constitutive. The intention was to form a demonstrable praxis where research and theory, teaching and learning were coexisting features of the City Academy learning community and characteristic of the partnership with UWE.

In the intervening time, work with Prof Lynn Raphael Reed (relating to CAB as an ‘Enquiring School’) and Dr Carolyn Bromfield (through participation with MA and MTL programmes) has furthered this intention, in addition to changes to in-house programmes such as CPD, including the introduction of the PPP (Personal Professional Project) as a small-scale enquiry undertaken by all teaching staff.

There are currently forty seven teachers engaged in undertaking MA studies and the academy has fifteen teachers who have already achieved an MA. In addition last year (2010) all NQTs were registered on the new masters in teaching and learning programme. The research projects are further supported by visits from the school of education librarian to support staff research for PPPs and to facilitate access to UWE’s virtual learning environment (VLE) from CAB.
The academy has recognised the value of teachers engaging in work-based research projects and forming learning communities by extending Dr Bruce Butt’s teaching and leadership role at CAB to associate tutor at UWE, including support and training in this role, his provision of an MA unit at CAB and training for the role of MTL coach to support these activities.

CAB also had a teaching and learning assistant complete her degree with UWE. She has gone on to become a deputy head of year at Bridge Learning Campus (another UWE enhanced partnership school).

The senior leadership developed an approach through personal professional projects. It was proposed that every teacher at CAB be required to complete a personal professional project (PPP) each academic year. This was to be a topic that was negotiated at the start of the year and disseminated to colleagues at the end of that same year. In the first instance, it would be something that was a professional requirement for every member of the teaching staff. The pursuit of these projects would be given existing professional development pathways time (i.e. twelve sessions a year, six of which are one hour and six of which are currently two hours). The planning of these projects would be informed by three levels of school improvement: the academy’s improvement plan; programme review documents (as devised, in part, from programme leaders’ self-evaluation forms (SEF)); and personal/professional development aspirations of individual teachers.

Research outcomes, evaluations and impact statements are required to be submitted by a date that is towards the end of the academic year, in the post-examination period and prior to the July INSET day. Part of this is used to disseminate staff research from the academic year. In its most modest form, this could be as a paper/poster to be displayed. For those who wish to and, particularly, those on the MA, this could take the form of a spoken presentation/seminar session. In its first year, project written submissions were between five hundred and a thousand words and were required to demonstrate evidence of wider reading. Much of the time for the research projects occurs in professional development programme (PDP) slots and staff are credited with six hours in the knowledge that this directed time might have already been devoted in MA study.

Finally, whilst a great strength of this system lies in its ability to accommodate a wide range of interests it is imperative that the requirements of the year are clear to all at the start and that sufficient value is put upon the submission and dissemination of projects so as to convey their value and worth to the individual and the wider learning community.

During an interview for this CS, Ray Priest reported enthusiastically on the recent (July 2010) staff conference during which one hundred and twenty action research projects were shared. These were very diverse, one involving a visit to Cambodia; another looking at the differences between state and independent schools; another revealing study of the school’s rewards and sanctions systems (not working as the school thought); and another on the use of the VLE. Each member of staff had ten hours to work on their projects – Ray is convinced most demonstrated far more than ten hours’ work and demonstrated integration of research and professional work.

Another example of this partnership between the City Academy Bristol and UWE was a year-long ‘Respect’ project involving student-led research developed by Dr Bruce Butt from CAB and Prof Lynn Raphael Reed from UWE. This was based upon the training and preparation of student participants by staff in the school of education at UWE and their empowerment to act as student researchers/participants in the
subsequent project. This culminated in the second Joint Academies Student Voice Conference at CAB in July 2009.

4.1.11 Initial teacher training

CA has been a consistent provider of placements for UWE’s initial teacher education trainees as the data below indicated, although a turnover of principal in 2010 meant a short period of offering no places. CA is one of the most reliable and consistent providers of ITT placements amongst Bristol schools.

Placement data for secondary trainees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total placements</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
<th>A Placements (short and early in the year)</th>
<th>B Placements (main school experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The benefits to CA are generally evaluated as positive and it is relevant to note the number of UWE NQTs the CA has appointed over the last few years: 2006 – two; 2007 – two; 2008 – three; 2009 – two. This represents 50% of CA’s newly qualified staff (the other 30% have been graduate teachers and the final 20% from other HE providers).

4.1.12 Other

The partnership with CAB has had other benefits for UWE:

- engagement with government;
- new forms of engagement with Bristol LA, given CAB was the first academy in the LA family of schools;
- links with Bristol business leaders and organisations (including the Merchant Venturers);
- new insights into community engagement and the outward facing nature of schools (illustrated well in a city council seminar UWE organised at which Ray Priest presented a case study of CAB as a school where new forms of engagement have been developed, especially with regard to new forms of adult learning);
- good local and national publicity (vast majority have been 'good news' stories);
• an example of a successful school-university partnership to use in disseminating UWE’s work with schools at national and international conferences;
• UWE has been acknowledged as the forerunner in university sponsorship of academies and this has effectively become policy within the academies sector.

4.1.13 Issues/challenges that have arisen with regard to the partnership

Given the origins of the partnership, outlined in the case, and the significance of individuals to the early phases, it has proved difficult to ensure there is a joined up and strategic approach to the partnership. The partnership is in some respects vulnerable because of its emphasis on key personal relationships. Issues related to succession planning related to colleagues linked to the CA has been reasonably successful to date but is, in some respects, an ongoing challenge to ensure the sustainability of the partnership. There have been frustrations on both sides related to the speed of delivery of innovation. The university staff have also seen the consequences of insufficient capacity and/or experience and expertise to develop certain innovations (such as the foundation degree).

4.1.14 Next steps for the partnership(s) and future aspirations

A new principal has recently been appointed to replace Ray Priest, who has chosen to move on to other things at this stage of his career. Clearly building a relationship with the new principal has opportunities and challenges. It offers the potential for critical review of progress to date and reflection on the ways in which the university’s engagement and support can be even more strategic so school priorities and needs are met.

4.1.15 Lessons learnt from which others can benefit

The breadth of the engagement with CAB is wider than most other EPs that UWE has developed and is illustrative of the ways in which services, such as finance, estates, HR and being part of the procurement consortium, can make valuable contributions to university-school partnerships. The longitudinal aspects of the relationship also provide evidence of the benefits and challenges of sustained university-school partnerships.

UWE could have offered more support for leadership development, especially of the senior team at CAB.

The partnership has gone some way towards explicitly badging the relationship as a shared identity between the academy and university in explicit ways e.g. the Research4Learning partnership. However, this aspect – of explicitly co-articulating mutual benefits to a range of stakeholders including staff, students and the community, might have been stronger. In addition, and on reflection, there are some aspects of support that the academy sees could have been beneficially provided by the university e.g. in relation to leadership development.
The overall benefits of this partnership in terms of reputation, positive publicity and profiling, and new forms of engagement with local agencies from the LA to business groups have been good.

4.1.16 Data sources accessed and available

1. UWE REACH data related to CA
2. UWE Strategic Partnership Statement prior to the establishment of the CA
8. ‘Top Marks for City Academy’ East, Kingswood and Keynsham Observer, 27 April 2007
9. ‘Academies show it’s fine to Aimhigher. Bristol Evening Post June 2007
12. Research for Learning Partnership 2007-8 Planning meeting notes
13. 400 Academies: Prospectus for Sponsors and Local Authorities, DES, CA case study p7
15. Raphael Reed, L. & Foley, J. (2008) Early perspectives of staff involved in the introduction of Project 7 at the City Academy Bristol. UWE
18. ‘University link boosts academies’. TES, 22 February 2008
20. John Rushforth PP, University Alliance Meeting, Leicester September 2008

Ofsted data

21. Ofsted Report from 01/09 Inspection
24. Ofsted Report from 12/05 Inspection
25. Impact statement from Maths Subject Leader 21.10.09

Web data

27. http://www.edboylefilms.co.uk/page9.htm You Tube version of video
28. https://www.ssatrust.org.uk/leadership/Pages/leadershipexchangeatcityacademy.aspx SSAT Case Study
29. http://www.thisisbristol.co.uk/educationplus/heads/Meet-heads-Dr-Ray-Priest-City-Academy-Bristol/article-1358956-detail/article.html Ray Priest article
4.2 Case Study 2

School: Bridge Learning Campus        Status: Trust
Partners: Trust in Learning – UWE, City of Bristol College and Bristol Local Authority
Author: Ron Ritchie

4.2.1 Introduction

Bridge Learning Campus (BLC) was UWE’s first trust school enhanced partnership in Bristol and opened as an all-through campus in 2008, as one of the then Labour government’s pathfinder trust schools. BLC was Bristol’s (and the south west’s) first all-through state school and comprises a primary school; secondary school (approx six hundred and fifty pupils); special school; student support centre; and a co-located vocational centre run by City of Bristol College (CoBC).

The university had a longstanding partnership with the predecessor schools, Hartcliffe Engineering Community College and Teyfant Community School, through teacher education, outreach work and other activities.

The development of the BLC happened over many years, initially as a community-led aspiration. UWE became involved in 2006 when the opportunity for the vision to be realised through a trust school and a new private finance initiative (PFI) building became a reality through discussion with the local authority.

The predecessor secondary school was deemed satisfactory by Ofsted in 2007. Prior to acquiring Trust in Learning (and becoming part of the trust), Hartcliffe Engineering Community College had very poor GCSE results (five A*-C including maths and English were gained by 11% of students in 2006, 17% in 2007 and 21% in 2008; any five GCSE A*-C grades were 36% in 2006, 38% in 2007 and 45% in 2008). After the first year as a trust school, results in 2009 improved to 36% and 62% respectively (making it the second most improved school in Bristol that year) and last year (2010) were 34% and 83%. In other words, trust status, the new building, the appointment of a new chief executive and other changes led to significant improvements in results at key stage 4. Results at key stages 2 & 3 have also shown improvements and applications for the school have risen since it became a trust school.

An Ofsted inspection of the secondary phase in 2010 was positive, although overall effectiveness was satisfactory (mainly due to pupil achievement data), the school’s capacity for sustained improvement was considered good and governance was rated as outstanding. Ofsted reported, ‘This satisfactory school is improving rapidly because of senior leaders’ vision, drive and determination. The chief executive and the governors have very successfully led a number of extremely significant changes since the last inspection that have raised the aspirations and expectations of both students and staff’.

4.2.2 Nature of the partnership

Work of the original trust school pathfinder group began in autumn 2006 and involved regular meetings until the opening in 2008. Prof Lynn Raphael Reed (then head of
department for secondary education and lifelong learning and co-author of a significant HEFCE-funded research report on low participation in South Bristol) and Prof Ron Ritchie (then dean of education, assistant vice-chancellor, schools and college partnerships and a co-optee on Bristol city council’s children and young people’s scrutiny commission) represented UWE at these meetings and played key roles in the co-construction of the vision which was articulated in the following way in the original trust prospectus.

**BRIDGE LEARNING CAMPUS WILL HAVE A LOCAL AND NATIONAL REPUTATION FOR PROVIDING EXCELLENT EDUCATION**

A number of threads link our strap line to our vision:
- transformational learning & experiences – that are relevant, different and lead to achievement for all;
- learning and pedagogy – a continued focus on core purpose to develop new and successful approaches to teaching and learning;
- personal – ‘it makes a difference to this one!’ – support and responsibility will be addressed through providing new approaches to personalised learning’
- cohesive, flexible and integrated all-through experience – so we support the attainment of learners in a seamless way;
- attitudes and expectations – transforming and aspiring to new possibilities
- partnership – we actively engage in partnership working with other schools, community organisations, further and higher education partners and employers;
- social responsibility and action – our work promotes good citizenship, community cohesion and understanding;
- structures – we ensure that the campus resources facilitate a new way of working and delivering success;
- pathways and progression – we will promote new routes for learning matched to individual needs.

The vision of BLC was directly informed by recommendations arising from Raphael Reed et al’s study of education disengagement in South Bristol (2007a).

The pathfinder trust discussions were premised on the notion that UWE, City of Bristol College and Bristol Local Authority would be equal partners in the trust. The name of the trust was chosen (by the pathfinder group) to emphasise one of the goals for the development – to support the local community in ‘trusting’ in learning as a transformative opportunity for young people.

The plans and aspirations for the new trust were shared in a transparent way with other headteachers in the city; with local authority officers and members; and with the local community in Hartcliffe. Other heads, confirmed through evidence of meetings and conversations, supported UWE’s choice to prioritise its trust school engagement in south Bristol, at that time.

Relationships with the local authority were constructive and positive throughout the planning process. Some complications were experienced relating to land and buildings issues, but overall the vision was jointly constructed and shared. The LA played a very significant role in supporting the development of the BLC and provided key officers to ensure all aspects of the project progressed.

Relationships between UWE and City of Bristol College were equally positive throughout and no areas of dispute arose at any time in the planning or
implementation phase. CoBC provided senior staff to support the planning and implementation phase (Keith Elliot, principal, and Judy Stradling, deputy principal). UWE and CoBC were collaborating on a range of other initiatives at the time, including the UWE Federation (a partnership between UWE and local FE colleges in the region).

The legal issues related to the formation of a trust (especially because of the PFI complexity and the co-location of a City of Bristol’s co-located vocational centre were complex and the pathfinder group was well supported by Mouchel Partnerships (funded by the local authority) in steering their way through these issues. UWE called on its in-house solicitor frequently to check documents and processes.

The relationship with New Fosseway Special School (NFSS) was complicated, as its governing body was reluctant to join the trust in the first phase. It co-located to the new campus building in January 2010 and finally acquired the trust (as a minority trust) in September 2010 once the benefits of co-location were evident. This case study does not cover its engagement in BLC in any detail, although another senior colleague (head of department in health and life sciences) has joined the governing body as a trust-appointed nominee.

When Trust in Learning was formally established as a charity in September 2009, it was agreed, through open discussion with partners, that UWE would provide the chair of the trust, given the vested interest of the other two partners in the BLC. UWE and City of Bristol College provided two trustees each (Prof Ron Ritchie and Prof Lynn Raphael Reed from UWE and Keith Elliot and Judy Stradling from CoBC – all four remain on the board and Ron Ritchie remains the chair). The local authority provide one trustee (initially Kate Campion (a deputy director), who was replaced by Annie Huson, director of children and young people’s services, in Sept 2009). Mark Davies (chief exec of BLC – see below) was also appointed as a director. The board was supported by the clerk to the governors at CoBC, who became the company secretary.

The new trust school was opened in September 2008 (in the original buildings). The campus moved to the new building in January 2009, at which time it comprised: BLC Primary; BLC Secondary; a student support centre and a post-16 vocational centre (co-located but run by CoBC).

The official opening of BLC by Princess Anne, Princess Royal took place on 12 October 2009.

Overall, this has proved a productive enhanced partnership which has reciprocal dimensions and is valued by the school and the university. The chair of governors at BLC stated at the conclusion of her interview, ‘It’s been a real pleasure to be working with UWE – they bring a lot to help us realise our vision for the school, which is transforming education for young people’. The chief executive said, ‘I really do enjoy working with the university and college … (the) relationship is working well. It’s honest and sincere, quite open’. He went on to suggest it is still 60% untapped!

The following sections outline some of the successes of the partnership.

4.2.3 Governance

One of the most significant contributions of Trust in Learning (and UWE) to this enhanced partnership was the establishment and operation of the new governing
body for BLC. This governing body covered the hard federated secondary and primary schools. NFSS kept its own governing body.

A key decision of the trust was to ask one of the existing chairs of the two predecessor governing bodies (Caroline Jenkins, the experienced chair of Teyfant Community School, who had served on the pathfinder group and been a governor for nearly 20 years) to stand as chair of the new BLC governing body, supported by trust-appointed governors. Since her appointment, the trust has sought to support her in a variety of ways, including regular meetings with the chair of the trust. Caroline is a local authority identified consultant governor, supporting other governing bodies. As interview data from her shows, she appreciated and valued the support offered. Her leadership, and her position as a member of the local community (her four children had gone through the predecessor schools), was a significant feature of the trust’s desire to build local capacity to support BLC.

A skills audit (based on one used by CoBC) was carried out on all existing and potential governors to ensure the newly created governing body had an appropriate mix of experience and expertise.

As a majority trust, Trust in Learning appointed the majority of the governing body. All trust-appointed governors have been interviewed prior to taking up their role. Prospective trust-appointed parent governors are usually met, informally, by two board members before a recommendation is made. These meetings ensure nominees are aware of the trust’s vision and the implications of being a governor as well as the support available. Not all parents that Trust in Learning representatives interviewed have been appointed and, in that case, they have been encouraged to get actively involved in the parents’ council (see below).

The original trust-appointed governors were:

- Prof Lynn Raphael Reed, member of the pathfinder group and strategic lead for UWE at BLC;
- Judy Stradling, member of the pathfinder group and strategic lead for CoBC at BLC;
- Stephen Hewitt, community member who sat on the pathfinder group;
- Andy Riggs, deputy finance director, UWE, identified to fill a gap in terms of financial experience highlighted through the skills audit of governors;
- Mary Waters, Burgess Salmon, identified through UWE networks to provide legal advice – a gap identified through the skills audit;
- Terry Williamson; identified through local school networks to provide educational experience focused on the local area (where he had worked previously).

There have been changes since, but the above is indicative of how the governors were identified. In the words of the chair of the governors, ‘it’s incredible the people they (Trust in Learning) found for us’ (interview data).

Identifying sufficient parent governors has been an ongoing challenge at BLC, although the parents’ council (established as a statutory requirement of a majority trust) has proved successful and included some UWE input (for example, an input from Prof Lynn Raphael Reed on her research findings related to gender issues).

The governor committee structure was revised and has proved successful. The contribution Prof Lynn Raphael Reed has made to building capacity in others within the governors has been recognised by the chief executive, in interview data.
Governor meetings have had ‘learning sessions’ built into meetings which have covered the following during 2009/10:
- self-evaluation form (October 2009);
- understanding data in schools (December 2009);
- positive dialogue between governors and staff (January 2010);
- Every Child Matters ( ECM ) (March 2010);
- understanding each other’s committees (May 2010).

These have been well-evaluated by governors (at joint governor/trust meetings).

Joint governor/trust meetings have been held (December 2008; July 2009; and July 2010) that have included group discussion to elicit issues from governors and follow up notes and actions have been organised.

The chair of the trust has held regular meetings with the chair of governors (jointly with the chief executive) and these have been positively evaluated by Caroline Jenkins (interview data).

The recent Ofsted inspection (2010) of the secondary section of BLC reported, ‘the outstanding leadership of the chief executive and governors is having a positive impact on improving provision and outcomes in the school. Their vision and aspirations are shared by middle leaders.’ The inspectors graded the cell ‘The effectiveness of the governing body in challenging and supporting the school so that weaknesses are tackled decisively and statutory responsibilities met’ as a one (outstanding). The report also reported that ‘the school is inclusive and cares and supports all students well, particularly those who are vulnerable’ which indicates another core principle of the original mission is being achieved.

The chair of the governor’s comments on the impact of the trust and of UWE was almost exclusively positive (interview data). Her evidence shows the extent to which she values HE involvement in raising aspirations in the community, recognises the university’s long-term commitment to the community; and the impact of the trust’s work to achieving an ‘outstanding’ from Ofsted. This is also acknowledged by the chief executive. Mark Davies described the university’s contribution to governance as ‘quite revolutionary really, excellent’ (interview data).

4.2.4 Leadership

The previous head of the secondary school chose to retire before the new school opened (having played an active and constructive role in the pathfinder group). The head of the predecessor primary school chose not to put himself forward as chief executive of BLC although he retained a senior leadership role at BLC.

Consequently, the governors and trust were able to appoint a new chief executive as a result of a national advertisement. Trustees were actively involved in the process and Mark Davies, an ex-headteacher from Gloucestershire, with an excellent track record of improving schools, was appointed from a strong field in October 2007, almost a year before the school opened.

His appointment has proved successful and was another significant feature of the trust’s achievements in the context of BLC.
The interview data from Mark Davies offered an account of his perspective of BLC and its successes and challenges, and is drawn on in the discussion below.

In that he made positive comments about the support he has received from UWE colleagues. Regular meetings between him, his chair of governors and Prof Ron Ritchie, as chair of TIL which data suggest have been valued by him (and Caroline Jenkins (evidenced from her interview data).

The new chief executive, Mark Davies, through discussion with others, including trustees and governors, created an innovative leadership model/infrastructure for the school as part of the complex planning he did to establish the new school and the move into the new premises. He has experience of providing leadership training and used this to support colleagues in implementing the new structures.

In order to promote strategic approaches to the partnership with UWE, the school’s senior leadership team met with UWE colleagues to promote a more strategic approach to the partnership. (March 2009). A record of this discussion illustrates the importance of teasing out, clarifying and building shared understanding of the respective roles of a university and a school e.g. in relation to teacher education and how this aspect of partnership might develop over time.

A key strength of Mark Davies, in the view of the chair of the trust, has been his focus on the immediate priorities for the BLC related to pupil outcomes and increasing admissions. This has, to some degree led to a more inward-facing focus over the first year than the trust aspired for but, given improving results, the school is increasing its outward-facing work and community engagement.

4.2.5 Student engagement

UWE-focused widening participation activities involving BLC have been developed, for example, three hundred young people were involved in a careers event in November 2010 run by UWE’s school of health and social care. Nine students attended the Year 10 summer school in 2009 and two students took part in a young carers mentoring project (February – June 2009).

The school has been linked into the Bloodhound Project (to create a car that will travel at one thousand miles an hour, of which UWE is a sponsor) and a class from BLC (primary) were involved in an activity day at UWE for Bloodhound sponsors in October 2010. Links with the engineering department at UWE have been established to support BLC’s engineering specialism.

Evidence from the chair of governors and the chief executive indicates they value the aspiration raising aspects of UWE’s outreach work with BLC.

A more strategic approach to widening participation and information, advice and guidance (IAG) activities with BLC are planned for the next phase and a school-based working group has been set up to support this. Evidence from the chief executive indicates how pupils’ aspirations have changed and how many more now aspire to go to university (sixty out of the eighty pupils he sampled recently).
4.2.6 Curriculum development

There have been some innovative developments related to the curriculum and organisation since the school opened. Of particular note is the creation of phases for mixed-aged groups (years 3-6; 6-10; 10-13; 13-16; 16-19). These developments have been supported by UWE colleagues through discussion, especially by Prof Lynn Raphael Reed. An example of this was a debate about the use of ability labels (March 2009) which led to a development of the initial plans.

Curriculum development at BLC has also benefited from the CoB college link and the opportunities the on-site college-led vocational centre offers.

Ofsted had the following to say about the curriculum in its latest report of BLC Secondary (2010) 'The innovative and creative curriculum has underpinned the improvement in students’ achievement over the last year, though the full effects have yet to be realised. Students’ needs are being met very well by the ability-related groups in which they are being taught, and by the range of both academic and vocational courses available to them in years 9 to 11. Links with a local college effectively extend the range of vocational courses that are available. The flexibility of the curriculum in these years, allowing students to follow accredited courses in one, two or three years depending on their ability, is beginning to show positive benefits. The school's engineering specialism has had limited impact on overall curriculum provision although recent initiatives are beginning to address this issue’.

4.2.7 Research and knowledge exchange

The HEFCE-funded research referred to at the start of this case study was used to inform the vision TiL and the governors had for the school and has been shared explicitly with a range of stakeholders including parents and community members. This provides an excellent example of the impact of research on policy and practice. Prof Lynn Raphael Reed has gone on to provide research evidence as feedback to the school on its school improvement journey as part of her role as a trustee and governor – learning herself from her role as a core partner. She has also provided wider research input to schools in the local community e.g. by providing a key note address on the significance of family and community engagement to a recent INSET day for staff in all schools in that part of the city. The resulting knowledge exchange from such activities continues to inform understanding within the university e.g. of the challenges of supporting family and community engagement with children’s learning in such parts of the city. This has in turn led to the university initiating a fundraising project to support a family and community engagement project (see 4.2.10 below).

Another example of using BLC as a site for research is evident in a recent Bristol LA-funded curriculum project. BLC provided a case study for that research

The BLC/TiL story has been shared at many national and regional events by UWE and CoBC colleagues and by Mark Davies. For example, it was featured by UWE colleagues as a case study in the following events/workshops/keynotes:

- UCET National Conference, 8 November 2008;
- Parliamentary Select Committee, 12 November 2008;
- SSAT National Communities Conference, 10 June 200;
- SSAT National Communities Conference 3 November, 2009;
- Higher Education Liaison Officers Association (HELOA) Annual Conference, 28 January 2010;
- UWE Civic Responsibility Conference, 20 May 2010;
- SSAT National Trust Schools Conference, 23 June 2010.

4.2.8 Staff professional development

BLC staff have benefitted from UWE-provided postgraduate professional development (PPD) and involvement in the masters in teaching and learning (MTL) as a key UWE partner. A member of the BLC senior leadership team has been trained by the university as an in-school coach and associate tutor to work with staff on HE accredited study.

Numbers involved have been small but evaluation of the work has been positive. BLC’s in-house middle leadership programme offers HE credit to those who seek it.

Perhaps more significantly, Trust in Learning has supported Mark Davies in the creation of BLC’s professional development centre. The university supported the production of an original business plan (September 2009) although the final model is very different to that originally explored, and credit for the concept and implementation rests firmly with Mark Davies and the colleague he appointed to lead the centre, Sara Grimshaw.

4.2.9 Initial teacher training

BLC has been a provider of placements for UWE’s initial teacher education trainees as the data below indicated.

Placement data for secondary trainees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
<th>A Placements (short and early in the year)</th>
<th>B Placements (main school experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to secondary placement, BLC Primary has been a site for innovative forms of primary ITE placements focused on how trainees might contribute to school improvement e.g. through their work as ‘better reading partners’. There is ongoing discussion between UWE and school colleagues about developing new forms of ITE partnership with an aspiration for BLC to develop as a teaching school.

4.2.10 Other

BLC has been the motivation for UWE’s recently initiated fundraising initiative called Families and Community Engagement (FACE). The university is seeking to raise funds to implement a range of initiatives around BLC (and Orchard School Bristol) through Trust in Learning to support improved family and community engagement. This will be through community and school-based projects, co-ordinated by someone.
based in BLC. This is very much work in progress at this stage, but is fully supported by the chair of governors and the chief executive.

4.2.11 Issues/challenges that have arisen with regard to the partnership

Challenges have included:
- building shared understandings of the respective contribution that a university and school can make to school improvement e.g. through training high quality teachers;
- ensuring sufficient UWE and school capacity to develop aspects of partnership.

4.2.12 Next steps for the partnership(s) and future aspirations

Possible areas for action (identified by school and UWE colleagues) include:
- seeking higher visibility for the UWE link;
- promoting enhanced family and community engagement through the FACE project;
- looking for more direct involvement of UWE in the professional development centre;
- looking for opportunities for the exchange of BLC and UWE staff;
- developing new, mutually beneficial models of teacher education.

4.2.13 Lessons learnt from which others can benefit

Key lessons include:
- enhanced partnerships take time, energy and commitment to develop;
- prioritising improving governors and building capacity for governance and leadership are essential steps in developing successful enhanced partnerships with trust schools.

4.2.14 Data sources accessed and available

1. Trust in Learning Prospectus
2. Interview data from chair of governors, Caroline Jenkins
3. Interview data from the chief executive, Mark Davies
4. Trust in Learning Newsletter June 2009
5. Notes of Trust in Learning /BLC governors’ Meeting 1.7.09
6. Trust in Learning Newsletter July 2010
7. Notes of UWE/BLC meeting 26.3.09
8. Section 5 Inspection, 11.5.10
   http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/display/(id)/120499
9. Section 5 Inspection, 2.5.07
   http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/display/(id)/83437
Evening Post articles (sample) since the school opened in new premises


School website

Wikipedia article
4.3 Case Study 3

School: Orchard School Bristol

Status: Trust

Partners: Trust in Learning – UWE, City of Bristol College and Bristol Local Authority

Author: Ron Ritchie

4.3.1 Introduction

This case study covers a relatively new enhanced partnership which began when the new school opened in 2009 as one of the first national challenge trust schools in the country.

The university had a longstanding partnership with the predecessor school, Monks Park, through teacher education and outreach work. The author of this case, Ron Ritchie (also chair of Trust in Learning) had an even longer association with the school, having started his teaching career as an NQT there over thirty years ago.

Prior to acquiring Trust in Learning as a trust school, Monks Park School had poor GCSE results (20% five A*-C, including English and maths in 2006). This led to the school being designated as national challenge and ‘encouraged’ to change its status through intervention by the then Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) in 2009. The results improved dramatically in the year the new school opened (35% five A*-C, including English and maths in 2009), which were not, of course, a result of the new status, and this progress was maintained in 2010 (37% including English and maths) with an even more dramatic increase in five good GCSEs (67% in 2010, compared with 48% in 2009).

Applications for places have increased at the school as a result of changed parental and community perceptions (helped by positive press coverage – see list at end). One hundred and fifty places were accepted for entry in 2010 compared to one hundred in 2009.

Since opening, Orchard School Bristol has also proactively worked with key primary partners in a number of ways:

- sharing policies;
- improved support for transition;
- increased outreach work by teachers in primary schools;
- joint commissioning (ICT, admin, finance, learning mentors);
- sharing continuing professional development and INSET days aligned;
- signposting extended services;
- links with outside agencies including Bristol Rovers Football Club.

Another aspect of the school’s new status has been its link with the other Trust in Learning schools, Bridge Learning Campus, and the benefits of that, especially with regard to governance.
4.3.2 Nature of the partnership

Orchard School Bristol acquired Trust in Learning and became a trust school as a result of a local authority approach to Trust in Learning early in 2009, encouraged by the then DCSF. The headteacher and governors welcomed the opportunity (evidenced through discussions at the time with board members and at a meeting with the existing governors, 12 March 2009). DCSF approved the development in March 2009. It was a significant decision for Trust in Learning to expand to another area of the city, when still in its first year of existence, supporting the Bridge Learning Campus. However, the new partnership fulfilled the criteria UWE had established for enhanced partnerships and was one that other members of Trust in Learning, City of Bristol College and the local authority were very keen to support. Trust in Learning’s vision statement and prospectus were redrafted as a bespoke version for Orchard School Bristol through consultation with school leaders. The development/plans for the new school were progressed through a partnership group that was funded by DCSF and supported by Mouchel. Prof Ron Ritchie, as chair of Trust in Learning, and Alison Fletcher (director of PGCE secondary programmes at UWE) sat on the board on behalf of UWE. The consultation (March/April 2009) proved unproblematic and included a meeting between Trust in Learning board members and the school staff, and open meetings for parents. The partnership progressed as planned and the new school opened in September 2009 with very positive press coverage. It is accommodated in a new PFI building, which was completed whilst the school had its community status and was not part of the trust development.

As a national challenge trust school, there was additional financial support provided as the result of a national challenge trust strategic plan (agreed through the partnership group formed to establish the new school and submitted to DCSF in October 2009 and subsequently approved after further revision).

The following sections illustrate some of the successes of the partnership.

4.3.3 Governance

Building on the experience and success of Trust in Learning’s support for governance at BLC, the new governing body at Orchard School Bristol, was constructed through discussion with the headteacher and the existing chair of governors (Peter Mortlock) who agreed to remain chair of the new governors. A skills audit and invitation to existing governors to express interest in the new governing body (GB) led to ‘gaps’ being identified. The trust then appointed the following governors:

- Judy Stradling, deputy principal, City of Bristol College and, at that time, a governor of Bridge Learning Campus – Judy became the vice-chair to support Peter Mortlock;
- Alison Fletcher, UWE – appointed because of her previous work with the school and her expertise in mathematics (at that time a recognised weakness in the school);
- Richard Coulter, assistant editor of the Evening Post (identified through UWE networks and chosen to support the school’s communication specialism);
- Nick Garrick, consultant and ex primary deputy headteacher (identified through UWE networks and chosen to support the school’s links with primary schools);
- Barry Northover, partner in the legal firm, Veale Wasbrough (identified through UWE networks and chosen to support the governor’s need for legal advice).
Amongst the trust-appointed parent governors was Julia Weston, who works in the marketing dept at UWE and is also a parent at the school (chosen to support the school’s need for marketing and communications expertise). Julia has supported the establishment and operation of a parents’ council (as a requirement of a majority trust school) and has been supported by the chair of Bridge Learning Campus governors in this. This development has benefited from learning that resulted from the Bridge Learning Campus parents’ council.

This governing body, according to TiL monitoring and evidence from the headteacher and the LA, proved to be successful. It has established a structure of committees and visits that mirror the successful Bridge Learning Campus model.

Since it was established some changes have occurred in the composition of the GB, but it continues to be constituted in a rational way to support the school through Trust in Learning deliberations.

Support for the governing body has been provided through: regular monitoring at Trust in Learning board meetings; a link with the chair of Bridge Learning Campus governors (Caroline Jenkins); meetings between Judy Stadling and Prof Ron Ritchie with Dr Helen Holman (headteacher of Orchard School Bristol); through annual meetings between all Trust in Learning governors and trustees; and an annual newsletter.

The headteacher, in interview data describes UWE as a ‘very effective partner’.

4.3.4 Leadership

The partnership board and Trust in Learning expressed confidence in the existing head of Monks Park (in post for the previous three years), Dr Helen Holman, at the planning stage of the new school she was endorsed as head of the new school. The board has worked closely and constructively with her and she attends Trust in Learning board meetings as a co-optee. Regular meetings have occurred between the chief executive of Bridge Learning Campus, Mark Davies, and Dr Helen Holman. Alison Fletcher from UWE has provided support for the head of maths directly as well as critical friendship to Dr Helen Holman.

Another example of the benefits of the partnership was an invitation from UWE to Helen Holman to bring her senior leadership team to the university’s Bolland lecture in 2010, which was given by another of UWE’s enhanced partnership heads, Ray Priest. The team had a table for dinner afterwards where they also met with UWE governors.

4.3.5 Student engagement

Orchard School Bristol students have benefited, like those in other enhanced partnership schools, from a range of activities aimed at raising aspirations and achievements. These are recorded at the university through the REACH database.

A particular intervention on the part of the university that led to impact was the use of undergraduate student volunteers to support mentoring in maths. The then head of maths, Steve Alexis, reported that the interventions were having a positive impact on likely GCSE maths results for the pupils benefiting from the mentoring.
4.3.6 Curriculum development

Orchard School Bristol features as a case study in a local authority-funded curriculum development project. A learning set was facilitated (by Prof Ron Ritchie) in the school over several months with a focus on curriculum organisation. A separate case study is available that documents this work. Of particular significance is the contribution this made to the school’s aspiration to promote distributed leadership, as the learning set comprised teaching and support staff at all levels from deputy head to learning supporter. The learning set conducted an enquiry focused on the question, ‘To what extent are the developments being implemented in Y7 with regard to curriculum organisation and banding meeting the needs of the pupils?’ The outcome provided evidence of positive impact as a result of the changes for pupils and provided insights of further improvements that could be implemented. Key features of the initiative, identified by participants, were:

- all participants regarded and treated as ‘equal’ members;
- structured agenda focused on enquiry questions;
- commitment from participants to engage, take responsibility for key areas and collect and present appropriate data;
- meetings recorded and accurate notes made to record discussions and agreed actions;
- follow-up meetings structured around planned actions;
- critical friendship from the facilitator and appropriate challenge to colleagues from participants;
- explicit reflective approach and critical engagement with data;
- acceptance of time and other pressures on participants which sometimes meant planned actions were not possible;
- support of the headteacher who showed interest in the learning set’s activities and outcomes and was regularly briefed by the facilitator and the deputy head.

The learning set and the headteacher (through interview data) reported how much this work had been valued. The headteacher particularly appreciated its contribution to building more distributed leadership in the school and its contribution to the ‘big shift’ in culture needed.

4.3.7 Research and knowledge exchange

The above is an example of school-based action research.

The university has also facilitated and led on a piece of research focused on community engagement and the nature of the school’s communities. This was funded from the school’s additional funding as a national challenge school. A report was provided to the school by Prof Lynn Raphael Reed, co-authored with Phoebe Beedell of UWE and Helen Burn of Orchard School Bristol, with several recommendations about how to improve relationships between the school, local families and communities in support of learning. This included reflection on the connections between the secondary school and its partner primary and local children’s centre.
4.3.8 Staff professional development

A small number of Orchard School Bristol staff have engaged in postgraduate professional development and the school is a partner of UWE with regard to the MTL. However, work is needed to promote more strategic links between UWE and the school in the context of accredited CPD.

Some staff from Orchard School Bristol are engaging on middle leadership programmes offered through the Cabot Learning Federation, illustrating a link between the two UWE federations (Trust in Learning and the Cabot Learning Federation).

4.3.9 Initial teacher training

Orchard School Bristol has been a provider of placements for UWE’s initial teacher education trainees as the data below indicated. Placement data for secondary trainees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
<th>A Placements (short and early in the year)</th>
<th>B Placements (main school experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, mathematics trainees have benefited from placements and Alison Fletcher’s ongoing link with the school. School staff have supported UWE through; for example, interviewing applicants for ITE programmes (English being one example).

The school has appointed a number of UWE trainees who had placements there, including three English teachers in the recent past.

As a school such as Orchard School Bristol undergoes an intense focus on accelerated school improvement, it is understandable that there is a reduction in ITE placement offered.

4.3.10 Other

Communications and marketing support (through Julia Weston, the trust-appointed parent governor who works in UWE’s communications & marketing department) has been valued and extensive, leading to a Trust in Learning funded appointment organised jointly with City of Bristol College. The funding came from the additional funding provided to a national challenge trust school. This has been particularly important in achieving positive media coverage which is likely to have had a major impact on public perceptions of the school.
Outward facing community engagement is an ongoing priority for the school (confirmed through interview data with the headteacher) and it is anticipated that the school will be a beneficiary of the planned Families and Community Engagement (FACE) Project being developed by the university through Trust in Learning (see Case Study 2).

The enhanced partnership with Orchard School Bristol is in a relatively early stage and in the view of key stakeholders 'work in progress'.

### 4.3.11 Data sources accessed and available

1. TiL Newsletter (July 2010)
2. Curriculum Project Case Study
3. Notes used for Monks Park governors' Meeting 12.3.09
4. Interview data from Dr Helen Holman
5. REACH Data regarding student engagements

**Ofsted data**

6. Ofsted Monitoring Visit 1.4.09  
   [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/download/(id)/107690/(as)/109282_332700.pdf](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/download/(id)/107690/(as)/109282_332700.pdf)
7. Ofsted Inspection March 2008  
   [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/download/(id)/94496/(as)/109282_309951.pdf](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/download/(id)/94496/(as)/109282_309951.pdf)

**Web data**

Recent Evening Post Articles
11. [http://www.thisisbristol.co.uk/news/Bristol-school-doing/article-1892268-detail/article.html](http://www.thisisbristol.co.uk/news/Bristol-school-doing/article-1892268-detail/article.html) (8.3.10)

**School website**

**Wikipedia article**
4.4 Case Study 4

Schools: Cabot Learning Federation (CLF)
Status: Federation of academies
Sponsors: University of the West of England and Rolls Royce
Authors: Guy Keith-Miller and David Carter

4.4.1 Introduction and structure

The Cabot Learning Federation was formally created in August 2009 (see diagram below) and brought together Bristol Brunel Academy (BBA), John Cabot Academy (JCA) and Bristol Metropolitan Academy (BMA) to form a hard federation of the three schools. The co-sponsors are Rolls-Royce and the University of West England (UWE). The Cabot Learning Federation board is chaired by the director of engineering & technology – civil aerospace at Rolls Royce, Peter Price, and the vice-chair is UWE’s assistant vice-chancellor Prof Ron Ritchie.

The executive principal of the federation is David Carter. The aim of the Cabot Learning Federation is to create a model of education support and delivery that reflects the needs and goals of schools in the twenty-first century. The creation of the Cabot Learning Federation formally changed the relationship between the University of the West of England and the three schools, most notably in the case of Bristol Brunel Academy. Previously JCA had sponsored (and was lead education sponsor of) BBA, as part of a soft federation with UWE as an education partner and Bristol City Council (LA) as a foundation partner. The local authority does not have representation on the Cabot Learning Federation. However it continues to be involved at academy council level and through the usual city council education channels.

The recent history of the Cabot Learning Federation is illustrated below
The Cabot Learning Federation has a goal of ensuring that each academy is a centre of excellence, where each principal, leadership team and academy council has something ‘unique’ to share with their partner academies. The Cabot Learning Federation is legally responsible for each academy, but by nurturing a culture of individual identity and by the delegation of identified and agreed responsibilities, each academy will, it is intended, reflect the diversity and uniqueness of its own staff and students.

For this reason, there is full representation at the board level from academy representatives, as well as sponsor representatives so that there is a two-way accountability process. The Cabot Learning Federation holds the academies to account for their performance and the academies hold the Cabot Learning Federation to account for the quality of support offered and the value for money for the annual per student contribution to the operational costs of the federation support team.

The Cabot Learning Federation board is made up of eleven trustees and these are outlined below:

- three sponsor representatives nominated from Rolls Royce;
- three sponsor representatives from UWE;
- executive principal;
- an elected parent representative from the parent councillors at the academy council level;
- three chairs of the academy councils.

The main responsibility of the Cabot Learning Federation is to be accountable to the DCSF and Charities Commission for the financial and educational achievements of the academies within it.
In addition, the Cabot Learning Federation has ten core objectives:

- to set the aims and ethos for the CLF;
- to provide strategic educational focus for the CLF;
- to provide strategic financial planning for the CLF;
- to design the longer term development goals of the CLF including the decision to admit new academies to the CLF;
- to assure the quality of provision across the federation, including performance in public exams;
- to appoint and performance manage the executive principal;
- to appoint with appropriate academy councillors the principal of each academy;
- to appoint CLF trustees, and ensure their induction, support and performance is of the highest quality;
- to appoint CLF nominees to the local academy councils and ensure their induction, support and performance is of the highest quality;
- to remove CLF board members or academy council nominees if their performance is unsatisfactory.

The aims of the Cabot Learning Federation are:

- inspiring and sharing Innovation;
- drawing upon local, national and international thinking;
- leading and communicating excellence to raise and sustain high standards of attainment;
- valuing the partnership with families and children and their communities;
- building capacity to effect change across the CLF;
- providing opportunities for leadership development;
- being actively involved and accountable to its partners.

The core principles of the Cabot Learning Federation are:

- to add value to the work of the academies;
- to recognise the unique contribution that each academy and its staff can make to the development of the CLF;
- to use the strengths and diversity that exists within the federation to build a sustainable and flexible society of lifelong learners;
- to quality assure the educational provision across the academies and to facilitate the sharing of excellent practice between the academies;
- to provide high quality support for the staff and students at the three academies in order to help them to be amongst the best schools of their type in the UK;
- to play a role in the regeneration of the communities that the academies serve, by increasing the belief of parents and carers in the purpose and value of education.

There are thirteen councillors on each academy council

- the principal;
- two elected parent councillors;
- one elected teacher councillor;
- one elected support staff councillor;
- one councillor who represents the local authority;
- seven sponsor representatives nominated by Rolls Royce and UWE
  - one of these sponsor reps should be the executive principal;
  - one of these sponsor reps should be a student advocate – an adult who promotes the interests of students and who from time to time,
where and when appropriate, brings student voice representatives to
council meetings;
  o five sponsor reps, appointed by Rolls Royce and UWE, who ideally
know the local academy community well and have a skill set that will
be beneficial across the federation.

The chair of the academy council is appointed by the Cabot Learning Federation
board.

4.4.2 How are academy councils different to governing bodies?

The academy council is a sub-committee of the Cabot Learning Federation board. Each academy council is represented at the Cabot Learning Federation board level by the chair of the council, and the executive principal who will know the progress that each academy is making.

The council is responsible for

- appointing and performance managing the principal and senior leaders with the support of the CLF board through the executive principal;
- appointing on behalf of CLF all staff who will work at the academy;
- the monitoring of teaching and learning, curriculum delivery and academy performance;
- fulfilling the role of critical friend to the principal and the leadership team;
- monitoring academy finance and property;
- the development plan of the academy;
- the quality of education experienced by the students at the academy;
- providing support for the CLF and the quality of education at the other academies.

An academy councillor is expected to hold the interests of their academy first. However, academy councillors are federation councillors as well and as a result are expected to:

- participate in training sessions with other CLF councillors;
- share effective practice from their academy with other councillors;
- share their own skills and knowledge for the benefit of another academy in the CLF where and when appropriate.

The core objectives of the academy councils are:

- to support, develop and monitor the quality of the curriculum, teaching and learning and student support across the academy, including the setting and monitoring of targets for the academy with the principal and executive principal;
- to take responsibility for the ethos and climate for learning in the academy through the implementation of CLF policies for safeguarding, teaching and learning, staff management and health and safety;
- to ensure that areas requiring support are recognised and communicated to the CLF through the executive principal so that the academy benefits from the support available within the CLF;
- to be aware of the areas of strength that can be the basis for shared practice across the CLF and to facilitate and support this so that the academy becomes a provider of support across the CLF;
to appoint and performance manage in partnership with the CLF and executive principal, a principal and senior leaders for the academy;

to ensure that the academy has a development plan that reflects the uniqueness of the individual school alongside the delivery of the federation core vision;

to appoint teaching and support staff of the highest quality, ensuring that their induction and training needs are fully identified and met;

to ensure that the academy council has full membership and that councillors have a clear link to teaching and learning monitoring in their own academy and across the CLF;

to ensure that the academy budget is well managed and monitored and that the required reports are provided for the CLF on time;

to take responsibility for communications to parents and the local community that the academy serves.

4.4.3 Academy interactions 2009-10 across the federation

In the first year of Cabot Learning Federation, partnership working has been demonstrated in a number of ways. One of the main developments in 2009-10 has been the emergence of both formal and informal interactions across the CLF. Some of these activities have been planned whilst a number have taken place as a result of individual staff and teams taking the initiative to work together.

4.4.4 Formal collaborations and Cabot Learning Federation strategies

Staffing:

- creating a centralised finance and HR team to manage and provide financial and human resource support for the three academies;
- staff working jointly for CLF and an academy – this year CLF has developed the roles of a number of colleagues across several areas including: English, maths, sixth form, student projects, primary partnerships, press/media and CLF PR. This ensures that additional support and capacity can be offered to the academies and our other partner schools;
- the CLF emerging leaders programme has been delivered twice during 2009/10 and over forty teachers and support staff have taken part. This includes staff from other Bristol schools.
- staff exchanges – CLF has developed a strategy for sharing teacher skills and abilities. In addition to those colleagues who have taken a CLF support role, a number of staff ended the year in a different academy to the one they began in;
- post-16 courses have been provided where teachers move between the academies and/or where students from more than one academy are in the same group;
- NQT and PGCE training – whilst the responsibility for the support for NQTs and PGCEs remains with the individual academy, the CLF have provided additional support by bringing these groups together across the CLF. There have been four CLF training sessions for the NQTs and two one-day
conferences for the PGCE students – the second of these took place at UWE and was a good example of CLF and UWE as sponsor working well together;

- a learning mentor from BBA also mentors at JCA.

Communications:

- launch of the CLF website www.cabotlearningfederation.net;
- CLF VLE training – The leader of E-learning from JCA has developed a CLF virtual learning environment (VLE) and has used twilight sessions to train teams in the use of this tool – he has also trained the CLF board and academy councils in the use of it and all paperwork for board and councils is now stored and shared electronically;
- CLF summer conference for all staff across the federation (over five hundred), hosted at UWE;
- CLF twilights – two have been hosted with an emphasis upon sharing practice and looking beyond the federation to see what changes are taking place within the education system and what the potential implications are for the CLF;
- CLF network meetings- The sessions held so far have included the following:
  - English and maths – sharing year 11 intervention strategies;
  - Humanities – developing a cross CLF project on ‘Bristol, My City’;
  - Arts – steel band workshop and ways to share the artistic talents of the staff and students more widely.

Developments:

- launch of the CLF re-engagement centre – resource for up to twelve students per day, partly sponsored by Rolls Royce;
- the CLF is due to become the local area partnership (LAP) for their part of the city and will be administered by the CLF admin team leader.

Partnership:

- the CLF has supported five secondary schools outside of the federation, sharing expertise and providing additional revenue. This is allocated to the CLF and the academies as additional resource;
- primary partnerships – a range of student-focused projects took place throughout the year which has encouraged local primary schools to join CLF’s primary partnerships programme next year.

Student Engagement:

- student parliament – students from all three academies have met throughout the year and have visited each of the academies and have worked on a project commissioned by the director, children and young people’s services, Bristol City Council, on ‘keeping safe’;
- sports teams – the CLF teams started in January with the combined football team playing three fixtures.

Curriculum:

- CLF English and maths support;
- VI Form open evening at UWE in November 2009 saw over six hundred students and parents attend the event;
• VI Form taster days (L2 and L3) in December 2009 were held at all three academies;
• science and technology – a session took place in the Science Learning Centre@Bristol and looked at ways to advance the STEM theme.

Academy management:
• managed moves (four in 2009/10) involving students between and across all three academies helped to avoid the escalation to expulsion that may have been the end result if the federation had not had this capacity to do this.

4.4.5 Informal Collaborations

Curriculum, exams and teaching and learning and sharing good practice:
• year 7 shared focus day between BBA and JCA students – the theme for the day was ‘About Me’;
• staff from BBA visited JCA to see how photography is being taught in KS4 and post 16;
• JCA ICT staff taught BMA students to support the OCR nationals on Friday afternoons to help BMA students – BBA staff also assisted with the sharing of resources;
• links between the technology faculties at JCA and BBA;
• sharing of resources between JCA and BBA with regard to post-16 psychology courses;
• an English teacher at BMA, introduced a writing tool ‘Hand with Writing’ that he devised for BMA staff with a view to launching to the CLF in September 2011;
• exam access arrangement assessment – a member of staff from BBA carried out assessments at JCA;
• shared expertise when conducting MFL oral exams;
• MFL staff from all three academies attended a meeting to look at possible MFL software that could be installed across the CLF;
• a Polish mentor from BMA supported GCSE Polish in CLF and other partner schools;
• an assistant principal from JCA worked with BMA SLT on curriculum development for 2010-11;
• twilight session between BBA and JCA English staff for A and A* students;
• joint English KS3 moderation session between JCA and BBA staff;
• training session on A Level teaching between BBA and JCA;
• shared EAL English resources from BMA to BBA;
• BBA shared careers conference resources with BMA staff;
• a member of staff from BBA shared resources and supported exam classes in health and social care with colleagues from JCA.

4.4.6 UWE and the Cabot Learning Federation

As a co-sponsor UWE is involved in numerous ways detailed specifically in two case studies to follow.
Where much of this work would have happened due to the nature of the partnerships we have built up with a number of schools, the partnership work achieved through the CLF can be described as being at an ‘enhanced’ level. The following list of activities details some of the keys areas with which UWE was able to assist both in the setting up of the CLF and its development:

- **setting up the CLF** involved particular challenges as it was at an accelerated pace with schools in two local authorities and, in the case of BBA, where one was tied into the Building Schools for the Future programme. This involved complex issues with regard to staff transfer;
- **the legal framework** involved in setting up an academy and federation, at the time, involved many detailed documents, all of which were scrutinised by UWE staff before approval at board level. Documents included: memorandum and articles of association, funding agreement, supplemental funding agreements, school agreement, leases, principal agreement, project agreement, JCA land and construction contract transfers and the due diligence report;
- **strategic advice** was provided throughout the process, the executive principal and other key figures had a number of discussions with UWE colleagues regarding the structure of the proposed CLF and, critically, the communication channels and processes for decisions to be made. A number of colleagues had significant emotional and professional interests in the schools which had to be managed carefully and respectfully;
- **UWE provided contacts** to senior leaders throughout the city to sit as UWE sponsor directors on the board. Careful consideration was given to provide a cross section of industries to best serve the board’s needs;
- **strategic meetings** have taken place, led by UWE’s AVC and then dean of education, with several key leaders throughout the CLF. The AVC has brought in a number of colleagues detailed in forthcoming case studies depending on their relevant expertise;
- **informal advice** was provided by the chair of BBA council and UWE’s AVC both formally and informally in a number of settings throughout the process;
- **federation expansion** was explored regularly. UWE colleagues attended and chaired meetings with various senior stakeholders in the local authority, government and other agencies during a period of significant uncertainty over funding and capacity to fulfil the Hans Price Academy project (the latest school due to join the CLF);
- **promotion of federation and networking** was facilitated, in part, by UWE colleagues as a result of UWE’s reputation in this area of work. The CLF has also been promoted at a number of conferences during key note speeches to audiences including HELOA (Higher Education Liaison Officers Association and the SSAT (Specialist Schools Academy Trust);
- **interviews/performance reviews** involved UWE colleagues who have provided representation on several recruitment and staff remuneration panels;
- **CLF Post-16 federation** has been supported by UWE colleagues who offered guidance for progression to higher education and curriculum provision;
- **attendance at CLF board**. teaching and learning and finance and general purposes committees and considered all items involved in running and supporting three academies.

As the partnership develops new areas of working will be sought. The following case studies describe in more detail the journey to becoming part of the Cabot Learning Federation and the partnership engagement throughout.
4.5 Case Study 5

**School:** Bristol Brunel Academy (BBA)

**Status:** Academy

**Sponsors:** University of the West of England and Rolls Royce

**Authors:** Guy Keith-Miller and Armando Di-Finizio

4.5.1 Context

Bristol Brunel Academy has had an enhanced partnership with UWE since opening in 2007. UWE is a joint sponsor of the Cabot Learning Federation (CLF) with Rolls Royce. Initially, in the context of the partnership with BBA, UWE acted as an ‘education partner’. John Cabot Academy was, at that time, the main education sponsor and, whilst the requirement was to have a financial sponsor, the academy has never had one.

The partnership was born from UWE’s aspiration to drive standards up in Bristol and to provide students with access to creative and innovative curricula that would equip them with the skills for the twenty-first century. This was later embedded as a strategic goal of the university, to ‘raise aspirations and widen participation in higher education through genuine partnership working’.

Before 2007, UWE had been actively involved, albeit in a less formal way, with the predecessor school, Speedwell Technology College (STC), providing a number of enrichment activities and through Guy Keith-Miller’s (who worked in the admissions service at UWE) voluntary role as a governor.

Due to the pressing need to reform STC, various decisions were taken by the local authority which led to the replacement of the governing body with an interim executive board (IEB) that comprised a local councillor, a chartered accountant, an ex headteacher, a senior executive at Bristol City Council, a BBC producer, a primary school chair from the local community and Guy Keith-Miller who provided continuity and the university link. The IEB stabilised the school, researched models of schooling and decided to apply for academy status after receiving an approach from John Cabot Academy. At the time, a large-scale school rebuilding programme (Building Schools for the Future (BSF)), championed by the then Labour government, had already seen four schools in Bristol rebuilt and they were in the later stages of the planning for another four schools including STC. The BSF programme operated within a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) agreement between the local authority and the contractor, in this case, Skanska, which presented a challenge as to how this agreement could work should the application to become an academy (and therefore independent from the local authority) be accepted.

Bristol Brunel Academy was the first BSF school to open in the country, bringing with it the prestige of the then prime minister Gordon Brown and education secretary Ed Balls opening the school, but also the inevitable pressures accompanying the attention.

The project was particularly interesting for UWE as a model of schooling, as there were only a few examples of its kind nationally at that time, whereby a successful school in a neighbouring authority (South Gloucestershire) had ‘buddied up’ to support one that was less successful (but with significant potential to improve). Supporting a school like STC and being actively involved in its development over a number of years to academy status has given, and continues to give, UWE a rich knowledge of different models of schooling and the university is able to actively and positively demonstrate knowledge exchange in a number of ways, to be detailed later.

‘Buddying up’ two schools in neighbouring local authorities in a (then) soft federation (i.e. where both schools retain legal and independent governance from each other), but where one school is sponsoring another carried with it a number of sensitivities amongst the staff, students and community. Every effort was made to promote the individual strengths of each school and to avoid the perception of a ‘take-over’. Press releases, parents’ evenings, staff meetings and numerous governors’ meetings were held in an attempt to carry all stakeholders through what, at times, in the view of key participants, were difficult negotiations. The transition from Speedwell Technology College to Bristol Brunel Academy, as indeed when any new academy is created, brings with it a number of opportunities as well as challenges. A new building, leadership team, board of governors, uniform, ethos and curriculum brought with it ‘quick wins’ and provided a secure footing to build for the future. As education partner, UWE provided advice and guidance throughout via a unique arrangement whereby Guy Keith-Miller would act as a governor, but, by agreement, papers could be shared with senior members at the university who acted as mentors.

The soft federation partnership soon became a hard federation with the inclusion of Bristol Metropolitan College (now Academy) creating the Cabot Learning Federation (CLF) in 2009. Due to UWE’s involvement with BBA and Rolls Royce’s sponsorship of John Cabot Academy, the two organisations decided to jointly sponsor the federation therefore ultimately, on paper, changing the relationship between BBA and UWE.

In the view of the council and Cabot Learning Federation board, the transformation in the school has been nothing short of tremendous. Whilst all would acknowledge that there is still much to do, BBA has proved to be a very successful in a number of areas:

- the number gaining five good GCSEs has risen from 30% in the predecessor school in 2007 to 83% in 2010. For those results including English and maths the percentage has risen from 19% to 45% (2010);
- year 7 admissions have risen from ninety applications in September 2007 to three hundred and forty applications for September 2010. The school, for this first time, heard eight admissions appeals this year (2009/10);
- from the predecessor school being the highest excluding school in Bristol, BBA has made only two permanent exclusions since opening and, with the exception of a few fixed term exclusions in the first month of opening, BBA has made no fixed term exclusions subsequently;
- the May 2010 Ofsted inspection, held under the new framework, limited the overall grade for the academy to satisfactory due to the attainment. However, the vast majority of judgments made were good or outstanding;

• an innovative, personalised curriculum ensures the needs of all students are met not only in terms of those with SEN or behavioural concerns, but also the more able students who are able to progress at their own rate. The current percentage of students on level 5 for English and maths in year 8 is above the national average for students in year 9. The majority of students begin their GCSEs in year 9 with some completing in year 10;
• The community cohesion strategies the academy has adopted has resulted in BBA becoming the ‘school of choice’ for the large Somali community in the area.

The academy opened its post-16 centre in 2008 and the first cohort completed their A Level programmes last year. The number of students applying to higher education is currently small (seventeen) from a cohort of fifty eight. Of that, UWE received applications from ten students. Five of those were offered a place and two have started a course at the university. A priority of the academy and Cabot Learning Federation this year is to enhance the 6th form provision and to raise aspiration and progression to higher education. The team is confident of success and believes that roll numbers will reach capacity next year. From September 2010 post-16 provision has run jointly with the Cabot Learning Federation with students attending programmes of study on all three academy sites.

4.5.2 Nature of partnership

The university’s engagement with BBA has covered a wide range of activities involving key university leaders and a wide range of faculties and services; especially education, admissions and the outreach centre but also marketing, estates, finance and the library. The case study focuses on activities in the following areas: governance; leadership; student engagement including information, advice and guidance (IAG) and widening participation activities; curriculum development; research and knowledge exchange; staff professional development and initial teacher education.

The following sections illustrate some of the successes of the partnership.

4.5.3 Governance

As a sponsor of the Cabot Learning Federation, the university has appointed three members to the CLF board. This includes the assistant vice-chancellor and (the then dean of education) Prof Ron Ritchie, the principal of City of Bristol College, Keith Elliot, and an executive producer from Aardman Animations and chair of the Kingswood Foundation, Heather Wright. The university’s partnership officer and chair of the Higher Education Liaison Officers Association for the south west, Guy Keith-Miller, also sits on the board due to his role as the current chair of the BBA council. The chair of council was also chair of the finance and general purposes committee for the interim executive board, which took over the governance of the predecessor school in its last year. The chair of the council has taken an active role in the academy and has been the main point of contact in developing strong links and partnership working with the university.

The principal and chair meet on a fortnightly basis, where one standing item on the agenda is links with the university. Progress and possible new areas of development are discussed and reviewed. The meetings have proved to be useful p in terms of allowing greater scrutiny of issues discussed at council, being a confidential sounding board in a more informal setting for the principal and allowing the chair to develop a
greater knowledge of the school. Often the chair will join the principal after the meeting in the daily break-time walk. Much can be learnt from watching the interaction between students and staff and it is a valuable exercise.

With the change in structure from governing body to council and the shift from UWE as education partner of BBA to sponsor of the Cabot Learning Federation, a certain degree of transition was necessary whilst an understanding of the changes took place. In fact this process is still underway and the development has been aided by a number of interactions from UWE both during formal strategy meetings and via a CLF conference. The majority of partnership/UWE related matters are discussed and actioned during the principal/chair meetings. However, councillors have, on occasion, asked if BBA is receiving or making the most from its sponsors and if the partnership could be developed further. This has also been discussed during the quarterly chairs’ meetings whereby the chairs of all academies in the Cabot Learning Federation meet to discuss related issues. The meetings are held offsite at Rolls Royce, UWE or the Orchard School Bristol. In addition to the support provided by UWE, Rolls Royce has also provided a senior contact for each academy.

At the last Ofsted inspection, governance was judged to be ‘good’. The BBA council comprises ten volunteers of which five are sponsor nominated and include a leader in the local Somali community, an ex headteacher and current SIP, a general manager in the field of engineering, an ex Speedwell/BBA pupil and a university representative as chair. The other councillors include a parent, a local authority representative and three staff members – one to represent teachers, the other support staff and finally a student advocate. The executive principal and principal also sit on the council. The council currently meets four times a year. Its role is to primarily ensure that the CLF board’s strategic responsibilities are carried out at the academy level and to monitor the outcomes and wellbeing of the staff and students in their academy. The academy council is a sub-committee of the CLF board and is the critical friend of the academy. At each meeting, updates and reports are given from the principal, the chair, the student advocate, the finance director and the executive principal. In addition a ‘big question’ is debated which usually comprises a presentation from a linked member of staff followed by a discussion. Forthcoming big questions include: ‘What are the two main areas of educational provision that are working well that the CLF board should know about?’, ‘What are the strongest network links that the academy has beyond the federation and what are the areas where new or stronger links need to be developed?’, and ‘What have been the benefits for the academy of being a part of the CLF?’. Other critical areas of discussion include:

- progress towards GCSE and post-16 targets;
- progress towards meeting the budget surplus target;
- areas for development identified by Ofsted;
- feedback from the SIP visits;
- academy improvement priorities.

The BBA council is a lively and challenging group and its members are passionate about achieving the best for the academy. Each member is due to be aligned with one key area of the strategic plan both to insure all areas are sufficiently monitored and also to involve councillors in academy life.

The UWE extended partnership is most noticeable in this area and the largest amount of direct resource allocated in the form of the chair’s time. The benefits of the partnership, detailed later, are significant and therefore provide a justification for the resource. The partnership has also provided valuable CPD for both the chair and other members of staff at UWE. Some of the knowledge gathered has been directly
used by the schools and colleges partnership Service to support and aid work in other schools.

4.5.4 Leadership

The first principal at BBA had been vice-principal at the City Academy, Bristol (CAB) and had already developed links with UWE when working with the principal at CAB. These links were further developed at BBA, especially in relation to initial teacher training (ITT), staff development, curriculum development and widening participation (all described in more detail in sections below). In addition to the meetings with the chair of the BBA council, the principal has less frequent meetings with the then dean of education to discuss progress, areas of partnership development and explore new innovation. Other items of discussion have included UWE’s vision and strategy for enhanced school partnerships, promotion of the partnership and potential new partnerships, ITT interviews, professional development, research and evaluation, SSAT research into curriculum development, HEFCE enhanced partnerships project, support in maths through a local business-led organisation called ABLAZE and evaluation of effectiveness of UWE appointed chair of council.

As a result of the strategy meetings, the partnership has developed in a number of ways, BBA staff are now involved in ITT interviews at UWE, the principal has delivered sessions for PGCE trainees, an enterprise event involving PGCE students took place, provision for larger groups of maths and/or English trainees to visit BBA was explored, and contacts were formed and broadened with a number of key UWE staff. The vice-principal with responsibility for teaching and learning and staff development has regularly met with senior colleagues in the school of education to develop strategies for ITT and BBA staff development.

In addition the assistant vice-chancellor (and vice-chair of the CLF) and other UWE colleagues also provide strategic support and guidance for the executive principal of the CLF and the senior leadership team, (comprising the principals of each of the academies) within the CLF, on how best each academy can engage and work with UWE.

4.5.5 Student engagement

Raising the aspirations of students in an area of deprivation has been recognised by BBA council and leadership team as a major priority. This is evident in the many widening participation activities organised within the academy since opening; many in partnership with UWE. BBA students attended Aimhigher events organised by UWE at the university. Separate events have been held for year 9, key stage 4 and post 16 students. BBA also held a year 9 widening participation day which also benefited from UWE staff and assistance.

This year UWE hosted the CLF post-16 open evening. The evening began with a keynote speech by the assistant vice-chancellor. With regards to IAG, UWE has hosted a two-day BBA year 11 conference in its conference centre. It also contributed a number of university staff and students who volunteered to help with various activities during the event. This event has done much, according to senior staff, to raise the aspirations of students especially with regards to applying to university.

BBA also supports the Heading Higher Passport (HHP) scheme which is a structured curriculum enrichment programme, run by UWE, which helps students make the right
decisions before entering higher education. By researching the broad range of aspects that are involved in going to university the scheme aims to aid students to make the right decisions for themselves.

In the early stages the scheme is open to all students attending UWE’s partner schools or colleges irrespective of background. Once a school or college has registered with us, all learners can participate in the scheme. However, only those applying to UWE who are eligible and have completed seven of the HHP objectives can register and gain the benefits of the scheme.

Heading Higher Passport objectives include:
- meet a current HE student;
- research into choosing a course;
- visit a UCAS/ HE convention;
- consider the career implications of the student’s course choice;
- research into choosing a university;
- attend an open day/visit a university;
- attend a subject taster session;
- attend an HE summer school;
- find out how to apply/personal statement preparation;
- research student finance;
- consider budgeting;
- work as a student ambassador or mentor;
- consider study skills.

HHP is delivered in local schools, colleges and UWE and is often supported by schools and colleges’ current enrichment programmes. The intention of the scheme is to offer the opportunity for many learners to gain entry into higher education where they previously may not have considered it or had previously not been able to apply.

Clearly, whilst considerable engagement is happening at all levels within BBA at both the generic partnership level and in terms of enhanced provision, we decided to ask some 6th form students a variety of questions with a view to discovering their views on the partnership.

Whilst it was accepted by the strategic leadership group that it was unlikely that students would be aware of the enhanced partnership activity due to the nature of the work, we wanted to test whether this was important and find out general perceptions about what it meant to have a university sponsor. The discussions spanned two events, the first a formal 1:1 interview with a 6th form student, the second a less formal group discussion with six 6th form students. The following summary picks up the key feelings of both discussions and poses a number of questions.

The students unanimously agreed that having a university partner is beneficial and should be encouraged. In fact some felt that engagement at this level could and should be done with more than one university. Most were aware of the relationship between BBA and UWE, although were not aware of the relationship between UWE and the CLF.

Some students questioned the motives of why a university would want to be a sponsor and how UWE benefited from it aside from the most obvious level of recruiting students. When this was explored, the students felt that engagement must
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http://www.uwe.ac.uk/schoolsandcolleges/heading_higher_passport.shtml

6
be, and be seen to be, deep and wide across the institution as to not be viewed as purely a recruitment drive. This seemed to be especially prevalent for universities that are perceived to have a greater need to recruit than selecting universities.

One student’s views about the perceived contribution from UWE and the possible contribution from a university like Bristol or Oxford followed a very ‘traditional’ line of thought and directly correlated with published league tables and perceived reputation. When questioned about perceptions of sponsorship in the community and how this may affect parental choice at a university, the student deemed the enhanced relationship to be a minor consideration, yet if BBA were sponsored by a ‘more prestigious university’ it was felt that this would become a greater deciding factor. Coupled with the perception of what impact an institution is able to make or knowledge it is able to bring, again the perception followed standard league table assumptions.

At the end of the interview the opportunity arose to question this perception, by explaining that UWE has been praised nationally for its work in this area and is considered a leader in the field. Universities that have traditionally been more recruiting than selecting usually have a greater intake from their local community and therefore are likely to have many years experience of close partnership and often include this centrally in their strategic plan. It is, of course, often perception that matters, and therefore communication of value should be wider spread and permeate through staff to students.

This also raised a discussion regarding a perception that sponsorship of a school by a top-ranking university may increase the chances of progression to that university. Whilst this is not likely to be true, if this is a widely held perception it would give weight to the argument that developed forms of partnership bring with them a risk that applicants from specific schools and colleges will expect to be favoured.

Continuing this discussion regarding the perception of what a university sponsor partner should or does do, raised some interesting points. It was felt that there is a general obligation amongst HEIs to support their local schools, much in line with the previous government’s view that all schools should have a university partner. When ‘support’ was unpicked it was felt that there was a greater obligation for university sponsors to support students in the way many already do and in their areas of direct expertise (admissions related), but also to go beyond this and support students in ways that perhaps would be unexpected – i.e. work with students unlikely to proceed to higher education. When the nature of an enhanced partnership was explained, the students still felt that it was important that the sponsor was visible and engaged in the student body for the relationship to be credible, regardless of the extent of the work ‘behind the scenes’.

Perceived benefits of having a university partner did not uncover anything new, which in some ways mirrors the experience during discussions with some staff about exactly how a partnership between a school and university can be developed. In the view of the chair of council, interaction is usually only limited by resources and lack of knowledge of how each organisation can add best value rather than reluctance to do so. Only when two organisations truly know each other well, can a partnership develop and flourish from what perhaps can feel artificial to something that feels natural. Investment in time on both parts to gauge a firm understanding of each other is critical for the partnership to be of value. Only after this has taken place can new ideas be explored (e.g. support setting up the library).
One suggestion, however, did raise an interesting point about levels of resources, capacity, the ability to support students and the potential for negative reaction should the university be unable to meet demand. A student suggested a drop-in session similar to that of Connexions support students to receive support in writing personal statements etc. A service such as this would be beyond the reach of most, if not all, universities considering the number of schools that are supported and the resources available to universities in this area. However, some thought should be given to raising expectations about what can be delivered and what is able to be delivered once an agreement such as this is made. In all good partnerships a degree of equity is essential and therefore an understanding of each others’ capabilities and capacities is critical.

Consideration should also be given to levels of dependence and ability to sustain provision and the negative impact of withdrawal of a service in a changing climate. The Heading Higher Passport scheme was discussed and welcomed amongst students, but a programme that was designed to help students progress to university, rewarding UCAS points for demonstration of research into higher education, may have developed an unwelcome perception of fostering dependence and a perception of the university acting as a fall-back option rather than being a university of choice.

In answer to a direct question from a student regarding what the university receives from the partnership with BBA we first explored the significant level of knowledge exchange, which cannot and should not be underestimated. When pushed to explain further what is done with the knowledge gained; an interesting discussion arose regarding the nature and equity of the relationship. It could be argued that the strength of the partnership and knowledge to date has been acquired largely on the basis of involvement in various projects rather than an active desire to exchange learning and information. The projects, in the main, have been centred in and around development of the academy. The partnership will reach a further dimension when engagement is based around projects linked more closely with the university. Examples, of course, can be drawn whereby the academy is involved in university projects (i.e. Bloodhound and various engineering enterprises). However, they have yet to develop into the realm of strategic and policy decision making at the most senior level in the university. Representation on UWE’s governing body could be a natural start.

4.5.6 Curriculum development

Following on from the research project carried out at CAB by UWE into the development of project based learning (see CAB case study), the principal used the findings when taking up his new role at BBA to continue the development of this programme; repeating the pilot study initially and then restructuring the curriculum fully. UWE’s media department filmed aspects of the programme which is now used as a learning tool for teachers within the academy and also for trainee teachers enrolled on UWE’s initial teacher education (ITE) secondary post graduate training course.

Since the academy opened UWE has provided curriculum support in maths and English (detailed earlier), master classes and subject tasters in the areas of health and social care, education and teacher training, robotics and artificial intelligence, environmental sciences, arts and humanities and engineering.

Many students have also attended both the year 12 residential UWE summer school and year 10 subject specific summer schools.
4.5.7 Research and knowledge exchange

This area of partnership is still relatively new. Over the past two years BBA and UWE have exchanged knowledge in the following ways:

- the principal has given a lecture to PGCE students describing the changing face of schools and pedagogy in the twenty-first century;
- BBA staff are involved in interviewing UWE ITT students;
- a member of BBA staff was involved in a UWE TDA/Ofsted event on grade criteria.

4.5.8 Staff professional development

Several teaching staff have taken advantage of the range of HE courses on offer to teachers by UWE including:

- CPD – taught non-accredited classes, includes access to library services for middle leaders, NQTs and SENCOs;
- postgraduate professional development (PPD) – ‘School Improvement Through Action Enquiry’ module – accredited and non-accredited;
- MA in education;
- Masters in teaching and learning (MTL).

UWE staff have also benefited from the partnership and have enabled progression and CPD. Following a request from the principal, a middle manager from UWE’s library services aided the setting up of BBA’s library shortly after opening. The chair of BBA and partnership officer at UWE has also gained significant experience during his number of years’ involvement.

4.5.9 Initial Teacher Training

BBA has been a key provider of placements for UWE’s initial teacher education trainees as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>A Placement (short one at the start of the year)</th>
<th>B Placement (main long placement)</th>
<th>C Placement (short placement towards end of the year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BBA has met UWE’s need for further maths and science placements by taking pairs rather than single trainees in those subjects.

BBA provides high quality development for PGCE trainees and supports the delivery of initial teacher education programme. Staff from BBA are involved with the interviewing of potential PGCE trainees and the principal contributes to the delivery of part of the PGCE training programme at UWE.

This two-way relationship has enabled both BBA and UWE to sculpt bespoke and innovative ways to work in collaboration and sustain this partnership. Currently ‘C’ placement PGCE trainees will have the opportunity to finish off their training by
teaching across more than one of the federation’s academies. This will provide much-needed support for year 10 pupils at a crucial time in the year and boost their entry into year 11. By the academies working in collaboration they will be able to deploy trainees to meet the personalised needs of students within BBA and the CLF, providing a bespoke response to the personalised learning agenda.

4.5.10 Other

UWE sponsors BBA’s annual record of achievement event, offering a prize for the most outstanding BBA student of the year. Last year the award was presented by the chair of the council and given to an outstanding student who demonstrated excellence both academically and by her significant contribution to the school community, most notably by winning equipment in the Doodle for Google competition and by providing ideas for the design of the new school. The student is now one of three who is applying this year to Oxbridge. If any are successful they will be the first students in both BBA and STC’s history to gain a place. UWE is providing 1:1 support for these students through mentoring.

UWE provides the venue for the Year 11 careers conference and the annual CLF conference.

4.5.11 Issues/challenges that have arisen with regard to the partnership

In its first year the academy focused primarily on developing its own internal systems and structures and so attempts at partnership with BBA were often frustrated and opportunities often not recognised. This has meant that the pace of partnership development has been slow, but what has happened has been highly effective and has opened the eyes of both institutions with regards to the possibilities and potential of enhanced partnership activities. In addition, working with a large institution can often be a daunting prospect in relation to communications. Although the main UWE contacts with the academy make every effort to ensure all communication is effective, at times opportunities can be lost when the academy works with one faculty without another faculty knowing.

This is a successful relationship that is based on a creative, sustainable and supportive model. As with any new relationship there are inevitable risks that need to be factored in when considering such a partnership. The risk of endorsing untested or controversial government policies and destabilising other schools in the area, potential reputational risks, and the challenge to ensure respectful dialogues, challenge and a genuine exchange of ideas, all need to be considered.

There have been some challenges around capacity, resources, sustainability and expectations.

Capacity and appropriateness has, to a small extent, limited some enterprises. However, this fits with the partnership model that no one provider is able to support in every way. Historically Keele University7 has conducted yearly surveys of staff (teachers and support), students and parents which have proved very beneficial. UWE could support this activity; however it is felt that an independent yearly review is desirable. From time to time, research projects have also been requested to be undertaken, some have been possible, others not. Also, due to TDA funding, UWE is

7 http://www.keele.ac.uk/
able to offer free CPD to teaching staff, yet despite receiving several requests from support staff it has not been possible to extend the offer.

As mentioned as part of the student interviews, careful consideration needs to be given to the level of resources, capacity and ability to support students and the potential for negative reaction should the university be unable to meet demand. It is true to say that one successful and sustainable interaction is better than five poorly resourced and ineffectual interactions and an important aspect of a partnership is the time and space given for both organisations to grow and develop.

The language and expectations used during the setting up of a partnership is also critical to the future relationship. A partnership based on a ‘parent-child’ model (whereby the university acts as the parent) may be effective in some cases, yet the evidence suggests the contrary and it certainly is not the model used in this case. The risk of using this model is a potential for an over dependence on the ‘parent’ or an assumption of provision by the ‘child’; therefore leading ultimately to the ‘parent’ not gaining the recognition that perhaps it should be afforded. To put it another way, a university that has a distant yet regular relationship with a school that provides one intervention per year may be celebrated in the widest sense more than a university that has a deep, resource-heavy relationship with a school, but which is unable to provide everything that is asked for or that the interventions that are given are not afforded the recognition they deserve. This, of course, can be mitigated by regular dialogue and a firm understanding of the nature and extent of the partnership and its inevitable limitations.

It is important to consider, if only to eliminate, the risk of potential conflict of interest within the sponsor organisation itself. A model such as the one at BBA, whereby a very senior member of the university’s leadership team is vice chair of the Cabot Learning Federation board and a less senior UWE employee is chair of the BBA council. The structure invites each academy council to have relative independence and delegated authority from the CLF board and it is the role of chair to represent the views of the council at board level. Regardless of how closely a shared vision or values or communication between colleagues inevitably there will be occasions, when the view of the university will differ from the view of the council. Fortunately, these occasions have been very few and far between. Yet they inevitably arise on decisions of considerable significance to the school whereby, correctly, potential conflict arises from the differing first allegiances to the welfare of the academy or the federation of academies respectively. The difference of view is likely to arise when there is a perception of inequity amongst the academies or it is felt that a decision may lead to this – i.e. moving senior staff from one school to another or adding schools to the federation.

Ultimately, all parties have an overriding interest in the benefit of the students at all academies within the federation and the differing roles and the level of discussion is viewed as part of the role of the sponsors and councillors/directors to scrutinise and act as a critical friend.

Given the capacity limitations already outlined, it is important that mutual benefit is gained and value is added. Ongoing evaluation of the partnership is critical to ensure that the most is gained for all.
4.5.12 Next Steps for the partnership and future aspirations

The academy and UWE recognise that significant opportunities lie ahead. The principal that the school opened with is shortly moving to another academy within the federation and the vice-principal has now taken over as principal. It is likely that this principal will retire in the next few years and therefore it is important that growth of the academy and succession planning for the future is taken into account. This can be a clear benefit to the academy: being involved in the federation offers development opportunities to all levels including the most senior, but retains talent within the federation. Through the chair of BBA, UWE is able to assist in these strategic discussions to enable a seamless transfer when the time arises.

Future partnership activities that are currently under discussion or are in their infancy include:

- co-writing a module(s) in the PGCE course or masters course related to the twenty-first century pedagogy BBA has been developing;
- BBA taking on large numbers of English and maths students for short placements to work in their Phase 1 curriculum with BBA students;
- BBA involved in a SSAT project researching academy and university partnerships;
- UWE research project into tackling homophobia in schools will continue to use BBA as a case study;
- pilot new ITE placements;
- working with primary colleagues who may also join the federation;
- closer collaboration with the CLF 6th form.

The partnership is based on a long-term vision of improvement in all areas and to disseminate what is learnt to others.

4.5.13 Data sources accessed and available

School website

Ofsted
2. www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/display/(id)/120618 May 2010

Other
3. www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/library/bsf voices bristol brunel.jsp
   Partnerships for Schools case study and video
4. www.northgate-managedservices.com/case-studies/study/14/bristol-brunel-academy/ Northgate case study
6. Transcript of interview with Year 12 BBA student September 2010. Recorded with permission, anonymity assured.
4.6 Case Study 6

School: Bristol Metropolitan Academy (BMA)      Status: Academy

Sponsors: University of the West of England and Rolls Royce

Author: Guy Keith-Miller and Stephen Taylor

4.6.1 Introduction

Bristol Metropolitan Academy has had an enhanced partnership with UWE since opening in 2009. The predecessor school, Whitefield Fishponds Community School, was awarded Language College status in 2005. This has been carried through to the academy which is a specialist language school. Whilst there is no formal agreement, BMA shares some of the site with Briarwood\(^8\), a special school for children with disabilities and a city learning centre\(^9\).

Bristol Metropolitan College was the second BSF school to be built in Bristol, following Bristol Brunel Academy (see Case Study 5 above). Designed by WilkinsonEyre Architects, it uses the exemplar learning cluster, or ‘strawberries’ as they are affectionately known, first used at the John Madejski Academy in Reading. In its first year BMA was nominated for the Best Design for a New School\(^10\); in the partnerships for schools awards.

BMA is part of the Cabot Learning Federation (CLF) (see Case Study 4) with two other local academies: Bristol Brunel Academy and John Cabot Academy. All three schools share a sixth form. Although UWE is the sponsor for the CLF as a whole, it has developed individual relationships with each of the academies in the federation.

In 2010 BMA was named as the most improved school in the country and since opening BMA has proved to be very successful in a number of areas:

- the number gaining five A*-C GCSEs has risen from 43% in the predecessor school in 2007 to 85% in 2010 and for five A*-C GCSEs, including English and maths, the percentage has risen from 29% to 39% (2010);
- year 7 Admissions have risen from sixty applications in September 2009 to seventy-six applications for September 2010. This is expected to rise sharply in 2011.
- an innovative, personalised, new curriculum encompassing intensive study, support and targeted revision sessions.
- ambition to reduce exclusions to zero in three years (previously one-hundred-and-seventy-nine, currently forty-one);
- launch of ‘The Metropolitan Way’ an ethos statement and code of behaviour.
- outstanding support for students who don’t have English as a first language, and new arrivals;
- creative and outward looking provision map for supporting students;
- language college specialism with twelve different languages taken at GCSE.

\(^8\) http://www.briarwood.bristol.sch.uk/
\(^9\) http://www.bristolclcs.org.uk/
\(^10\) http://www.p4sawards.org.uk/
4.6.2 Nature of Partnership

The university’s engagement with BMA is relatively new at the ‘enhanced’ level, previously focusing on a variety of outreach activity detailed later. Since BMA joined the CLF senior UWE staff have met with staff at BMA to discuss ways in which the institutions can work closer together and to scope areas of mutual benefit.

The enhanced level partnership was largely born from BMA joining the CLF; however, it also built on a smaller scale existing relationship.

4.6.3 Governance

As a sponsor of the CLF, the university has appointed three members to the CLF board. As detailed in the CLF case study (4) the board has overall legal responsibility for the governance and scrutiny of the academy. This takes place on a number of occasions including formally during board and sub-committee meetings, the CLF conference and 1:1 meetings as well as informally throughout the year. As yet, the university does not have representation on the BMA council, but the three chairs regularly meet to exchange good practice.

4.6.4 Leadership

The principal Stephen Taylor (co-author of this case study) was appointed and took up his post in June 2009, shortly before the opening of the academy. Stephen sees the relationship with the UWE as primarily funnelled through the Cabot Learning Federation representing a part of a larger partnership that we have. Stephen said ‘that means it’s quite well integrated into our thinking and our work, possibly more than in other partnerships that we have, because UWE is CLF sponsor’.

4.6.5 Student Engagement

UWE has worked with BMA and the predecessor school on a number of projects. Students had visited the campus, taken library tours, and been involved in a number of Aimhigher related activities focused around progression to higher education. Both BMA and the predecessor school took many students on the SchoolsLink mentoring and tutoring schemes. Raising the aspirations of students in an area of deprivation has been recognised by the principal as a major priority. The scheme aims to raise personal aspirations and awareness of higher education amongst groups of minority ethnic school students, particularly those of African, African-Caribbean, Asian and mixed heritage.

UWE has provided training space for student training and development. This took place specifically in July 2010, when year 10 students were being prepared for leadership roles in the new ‘vertical tutoring’ system, implemented in September 2010.

Role model tutors work on a regular basis in one of the four local secondary schools participating in the scheme, including BMA. They work with small groups of year 7 and year 8 pupils on pre-planned activities linked with raising aspirations for further and higher education, increasing confidence, self-esteem and motivation, life

---

11 See BBA case study (5)
histories and other relevant topics. Role model tutors also assist with pupils’ visits to the university towards the end of the academic year. They facilitate learning activities and give pupils a tour of the campus to enable them to gain an insight into university life.

A mentoring project links individual school students in year from year 6 to year 11, who may be in danger of not achieving their full potential, to a mentor who will offer one-to-one support outside the classroom. The mentor’s role is to raise the standard of performance of those school students involved in the scheme, who are at risk of not achieving; to help the school student to draw up individual learning plans (ILPs), including targets and timescales; to help school students to acquire and develop study skills in order to improve the effectiveness of their application to their studies.

Several students each year are part of Student Associates Scheme\textsuperscript{12} which is run as a partnership between the department for education and the schools & colleges partnership service at the University of the West of England, and the graduate school of education at the University of Bristol.

In addition, a number of subject specific master classes have been run as part of a GCSE refresher programme. Now that BMA is part of the CLF and therefore has a 6\textsuperscript{th} form provision, UWE will be working with students to enable them to achieve the Heading Higher Passport\textsuperscript{13}.

4.6.6 Research and knowledge exchange

Two planning meetings with senior members of UWE’s education faculty and BMA staff took place to discuss how links can be formed and extended. The principal indicated that he would be interested in further evaluation of the following:

- KS3 developments and roll out of Met Learning to year 8;
- use of ‘vertical grouping’ in year 9/10 in context of delivering KS4 options;
- development of 6\textsuperscript{th} Form;
- impact of ‘vertical tutoring’.

4.6.7 Staff professional development

Since opening, staff have taken some advantage of the range of HE courses on offer to teachers at UWE. BMA has two NQTs, one of which is intending to do UWE’s masters in teaching and learning (MTL)\textsuperscript{14} course. UWE has provided meeting space for staff development and offered to run training events if required.

\textsuperscript{12} http://www.uwe.ac.uk/sascheme/index.shtml
\textsuperscript{13} http://www.uwe.ac.uk/schoolsandcolleges/heading_higher_passport.shtml
\textsuperscript{14} http://www.uwe.ac.uk/library/resources/educ/mtl.htm
4.6.8 Initial Teacher Training

BMA is a significant provider of placements for UWE’s initial teacher education trainees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>A Placement (short placement at beginning of the year)</th>
<th>B Placement (main long placement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An agreement has been sought to at least maintain, if not increase this number in the future and explore the possibility of paired placements.

Further exploration will be undertaken as to the introduction of ‘C’ placements especially in innovative curricula models.

Currently placements subjects have been restricted to English, maths, history and modern foreign languages.

4.6.9 Issues/challenges that have arisen with regard to the partnership

As this is a very new partnership the main challenge has been identifying areas of support and raising awareness of it. The principal has praised the work with year 8, KS3 pupils, and opportunities for work experience in year 10 to visit the campus. He felt that the revision modules, whilst some were effective, others were not necessarily the most useful in terms of time spent, but appreciated that it is very difficult to set up a revision day where one size fits all. He felt the best revision is personalised and most often done at school, but commented that it is very useful for students to see that there are other young people in similar circumstances who have similar challenges. It is important that feedback is given to ensure that the partnership develops productively.

Whilst the principal feels that the current relationship is not equal in the sense of mutual benefit, this is not necessarily a concern or issue. UWE colleagues have commented on the excellent PGCE support provided by BMA and good career prospects for the graduates.

4.6.10 Next Steps for the partnership and future aspirations

A priority for UWE is to build the partnership with BMA to allow the school to benefit from some of the interventions that are afforded to other schools in the federation. Now that BMA has a 6th form (as part of the CLF) this is naturally an area which can be developed. Stephen Taylor felt that he would like to see more of what the university has and also more direct contact between UWE staff and UWE students and BMA students and staff. He would also like to see further and enhanced opportunities for training and professional development as well as self esteem boosting and aspiration encouraging visits.
4.7 Case Study 7

School: Ashton Park School
Status: Co-operative trust
Partners: UWE; the South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust
Author: David James

4.7.1 Introduction

This case presents a brief account of the newest of UWE’s enhanced partnerships. The partnership was formalised in April 2010, when UWE signed an agreement making it one of the founding members of a new trust, the South West Bristol Co-operative Learning Trust. In the following sections there is an overview of how the partnership came about, its nature and character, the current activities of particular interest, and how it is anticipated that the partnership may develop in the next year or two.

4.7.2 Background and origins of the partnership

There are a number of connections, relationships and activities that have had some role in leading to the current arrangements. Firstly, the head of Ashton Park School is an active member of the Bristol Secondary Heads Association and this contributed to his awareness of the relationships that some other secondary schools were developing with UWE in various enhanced partnership arrangements. Secondly, UWE has placed teacher education students with Ashton Park School for a number of years and this is widely regarded as a very successful, mutually beneficial arrangement. Thirdly, a former UWE employee, Roger White, is a longstanding chair of governors of Ashton Park School: Roger has retained close links with UWE since leaving to move into his chief executive officer (CEO) role at ASDAN in 2001. Fourthly, Prof David James (professor of education in the school of education, UWE) was a parent governor from 2000 to 2008 and, during that time, contributed to the preparation of Ashton Park’s successful bid to become a specialist sports college. He also facilitated some staff development on teaching and learning, contributed to governor events that produced a revision of the mission and vision, and carried out a small-scale ‘Trust School Scoping Study’ for the governors in May 2009. This relationship also assisted with Ashton Park’s involvement in research projects. Fifthly, there have been several research activities that have included Ashton Park. For example, the school was recently selected by Bristol City Council as one of four case study schools in a UWE research and development project led by Prof David James and Prof Ron Ritchie. Entitled Secondary Curriculum Development and Innovation in Bristol, the project involves working with groups of staff in learning sets in a small number of schools where it can be expected that other schools might be able to learn from the process. Ashton Park was selected for its successful adaptations of the Opening Minds and Enquiring Minds initiatives. That specific project finished in the autumn of 2010, whilst the development and extension of the curriculum innovations continue.

These points help to explain something of a pre-existing relationship between Ashton Park School and UWE. In contrast to many other arrangements that have developed...
in recent years, the trust itself was the result of a school-based initiative to which the local authority was invited. UWE’s involvement was not in any sense automatic, and it is important to note that the other members of the trust – particularly the primary schools and their governors – also decided that UWE was an appropriate partner. Once an in-principle interest had been declared from both parties, a meeting was held between the head of Ashton Park School, two of the primary heads, and Prof Ron Ritchie (assistant vice-chancellor, partnerships, diversity and civic engagement): UWE’s partnership policy provided the criteria that were used to assess the proposal to weigh up its benefits and degree of affinity with UWE policy.

The other members of the trust are: Luckwell Primary School; Compass Point/South Street School and Children’s Centre; Ashton Vale Primary School; Futurelab; Bristol City Football Club; Bristol City Council; and the Co-operative Group. The anticipated contributions that all these partners are predicted to bring to the trust are fully documented, though they are also expected to develop over time. The combination of primary and secondary schools in a trust is still an unusual arrangement, and there is an insistence here that all the partners are equal – for example, there is no sense in which the secondary school regards itself as a superior partner to the primary schools involved.

The values of the Co-operative movement are also a very important ingredient in the trust, and early discussions of trust partners have acknowledged the significance of these values in an age characterised by the questionable ethical standards of some in the banking industry, in politics and in the corporate world. The Co-operative ‘model’ generates an ethos for working together, but also a helpful set of educational concerns that can frame curricular and pedagogic development. UWE’s department of education is regarded by other trust members as being ‘values-driven’ in a similar way. There is a collective expectation that UWE will assist with research-based insight as well as with influencing the aspirations of young people. The head of Ashton Park School points out that the idea for the trust grew out of ‘lots of conversations and looking for a model that would enhance community cohesion and learning across the age-range’. The idea of a ‘coherent offer’ is important, in that several of the parties involved wish it to be clearer to parents of children who are beginning school that a range of opportunities are built in from the start. This can be understood as an attempt to change the size of the ‘package’ so as to reassure parents who have been made unnecessarily anxious by marketisation of schooling.

4.7.3 Nature of the partnership

As is clear from the above, the nature of UWE’s partnership is that it is one of nine constituent bodies in a co-operative trust. Importantly, this trust includes the local authority, with which UWE has many other relationships. UWE’s representative, Prof David James, was elected chair at the second full meeting of trustees on 13th July 2010. Both Ashton Park and the university have expressed a wish that the trust provides opportunities for a genuinely ‘two-way’ process of exchange. The head recognises that UWE has other kinds of roles in other partnerships and that this experience means it is well positioned to make comparisons, and he anticipates that this capacity will be useful to the school. The trust is the only ‘Co-operative’ one in the region, and may for this reason provide instructive contrasts with other forms of enhanced partnership.
4.7.4 **Current activity**

In these early days, the main activity in the partnership consists of the trustees working out the core meanings of the trust’s purposes and how to translate the general vision and co-operative values into actions. School governors and school staff are doing some of this, too, in dedicated meetings.

4.7.5 **Anticipated development of the partnership**

The head of Ashton Park School sees the potential for growth in what the university does for the school. He sees this as including evaluation and research that will hold up a mirror to practices in the school, but is also anticipating that in time UWE might move into some areas of CPD and pedagogic/staff development. The view of the chair of governors is that the university could be more proactive in encouraging teachers to get involved in research and in finding new ways to make this happen. He also sees UWE as upholding a set of values about education, which could influence developments in the school, perhaps by giving trust members confidence about their direction. Given the community-related ambitions of the trust, the chair of governors also points to scope for the university to change some of the perceptions of universities that are ‘out there’ and this could include parents as well as children.

There may be scope for adding to what already happens to bring school students into contact with the university, and opportunity for raising the aspirations of an even wider group via the link with the university. However, the head also recognises a possibility that in an era of tightened resources, the university could over-extend itself in its partnerships, not least if individual staff members attempt to maintain activity that is not supported by any direct resource.

4.7.6 **Conclusion**

This example of an enhanced partnership in-the-making illustrates some of the scope for exciting and productive work of new kinds, much of which could have a positive impact on learners. However, it also signals some of the dangers. As the chair of governors puts it, there are so many aspects of the school that could become a focus for partnership activity, and it ‘...would be better for the partnership if it was about two or three things. You’ve asked me will it impact on policy, staff, students and so on – if you try to make it all of those, it becomes what school’s about, trying to do too much, would be my observation, – as chair, I would say let’s focus on a few areas here’.
4.8 Case Study 8

School: Merchants’ Academy
Status: Academy
Partners: Society of Merchant Venturers and University of Bristol
Author: Rosamund Sutherland

4.8.1 Introduction

In 2004, the University of Bristol agreed to become a co-sponsor of Merchants’ Academy together with the Society of Merchant Venturers. The university played an active role from the start, with the (then) head of the graduate school Prof Rosamund Sutherland and the registrar Derek Pretty sitting on the project board (the forerunner to the board of governors). Valuable support was also provided by the director of communication, Barry Taylor, and the director of personnel, Guy Gregory. The university developed a partnership with the predecessor school, through a set of action-based research projects and a community research project.

The aim of Merchants’ Academy is to help regenerate Withywood by providing young people in the area with a first-class education, developing their ambition, skills, confidence and potential. The academy specialism, enterprise and skills, aims to provide the academy with its distinctiveness, developing initiative and energy amongst its students and learning, as an organisation, from international best practice and research. The mission of the academy is ‘to develop the ambition, esteem, confidence and potential of each of our students and to widen their horizons, through the provision of a first-class education’.

The academy opened in September 2008 and the following are some of the successes:

- the number of students achieving five A*-C GCSEs in 2010, including English and mathematics, has increased to 25%, representing a 47% improvement against 2009, and marking a significant milestone in the academy’s journey;
- overall, 30% of students achieved ten or more GCSEs at A*-C grade in 2010, and a large number are going onto further education;
- the academy’s specialist BTEC programme was judged as ‘excellent’ by an independent review body;
- a positive Ofsted inspection in June 2010, in which the academy was judged to be ‘making good progress’. The report praised the academy for raising standards of teaching and learning, and found that rates of student progress were accelerating, ‘as a direct result of improved attendance and behaviour, and rapid improvements in the quality of teaching’;
- in a recent parental survey run by Keele University, 94% of parents with children at the academy said that they thought it was a safe and secure environment for their children, and considered standards of student behaviour as high.
The first academy principal, Stephen Kings, retired in August 2010 and was succeeded by the new principal, Anne Burrell.

4.8.2 Background to the partnership

The University of Bristol decided to sponsor the Merchants' Academy in January 2004. The master of the Society of Merchant Venturers had approached the vice-chancellor, Professor Eric Thomas, asking if the university would be a joint sponsor, with the Society of Merchant Venturers. Professor Thomas approached Professor Sutherland (then head of department of the graduate school of education (GSoE)), who was very supportive of the idea because developing closer links with Bristol schools was part of the strategic plan of the GSoE. The decision to sponsor the Merchants' Academy was also strongly influenced by the university’s widening participation agenda and its commitment to engagement with the local community. From an early stage the registrar (Derek Pretty) and head of the graduate school of education (Rosamund Sutherland) were both members of the project board developing the new academy. This involved contributing to strategic thinking about:

- building design;
- curriculum and use of ICT for teaching and learning;
- ICT infrastructure;
- appointment of principal and other staff;
- ‘Making the Difference’ paper;
- post 16 – and decision to run the International Baccalaureate.

4.8.3 The origins of the partnership

The invitation to become a joint sponsor of the Merchants' Academy was timely because the VC Professor Eric Thomas was committed to enhancing the engagement of the university with the local community and the then head of the graduate school of education professor Rosamund Sutherland had explicitly made enhanced partnership with local schools a strategic objective of the GSoE. From the outset the intention was that sponsorship would involve links between the academy and all aspects of the university. The importance of building a relationship with the community and the predecessor school was recognised and to this end the preliminary phase of the partnership was characterised by a range of activities that included:

- work experience of BTEC ‘catering’ students at the university;
- community project that centred around the use of play-back theatre to elicit the communities’ experiences of learning at school;
- action research projects involving collaboration between staff from the predecessor school with staff from the GSoE;
- VC involvement in prize-giving;
- undergraduate involvement in student mentoring.

These working relationships were strengthened and broadened with the appointment of the principal Stephen Kings in April 2008. Stephen Kings has made an important contribution to the University of Bristol’s local schools and colleges forum, which directly addresses the widening participation agenda.
4.8.4 Nature of the partnership

As discussed above the partnership involves the whole university and this includes:

- three university members of the governing body, one of these chairing the education sub-committee;
- work experience for students in academic departments and in areas such as catering and gardening;
- visiting fellowship status for a range of staff, which provides access to the library and other facilities;
- teachers studying for masters-level degrees;
- academic links between university departments and the academy;
- partnership related to initial teacher education programme;
- mentoring of post-16 students and in particular those considering university education;
- programme for gifted and talented students;
- two-way exchange between colleagues at the university and the academy to enhance the widening partnership agenda.

In addition the university provides advice on marketing, finance and HR when appropriate. Considerable emphasis is placed on supporting colleagues from Merchants’ Academy to develop networks with University of Bristol colleagues. For example, two social events have been organised in which a range of staff from the academy have met the following colleagues from the university: the registrar and assistant registrar; university secretary; head of library services; head of the international office; director of education, medicine & dentistry; pro-vice chancellor; director of widening participation; director of communication & marketing, director of Chemlabs; residential services manager; director of ILRT; members of departments/schools of: anatomy, physiology and pharmacology, mathematics, English, electrical & electronic engineering, biological sciences, geographical sciences, school of chemistry, historical studies, biochemistry, medical sciences, law, politics, oral & dental science, policy studies.

4.8.5 Governance

There are three University of Bristol governors on the governing body:

- registrar Derek Pretty (now replaced by deputy registrar, Lynn Robinson);
- Prof Rosamund Sutherland (chair of education sub-committee);
- Chris Wilmore (sits on enterprise sub-committee).

In the view of the first principal Stephen Kings the university involvement in the academy is important because ‘it is a state funded organisation, it’s educationally based, and colleagues understand the stresses and strains that are going on within the school’.

The governing body functions as a whole and the university governors work collaboratively with parent governors, teacher governors and Merchant Venturers governors. The 2010 Ofsted inspection made the following statement about the governing body as a whole:

‘The governing body is particularly well-informed and have an excellent understanding of the role of the academy, its strengths and areas for development. Their analytical focus on raising achievement is very clear and
their commitment to the students is unquestionable. For example, governors reward student progress by taking them out for a meal in a top restaurant, to a special football match or on a trip to London. Regular meetings between governors and key staff ensure that the board have a realistic view of the progress being made by the academy. Governors work hard to engage the full support of parents and the local community. With close connections to the world of business and higher education in Bristol, the governors are fully committed to ensuring that the students are well prepared to contribute positively to the local community when they leave school.'

Each academy governor links to one area of the curriculum and Stephen Kings believes that the links made by Professor Sutherland with the mathematics department have had a substantial impact on the academy. The following is an excerpt of the Dec 2009 report of this link:

'Much of my work with the mathematics team has involved introducing them to Lynn Churchman, an ex HMI in mathematics and currently in charge of mathematics education at the ARK Academies. I have known Lynn Churchman for some years, and have worked closely with her in my role as chair of the Joint Mathematical Council of the UK. I had met her in London in the summer of 2008 (before the opening of Merchants’ Academy) to discuss the strategies she has put in place to raise attainment in mathematics within the ARK Academies (mathematics is their specialism). At my first meeting with Richard Cormack and Phillipa Rouet in Oct 08 I discussed with them the work of the ARK schools. Lynn visited Bristol in Dec 08 to meet with Richard Cormack, Phillipa Rouet and Stephen Kings. At this meeting she discussed the work of the mathematics team at Merchants’ Academy and communicated some of the approaches she was developing with the ARK schools. It was agreed that Lynn would be able to give four days of consultancy work (through the SSAT) to working with the Merchants’ Academy mathematics team.

On May 1st 2009 three members of the mathematics team visited Evelyn Grace Academy in London to investigate the approaches being used by this ARK Academy to raise attainment in mathematics. Major outcomes from this visit included:

- introduction to Renaissance learning. Richard Cormack to consider with team if it is applicable to Merchants’ Academy;
- Lynn Churchman to provide access to the Yr 7 Passport Maths. Richard Cormack and team to consider use within Yr 7 / Yr 8 catch up programmes;
- Lynn Churchman to pass on contacts for Method Maths. Maths team to introduce and use with KS4 students;
- Richard Cormack and team to develop flight path pilot – we discussed production of termly outline with annual flight path displayed on back. He and team to explore IT based production and monitoring of flight path.’

Importantly there is concrete evidence from ARK schools that students can progress well beyond Fischer Family Trust predictions of progress in mathematics.

4.8.6 Leadership

The first principal, Stephen Kings, was appointed in April 2008, and members of the university were on the appointment panel, as was the case when the 2nd principal was appointed in 2010. From the beginning, Stephen Kings was made a university fellow and in the early days he worked from office space in the graduate school of education. This made it easy for him to have informal meetings with colleagues in the
university (for example the head of widening participation, Lucy Collins, who later worked with Stephen to set up the student parliament).

Stephen Kings was very clear about the priorities for the academy within the first two years, and these related to improving student behaviour and achievement. The focus was on building a strong team of staff and a new culture of learning amongst students. Stephen created a flat management structure with a strong focus on distributed leadership and devolved responsibility.

The following is an excerpt from the 2010 Ofsted report:

‘The impact of very effective leadership from the principal and his team of senior leaders are reflected in the significant improvements made so far. The principal has been highly influential in creating an inclusive ethos from which derives a cohesive school that is developing strong local links. He has won the confidence of staff, students and other stakeholders and this has been crucial in taking forward the academy’s vision for the future. Senior leaders have had a notable impact on raising the quality of teaching and learning and improving attitudes and behaviour. They provide a clear direction to the academy’s work. Very challenging targets have been set to raise attainment and improve attendance. The leadership team demonstrates the capacity to deliver further improvements. Middle leaders are increasingly engaged in the monitoring work of others in their departments and are proud that their opinions are valued and appreciated’.

4.8.7 Student engagement

The head of widening participation, Lucy Collins, worked with Stephen Kings to establish an academy student parliament. The parliament provides a mechanism by which students can be directly involved in the running of the academy. The elected representatives are able to influence policy on teaching and learning, the structure of the school day, and the appointment of new staff.

Other aspects of student engagement include:
- work placements for students;
- student visits to academic departments;
- programme for gifted and talented students;
- involvement of year 9 students from predecessor school in community project;
- links with Chemlabs;
- drama project (using Play Back Theatre) with Prof Martin Hughes.

4.8.8 Curriculum development/teaching and learning

Each governor links with an area of the curriculum, working with the head of the curriculum area on the curriculum development plan. Reports of these links feed into the education sub-committee.

Prof Rosamund Sutherland was supportive of the decision to introduce the International Baccalaureate (IB) as the academic qualification for years 12 and 13. This has influenced the development of a passport and learner profile for all students, which relates to learner skills specified by the IB middle years programme.
4.8.9  **Research and knowledge exchange**

Merchants’ Academy has been a partner in several research and development projects (for example the transition from primary to secondary school project, the home-school knowledge exchange project, Hewlett Packard ICT in science education project, development project with Chile). The plan is to expand such partnerships over the next few years.

4.8.10  **Staff professional development**

Several teachers are studying for the University of Bristol masters programme. The plan is to expand this professional development in the next few years. Since the opening of the academy a number of newly qualified teachers who were trained on the University of Bristol PGCE programme and have been appointed to the academy. These teachers work with GSoE colleagues on the NQT programme.

4.8.11  **Initial teacher training**

The number of University of Bristol students placed at Merchants’ Academy is growing with the partnership as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.12  **Other**

In general the University of Bristol's sponsorship of Merchants’ Academy is having an impact on:
- university's widening participation strategy and practice;
- the GSoE’s strategy for working in partnership with local schools;
- theoretical work of colleagues in the university on issues of social justice and leadership in schools.

4.8.13  **Issues/challenges that have arisen with regard to the partnership**

The challenge is to develop a partnership that is sustained into the future, and exists beyond what has been set up by key players. The chair of council, the university governors and members of the academy leadership team are in the process of developing a strategic plan for the next 10/20 years. Not all colleagues at the University of Bristol are fully aware of the significance of the partnership and a challenge is to raise this awareness in 2010/2011, with the support of the director of communications. Ideas include: senior management of university holding away-day meetings at Merchants’ Academy; a special open day at the University of Bristol for students and staff from Merchants’ Academy.
4.8.14 Next steps for the partnership(s) and future aspirations

The university aims to:

- ensure the partnership is sustainable;
- ensure that all members of the university know about the partnership;
- develop a sustainable professional development programme for staff at the academy;
- exploit the potential for collaborative research and development projects;
- develop stronger links with the local community.

4.8.15 Lessons learnt from which others can benefit

It is taking time for colleagues at the University of Bristol to understand the role of the university as a sponsor of Merchants’ Academy. However, there has been no resistance to the idea of the university as a sponsor of the academy and in general colleagues are very willing to support the strengthening of maintained education in the city. In many respects the link with Merchants’ Academy has also strengthened the link between the University of Bristol and the local authority, and has also had knock-on effects on the widening participation agenda of the university. Whereas in the beginning phase of the sponsorship it has been important for key players to take the lead, it is clear that a more strategic partnership has to evolve for long term sustainability.

The first principal, Stephen Kings, considered that it was important in the first two years of setting up the academy to focus on building a strong team of staff and this required prioritising a relatively inward focus. However, as the Merchants’ Academy develops as a strong school the potential of the university partnership will increasingly be able to be exploited.

4.8.16 Data sources accessed

1. School website
2. Merchants’ Academy prospectus
3. Sixth form prospectus
4. Ofsted
   http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxcare_providers/urn_search?urn=135597&type=2
5. Transcript of interview with principal
6. Transcript of interview with head of post-16
7. Minutes of Education Sub-Committee
Chapter 5 The nature and meaning of enhanced partnership

The eight case studies in Chapter 4 vary in respect of their precise nature, the emphasis placed on different activities, and the timescale of their development. Seven are based on UWE partnerships and one (Case Study 8) on the University of Bristol. The discussion below has an inevitable focus on UWE practice given the number of enhanced partnerships with which they are involved. Despite the variation in the cases, it is possible to compare the cases and identify a number of features that are present in all or most partnerships or those which appear to be particularly significant in more than one. This chapter begins with an identification of these features. We then turn to an examination of the meaning of enhanced partnerships.

5.1 Common features including impact on schools

5.1.1 General features

All of the enhanced partnerships featured illustrate sustained partnerships, based on formal agreements that are seen as strategic and institution-wide. All provide evidence of improving schools being supported in a variety of ways by their university partners.

Key features of the UWE partnerships are:
- based on explicit UWE mission and strategy (see Appendix 3 & 4);
- evaluated before establishment using explicit and validated criteria (see Appendix 5);
- implemented in an open and transparent way with other schools, local authority officers and members and government departments;
- supported by a UWE infrastructure;
- led by a senior member of the vice-chancellor’s executive team;
- have involved both self-selecting schools (Case Studies (CSs) 1, 2 & 7) and ‘interventions’ as a result of external pressures (CSs 3, 5 & 6).

5.1.2 Governance and strategy

As argued later in this chapter, governance is probably the area in which the difference between ‘partnership’ and ‘enhanced partnership’ is most visible. The case studies show evidence of significant impact from UWE and the University of Bristol on governance of schools through:
- strategic decisions about composition of governing bodies (especially Trust in Learning schools – CSs 2 & 3), including supporting chairs with local connections;
- identification of key university staff as governors (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 & 8);
- support for self-identifying UWE staff who are governors (CSs 3 & 5);
- direct contribution of key staff on governing bodies (CSs 1, 2, 3, 5 & 8);
• influence on non-university governors, especially with regard to issues related to social justice (CSs 1, 2, 3 & 5);
• facilitating joint governor meetings (CSs 2 & 3);
• mentoring of university governors (CS 5);
• direct impact on parents’ councils (CSs 2 & 3).

A great deal of value was placed by schools on how a joint responsibility for strategy gave a close association with the university and with specific university people, and how this gave heads/principals and bodies involved in governance a greater confidence in their decisions and direction of travel. This is not quite summed up by the term ‘a strategic role’, and might be better described as the university assisting schools or groups of schools with the courage to be more self-determining.

5.1.3 Leadership

There is evidence of impact from university colleagues on school leadership in the following ways:
• support for individual heads/chief execs, especially through confidential one-to-one meetings with key UWE colleagues (CSs 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 & 8);
• support for leadership teams through funded projects (CS 3);
• opportunities for middle leaders to have their work accredited (CSs 1, 2 & 3);
• strategic meetings to plan university-wide support (CSs 2, 3, 5 & 6);
• confidence to be self-determining (see 5.1.2 above).

5.1.4 Student engagement

There is evidence of the positive effects of university-led engagements with pupils in the schools aimed at raising aspirations and achievements:
• visits by school students to the universities for a range of purposes;
• REACH data for all UWE enhanced partnership schools;
• impact of specific interventions (for example, CS 3);
• university student mentors;
• the symbolic and cultural effects of a visible connection with universities, particularly in its effect on student aspirations and horizons or perceptions of pathways. More specifically, several heads pointed to dramatic increases in the proportion of young people going to university or considering going to university, and they partially attributed this to the partnership itself.

5.1.5 Curriculum development

There have been many specific contributions to curriculum development made ‘on the back of’ an enhanced partnership. Examples include:
• university staff facilitating a learning set as part of a LA-funded project focused on EP schools (CSs 1, 2, 5 & 7);
• schools commissioning a specific piece of research (for example, CSs 5 & 8);
• university assistance with the development of part of the curriculum;
• Impact through governors (CSs 1, 2, 3, 7 & 8);
• university education dept-led interventions (CSs 1, 5, 6 & 8).
5.1.6 Research and knowledge exchange

Enhanced partnerships have provided opportunities for:

- disseminating and demonstrating the impact of research (CS1 – HEFCE-funded Project);
- sites for research (CSs 1, 2, 5, 7 & 8);
- case studies to support UWE staff conference inputs and research (CSs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6).

5.1.7 Staff professional development

Enhanced partnerships provide a structure in which opportunities for accredited and recognised continuing professional development become more accessible and affordable from the point of view of schools and individual teachers. This is highly valued by school heads/principals. Enhanced partnerships have provided positive impact in schools through:

- postgraduate professional development work, especially valued in CAB, where significant numbers of teachers have benefitted (CS1);
- EP schools becoming key partners for UWE in delivery of the masters in teaching and learning (CSs 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6);
- federations becoming key providers of local CPD (CS 1 & 4).

5.1.8 Initial teacher education

Schools in enhanced partnership are generally established providers of ITE placements, although the provision of these placements becomes more difficult to maintain when schools are facing challenging circumstances. There have been tensions related to the ‘value-added’ by EPs with regard to ITE placements as far as some UWE colleagues are concerned, as offers of placements have not always been as many as hoped for, usually as a result of school-based perceptions about the potential impact on results (not evidenced in practice). Positive aspects have included:

- the presence of training teachers, which schools value for its positive contribution to the learning culture of the school (CSs 1 & 7);
- involvement of EP school staff on ITE curriculum developments (CSs 1, 5 & 6);
- challenges to develop ITE models from the development of new models of curriculum and school organisation (for example, CS 1 and ITE related to all-through schools).

It should be noted that enhanced partnerships are not designed to promote exclusive partnerships with specific HEIs regarding initial teacher education. Most EP schools are working with more than one HEI as ITE partners.

5.1.9 Other positive features

Enhanced partnerships have also been characterised by:

- opportunities (for schools and the universities) to influence national and local policy (through, for example, providing evidence to a select committee and engaging with key LA officers re strategic discussions);
- significant positive profiling for the universities through local and national media (evidenced from coverage of all EPs);
• support to schools from specific services within UWE such as finance (CS1), communications and marketing (CSs 1, 2 & 3), estates (CS1);
• a focus for engagement with many other organisations, for example with the Merchant Venturers (CSs1 & 8), City of Bristol College (CSs 2 & 3), Rolls Royce (CSs 4, 5 & 6), Bristol City Football Club (CSs 1 & 7).

5.1.10 Benefits to HEIs

There are a number of benefits for HEIs that emerge from the cases (and that were validated through the project’s advisory group).

By way of context for the following, we recognise that schools and people working in schools (staff and students) are specific sites for knowledge production and practice development. They provide context-embedded understandings and skills related to the development of young people’s wellbeing, engagement, aspiration, attainment, achievement and progression, as well as ways of working with families and communities. Productive partnership activities between schools and HE partners necessitate acknowledgement that educational theory and practice are developed in both organisational settings, but can be enhanced through respectful dialogue between the two.

Specifically, we see the benefits to HEIs of enhanced partnerships to include:
• promotion of HEI and opportunities on offer to potential students and their families, especially those from backgrounds under-represented in HE;
• enabling HEIs to reach out much further into communities with low levels of participation in tertiary education, thereby enhancing HEIs’ profile within the communities in question;
• influence on vision, policy and strategy
  o critical friendship for HEI leaders from senior school leaders and others;
  o local committee representation at departmental, faculty and university level;
  o local and regional – e.g. school influence on HEI contribution to LA strategic fora;
  o national – e.g. school influence on HEI contribution to national agencies and policy;
• school staff contribution to HEI programmes;
• school staff contribution to HEI staff development/seminars/conferences;
• school staff as participants in HEI programmes;
• schools as sites for research/knowledge exchange;
• schools as sites for disseminating research and demonstrating impact;
• schools and school staff as sources of data/case studies/vignettes/information/material for publications for local (with students) and wider use;
• schools as partners for bidding for external funding;
• school staff as co-researchers;
• schools as providers of placements and support for students on such placements;
• schools as sites for volunteers from HEI (student and staff);
• schools as sites for HEI programmes;
• opportunities for individuals to make civic contribution;
• opportunities for new forms of engagement with communities;
• opportunities for engagement in school networks, including LA;
• encouragement for HEI faculties/departments/services to collaborate and learn about each other’s activities;
• profiling of HEI through school-initiated local and national media coverage of EP.

5.1.11 Challenging features

Our interviews with heads/principals and chairs of governors produced surprisingly few comments expressing any concerns or tensions in the experiences to date, with only two points being expressed strongly. The first was that where a partnership with a university primarily widened participation by raising awareness and aspirations, this may not do much to help the numerical majority of students who were not achieving the five A*-C GCSE qualifications needed for progression to programmes that lead to higher education. Indeed, it could be argued that a greater university ‘presence’ of this kind could induce a greater sense of failure if there is insufficient recognition and celebration of other kinds of achievement and other routes to study and employment. However, it is worth noting that, in another school, a head applauded ‘the university’s work targeted towards vulnerable kids’, and noted the impact of this work.

The second concern, voiced by two respondents, was the view that by ‘getting involved in more and more trust schools and academies’, a university might ‘get to the point where they were over-committing themselves’. There was recognition that university staff had put in a great deal of time and could be trying to do too much, to be ‘all things to all people’, and that this ran the risk of over-extending a finite resource that would be best used in a targeted manner.

Overall, the cases and the detail and evidence behind them suggest that there are four areas in which the building and development of enhanced partnerships might meet particular challenges. These are:

• strategic engagement with school leadership teams;
• negotiating the balance between school-led and university-led aspects of initial teacher education;
• the level of resource required. EPs are complex and time consuming, especially for key staff involved;
• coping with rapid changes in the policy context, which continually re-cast the institutional and governance possibilities in the educational landscape. For example, at the time of writing, there is the possibility that a new government will not support the trust school model in future.

5.2 The meaning of enhanced partnership

5.2.1 New concepts of partnership

The term ‘partnership’ has broad connotations. This is both useful (in that it can function as widely inclusive of different interests and agendas) and problematic (in that it is hard to ‘pin down’). We must also take into account that like ‘learning’ or ‘progress’, a term like ‘partnership’ has an automatic positive and consensual implication. As several writers have noted, the fact that everyone is in favour of partnership could itself obscure crucial differences of interest and power in the real world (see for example Slack, 2004).

In attempting to develop a rounded appreciation of contemporary university/school partnerships, it is worth acknowledging the recent history of the term in education
policy. Some trace the rise of the term ‘partnership’ in education to Conservative policy in the 1980s and 1990s, in particular the Conservative’s ‘belief in the capacity of the private sector to show public sector organisations the way to run their operations’ (Foskett, 2005: 252). New Labour retained but adapted this feature. Their twenty five Education Action Zones, set up in 1998-9 with an over-arching objective of raising standards in disadvantaged areas, introduced a new concept of partnership. EAZs were not just ways of promoting greater collaboration between groups of schools (which of course had been effectively forced to compete by most key policies); they were also a new forum for public/private partnerships. Where some previous initiatives had attempted to harmonise the delivery of education with the interests of business, the partnership of EAZs went a step further, ‘…to bring the resources and capabilities supposedly possessed by business directly to bear on a broad educational agenda organized around objectives of social cohesion as well as economic productivity. “Partnership” is a term inflected in various ways, but one of its central current meanings refers to this process of government-shaped, business-active, community-oriented support and rescue’ (Jones & Bird, 2000: 492).

For Jones and Bird, this notion of partnership, ‘erasing the line between “public” and “private”’, was ‘at the heart of New Labour’s vision of Government’ (: 429).

In this report we focus on developments situated over a decade later and, although there are many similarities in the ideas driving government policy, there have been further significant shifts in the policy context that (as we noted in the Context section 3.1) have contributed to the forms of partnership detailed in this report. The meaning of ‘partnership’ has been further refined. For example, HEFCE and the Learning and Skills Council produced a joint ‘Partnerships for Progression’ consultation (HEFCE, 2001) which took the longer-term policy objective of widening participation and argued for a shift from ‘supply’ to ‘demand’ in strategies to meet it (see Lewis, 2002). A few years before, the Fryer Report of 1997 had signalled this as a desirable policy direction (Murphy, 2002). With schools, the development of academies (embodying private sponsorship) and the development of trusts (often including several schools, private companies and other organisations) have given rise to new opportunities and new capacities for providers to act independently. Our study suggests that they also give rise to new needs, and that enhanced partnerships with higher education are one way in which these new needs are being addressed. For all their variety, the partnerships represented by the cases are all the result of local decisions to initiate or strengthen specific relationships and, once in place, new partnerships entail the identification of new visions, goals and needs. In contrast to the implications of the EAZ policy, the examples detailed in this report appear to be characterised by expectations of equality between the partner organisations.

One substantial set of needs is created by the separations that occur when a maintained school becomes an academy, a process in which there is actual or anticipated disconnection from the local authority and many of the different forms of support that it characteristically provides. Some of these forms of support are replaced in a simple fashion (e.g. a contract with a specialist provider of a service), but others are slower to emerge or not immediately apparent. Our data suggest that substantial areas of work covered by school/university enhanced partnerships have large overlap with what local authorities do (or did) for schools. These include direct and indirect enhancement of aspects of the curriculum, practices and opportunities for staff development, the capacity and arrangements for governance, and enhancing the confidence of leaders. These are all matters that remain of central concern to local authorities, but new school/university relationships have provided opportunities to identify them afresh and then, to some extent, meet them in new arrangements.
In several of our school-based interviews, respondents said or implied that a now hectic rate of change in the policies, agencies and requirements placed on schools was in contrast to their perception of a slower pace of change for universities. They presented this as being a benefit rather than a difficulty. One chair of governors described a process whereby a university link provided a fortnightly opportunity to meet with the head and sift through the many requests, suggestions and approaches coming in to the school and choose which to ignore or reject, and which to follow up. Partnership here seemed to include the university having a strong advisory function that a school or a trust could tap into as required, and both parties saw the relationship as helping to prevent ‘initiative fatigue’. In several other interviews a view was expressed that a university was a ‘trusted brand’ or that it might provide some stability in times when everything else seemed to change so rapidly. This is an important expectation, since it implies that university support has in some respects replaced that traditionally provided by local authorities. It is perhaps worth adding that the perception of a university as a place set apart from social and economic turbulence would not be a view shared by many of those working inside higher education.

5.2.2 Partnership, enhanced partnership and governance

Our data also suggest that there is an important difference between ‘partnership’ and ‘enhanced partnership’. These two terms could be conceived as on a continuum, but they may be best considered to be hierarchically related. We suggest that ‘partnership’ is best used to describe the arrangements and surrounding relationships for a number of well-established functions including one or more of the following:

- teacher education placements;
- forms of university outreach work;
- Aimhigher and other WP initiatives;
- mentoring of school students by university students;
- continuing professional development for teachers on favourable terms;
- voluntary schemes such as those to support reading in schools;
- specific arrangements with research and/or development objectives.

These functions could all vary greatly in how they are carried out, and how rich, generative or democratic (or alternatively, how perfunctory) the relationship supporting them turns out to be.

Rather than being at the other end of a continuum from these tasks as operations or functions, ‘enhanced partnership’ might best be conceived as another layer or sphere which encompasses the first but has another – in some ways, superior – set of purposes. So whilst there will be significant functional activity of the sort outlined above, in enhanced partnership there is also a significant strategic dimension in which the school and university are formally related in governance terms – for example through sponsorship of an academy, or the instigation and membership of a trust. The expectations of all parties are correspondingly different to those of partnerships with only a functional raison d’etre. Our data show that (not least from the point of view of schools) enhanced partnership is indeed recognised as distinctive and is seen to be characterised by:

- proactive and visible engagement in governance;
- the generation and/or development of new governance arrangements and capacity;
- critical friendship to leadership teams;
- a pervading sense of equality amongst partners;
- the expectation that the association with a university is a stabilising force.
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5.2.3 Enhanced partnership, university mission and social change

Several school heads and chairs of governors made reference to the values-driven nature of the people and structures with which they had contact in the university. As one head put it, 'The really nice thing about UWE is that it has this social and corporate responsibility for Bristol education – that's why I like it – it has this duty to support and widen participation and lifelong learning'. Other school-based responses identified a thorough commitment to widening participation in HE and a genuine interest in social justice which drove a concern to help schools to provide the best quality of education to all the young people in the region. Thus, values were seen both (a) as something to explain the productivity of a partnership, and (b) as a way of explaining the degree of affinity between the key parties. A possible 'enlightened self interest' (whereby a university could form partnerships to help itself to secure a supply of future students) was also mentioned by two people interviewed, but they both suggested this was a minor factor.

The idea of a university realising such values is an interesting and important dimension of enhanced partnership. Silver (2007) discusses the relationships between universities and local and regional communities from an historical perspective, noting that from the nineteenth century to the present, universities have generally been 'responsive' rather than engaged in 'explicitly pursuing social change'. Silver also cites a paper by Weinberg (2002) which sets out some American examples, and notes that whilst social engagement was not new, ‘... the novelty in these cases arose from the university having altered its normal operating principle, elevating social change from "a by-product of some process to a core product". From a service provision model the institutions had developed new models of “changing the community by empowering it in relevant political arenas”...Crucial to these examples is their explicit commitment to some form of social change.' (Silver, 2007: 544-5).

By contrast, ‘The main aim of British higher education institutions in this connection has been one of support, either of the status quo or of externally determined change. It produced the eighteenth-century gentleman, the nineteenth-century administrator, the twentieth century professional. Higher education endeavours were focused on appropriate supply and improvement.' (ibid : 548).

Of course, there are very different expectations and contexts between higher education institutions in England and the USA. In the latter, it is to some extent possible to speak of a university/community partnership 'movement' which is reaching 'maturity' and which realises elements of a longstanding 'service' mission, especially in urban settings (see Maurrasse, 2002). In the context of English education, there is no shortage of examples of various forms of engagement between university education departments and primary and secondary schools, consortia of schools, or groups of professionals, often rooted in the work of Lawrence Stenhouse or in action research models (see e.g. Elliott 1998). There are particularly impressive examples of schools and higher education working together to generate deep reflection on strengths and weaknesses, in processes connected to (but deliberately separated and insulated from) Ofsted requirements to self-evaluate (see for example Durrant et al, 2004). Yet even these cases do not depend on long-term commitments between the main parties.
In the cases documented in this report, it is clear that there is also a social project on the part of the university which is longer-term and which partnerships with schools helps to realise. Whilst both the activities and the values driving them are far from unique, the formation of relationships of the sort detailed in this report, through which the activities and values are given expression, does appear to be unusual. In the case of UWE it appears to represent continuity in relation to a longstanding policy of regional engagement championed by a former vice-chancellor, in which schools provided many of the strands of the web of connections. Currently for UWE, enhanced partnership contributes to the realisation of an institutional mission to foster public engagement and to facilitate knowledge exchange. Enhanced partnership can be seen as an expression of the vision approved by the governors (see Appendix 4), and UWE’s published detail on enhanced partnerships includes a list of criteria against which new proposals are judged. The first item on this list concerns values, and asks: ‘To what extent is the partnership congruent with our values, especially those related to social justice, and our strategic aims, including those related to our work with local authorities and other agencies?’

A further criterion asks: ‘To what extent will the alliance/partnership make a distinct contribution to the education/skill base, economic well-being and social cohesion of the City of Bristol and/or other localities within the surrounding region/sub-region?’

Much of the level of activity detailed in the cases continues and, whilst UWE is co-ordinating a new effort to raise financial sponsorship to support family/school relationships, a new and more stringent economic climate raises difficult questions about what types of activity are sustainable in the longer term.

One useful way perhaps to conceptualise the context for sustainable action between schools and universities through enhanced partnerships, even through periods of economic challenge, would be through a consideration of alignment of different forms of capital in support of institutional missions. Caldwell and Spinks in their study of school improvement (2008) identify that for transformation to happen in schools, there must be organisational alignment of four forms of capital in the service of all students: intellectual capital (knowledge and skills), social capital (formal and informal partnerships and networks, based on mutual support, reciprocity and trust), spiritual capital (moral purpose, ethics and values) and financial capital (monetary resources), underpinned by outstanding governance (formal decision-making processes of the school and their interaction with civil society). This report evidences in a number of ways that enhanced partnerships between universities and schools can contribute to, and are dependent upon, the building of such forms of capital. In addition, we have shown the importance of developing ‘relational capital’ to facilitate the effective development of other aspects of enhanced partnership practices.
Chapter 6 Conclusion

This report documents the development of a series of partnerships between universities and schools in Bristol. The relationships examined vary in terms of original focus and the trajectory of their development, and they represent a wide range of types of school and indeed the governance arrangements in which schools are located.

The report suggests that amidst this diversity, there are many trends and themes that are worthy of note. Here we would wish to emphasise six of these as being most important, on the grounds that they appear to be the most pivotal for consideration if other schools and universities are weighing up potential partnership arrangements.

Firstly, we would suggest that there is an important distinction between ‘partnership’ and ‘enhanced partnership’, and that this is a qualitative difference rather than simply a question of degree. Enhanced partnership encompasses activities such as those that can be found in many partnership arrangements, but has a strong governance dimension as well, which can translate readily into both strategic and operational actions.

The cases indicate that in the context of enhanced partnerships, universities should consider:

- developing a robust set of criteria to use to evaluate development of particular partnerships and to review those partnerships in operation;
- articulating for stakeholders the potential benefits to schools partners and to the HEIs of enhanced partnerships;
- explicit leadership of such partnerships at a senior level in the institution;
- an appropriate infrastructure for supporting partnerships as institutional-wide and involving a range of faculties and professional services;
- explicit allocation of resource to support the work.

Secondly, and contrary to the spirit and letter of much earlier policy promoting partnerships in education, we have found that the structures and practices of enhanced partnerships contain no trace of an assumed superiority of ‘private business’. It is more common to find explicit declarations of the equality of the partners and their mutual dependence.

This leads to a recommendation that enhanced partnerships be initiated and developed through open and transparent dialogue with the schools themselves and with other stakeholders. Developing dialogic relations depends upon creating and sustaining respectful and relational practices within which differences as much as similarities between partners can be explored for mutual benefit.

Thirdly, our data suggests that enhanced partnership has had (and continues to have) positive impact on schools and school improvement, not least in terms of:

- student achievement as conventionally measured;
- aspects of school leadership and governance;
- student engagement;
- curriculum development;
- staff professional development.

In addition, we have noted examples of joint positive impact on schools and universities with respect to:
- research and knowledge exchange;
- initial teacher education;
- community engagement.

This leads to a recommendation that strategic planning of partnerships (in dialogue between partners) that address the dimensions above should be encouraged. It also suggests that a range of HEI stakeholders across different disciplines and services may need to be engaged. A forum in which such stakeholders can meet and exchange ideas about practices is desirable (as in the case of UWE’s schools and colleges partnership group, discussed in Chapter 2).

**Fourthly**, the study indicates the importance of university missions and values – not only in terms of partnership per se, but also in terms of having particular values and a sense of responsibility, a ‘social project’ that seeks social change in certain specified areas. Though common in North America, this is, historically speaking, an unusual feature in English higher education. If the analysis of Olssen and Peters (2005) is correct, and there is an increasing need for universities as institutions to demonstrate to governments the depth of their contribution to the knowledge economy in a neoliberal environment, enhanced partnerships may be a way of doing this that is in keeping with a sense of commitment to the local and regional community.

This suggests that universities should consider developing and seeking approval for institutional-wide vision/mission statements and strategies for such partnerships, linked to key institutional aims, from which institutional-wide action can be planned. It also suggests that such statements, related to enhanced partnerships, should make the values that underpin them explicit.

**Fifthly**, the study provides evidence of how the alignment of different forms of capital through enhanced partnerships can be supportive of institutional missions and makes the case for the importance of doing so, especially in times of economic challenge.

**Finally**, the study has revealed that enhanced partnerships have involved a great deal of time and energy on the part of all parties, and especially certain key individuals who have promoted certain developments and inspired others. Whilst undoubtedly productive, this volume, breadth and level of reliance on key individuals represents a considerable resource. The ways of working represented by the case studies may become less sustainable in a time of cuts in public expenditure.

Such ways of working are also dependent on government policy continuing to value and validate the potential role of universities in supporting school improvement agendas.
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Abbreviations

AVC Assistant Vice-Chancellor
BBA Bristol Brunel Academy
BIS Business, Innovation and Skills
BLC Bridge Learning Campus
BMA Bristol Metropolitan Academy
BME Black and Minority Ethnic
BSF Building Schools for the Future
BTEC Business and Technology Education Council
CAB City Academy Bristol
CCTs Co-operative College-led Trusts
CEO Chief Executive Officer
CLF Cabot Learning Federation
CoBC City of Bristol College
CPD Continuing Professional Development
CS Case Study
CVA Contextual Value Added
DBIS Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2009- )
DCSF Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007-10)
DFE Department for Education (1992-95; 2010- )
DFES Department for Education and Skills (2001-07)
DIUS Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (2007-09)
EAL English as an Additional Language
ECM Every Child Matters
EPs Enhanced Partnerships
GCSE General Certificate of Secondary Education
GSoE Graduate School of Education
HE Higher Education
HEFCE Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEIs Higher Education Institutions
HELOA Higher Education Liaison Officers Association
HERDA Higher Education Regional Development Agency
HHP Heading Higher Passport
HR Human Resources
HoF Head of Finance
IAG Information, Advice and Guidance
IB International Baccalaureate
ICT Information and Communications Technology
IEB Interim Executive Board
ILP Individual Learning Plan
IMD Index of Multiple Deprivation
INSET In-service Education for Teachers
ITT/E Initial Teacher Training/Education
JCA John Cabot Academy
LA Local Authority
MA Master of Arts
MFL Modern Foreign Languages
MTL Masters in Teaching and Learning
NFSS New Fosseway Special School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NQTs</td>
<td>Newly Qualified Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCR</td>
<td>Oxford, Cambridge and Royal Society for Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>Professional Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>Private Funding Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Personal Professional Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTS</td>
<td>Qualified Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAICS</td>
<td>Raising Achievement in City Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;KE</td>
<td>Research and Knowledge Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEF</td>
<td>Self Evaluation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCO</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAT</td>
<td>Special Schools and Academies Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>Speedwell Technology College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Training Development Agency (for Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Trust in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUPE</td>
<td>Transfer of Understanding (Protection of Employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCET</td>
<td>Universities’ Council for the Education of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAS</td>
<td>Universities and Colleges Admission Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUK</td>
<td>Universities UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWE</td>
<td>University of the West of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLE</td>
<td>Virtual Learning Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Widening Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVLLN</td>
<td>Western Vocational Lifelong Learning Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP</td>
<td>Young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 1: Composition of Bristol City Council and brief history of issues related to local authority support for Bristol state schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Lib Dem</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership of Bristol City Council

Jun 2009 – Present: Liberal Democrat Majority

Feb 2009 – Jun 2009: Liberal Democrat Minority

2007 – 2009: Labour Minority (As 2nd largest party, supported by Cons. Party)

2005 – 2007: Liberal Democrat Minority

2004 – 2005: Labour Minority

2003 – 2004: All-party administration

1996 – 2003: Labour Majority

History of leadership of education in Bristol to 2006 (quotes from Ofsted reports)

Bristol City Council was established on 1 April 1996, on the dissolution of Avon County Council. The majority political party from its formation was Labour. Richard Riddell was appointed as the first chief education officer/director of education.

The new local education authority was inspected by Ofsted for the first time in 1999, when the council was found ‘not successfully exercising its functions for raising standards in schools’.
It was inspected again in 2001 and at that time the inspectors found ‘some momentum had been generated and the majority of the LEA’s functions were carried out satisfactorily; nevertheless, significant weaknesses remained in a number of important areas, and the council’s capacity to sustain improvement was in doubt’ (Ofsted, 2001).

Richard Riddell resigned in early 2002. Labour had been in control of the city council throughout his period of office. An interim director of education, Simon Jenkin, was appointed.

As a consequence of the 2001 inspection, the Bristol Education Partnership Board was set up, chaired by Geoff Whitty (director of the Institute of Education), as a joint venture between the council and central government, with a remit to offer strategic advice to the LEA.

The Audit Commission’s Comprehensive Performance Assessment for education, published in December 2002, gave the education service one star (a low category) for performance because strategic management, and the low performance of schools, formed part of the assessment. Based on the previous inspection, weaknesses in the education service’s capacity to make further improvement were indicated by its one star rating for improvement.

The partnership board, according to Ofsted (2003), proved a highly successful catalyst for change. It claimed that the interim director of education (Simon Jenkin) ‘had done much to identify what needed to be done, and began to establish the fundamental change in culture needed to do it’.

2002 saw a change in the leadership of the council which, according to Ofsted (2003), brought about significant improvements in elected members’ relationship with schools.

John Gaskin was appointed as the new director of education and lifelong learning in September 2002.

A further inspection in 2003 found ‘much has happened to improve matters over the past two years. Priorities are clear, and there is now no doubt that Bristol is ‘a city where learning comes first’. The new director’s leadership was said to be ‘impressive and resolute in his determination to improve education in Bristol, and has been crucial in securing the confidence of all those involved in education’. That report signalled that ‘improvement has accelerated in recent months, and aspiration, cautious optimism, and a growing sense of collective responsibility for improvement are displacing despondency in schools’ (Ofsted, 2003).

Ofsted went on to report that ‘The LEA has demonstrated its capability to face up to, and to deal with, its weaknesses. Strategic direction is now much improved, and leadership considerably strengthened. Weaknesses in school leadership and management are now confronted. Stakeholders are much more involved in council and education decision making, which is now better informed. headteachers had regained a degree of confidence in the leadership of elected members, but following local elections in May 2003, a change in the political balance of the council has left them anxious about the future. As the partnership board comes to an end, a cross-party agreement for continued support for collaborative working between senior officers and members, and for further strengthening corporate decision making, is wholly appropriate in ensuring that gains are not lost.’
The City Council established an Education and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Commission in 2003 and this became a Children’s Services Scrutiny Commission in 2005.

Since 2003, no single political party has had an overall majority on Bristol City Council. Following a period when various political parties shared control. Liberal Democrats currently (2006) lead the council as a minority administration.

In 2004, the Audit Commission’s Comprehensive Performance Assessment for education gave the education service a two star (lower) rating.

Heather Tomlinson was appointed as the new director of education in September 2004 (the fourth director in three years) after John Gaskin unexpectedly resigned. She was appointed as director of children’s services, responsible for integrated services for children and young people, in April 2006.

In 2006 Ofsted reported on a Joint Area Review conducted in December 2005/January 2006.

Heather Tomlinson resigned in December 2008 and was replaced by Annie Hudson (previously director of adult social services in Bristol).

**Ofsted reports on Bristol since 2006**

These inspections are the outcome of children’s services inspections carried out by Ofsted in partnership with other Government agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAA: annual rating of council children’s services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The annual rating of the council’s children’s services contributes significantly to the managing performance theme and the overall score for the council’s CAA organisational assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest CAA: annual rating of council children’s services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating as pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAA: Ofsted local authority performance profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The profile informs the annual rating of the council’s children’s services. It draws together findings from across Ofsted inspections and the performance indicators for children and young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest CAA: Ofsted local authority performance profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile as pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unannounced inspection

These short inspections focus on front-line practice and processes for children in need and children who may be in need of protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Unannounced inspection</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unannounced inspection as pdf</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>01/10/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safeguarding and looked after children inspection

These inspections focus on evaluating outcomes for looked after children and safeguarding outcomes for all children and young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Safeguarding and looked after children inspection</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding and looked after children inspection as pdf</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24/05/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Performance Assessment (APA)

An APA assesses the council’s contribution to improving the lives of children and young people through its education and social care functions, and covers other services as relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Annual Performance Assessment (APA)</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Assessment as pdf</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17/12/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Performance Assessment (APA) Toolkit

These are the APA performance indicators that contributed to the assessments given to local authorities on their services for children and young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Annual Performance Assessment (APA) Toolkit</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Performance Assessment Toolkit as pdf</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21/01/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tellus2

Tellus2 is a survey of children and young people across England, which asks for their views about their local area, and includes questions covering the five Every Child Matters outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Tellus2</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The JAR describes the outcomes achieved by children and young people growing up in the area and evaluates the way local services, taken together, contribute to their well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Joint Area Review (JAR)</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The JAR describes the outcomes achieved by children and young people growing up in the area and evaluates the way local services, taken together, contribute to their well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Joint Area Review (JAR)</th>
<th>Inspection Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Area Review – Children and young people as pdf</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11/04/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Progress of UWE-supported schools at KS4

(scores in bold are achieved during UWE enhanced partnership)

**Five A*-C GCSEs incl English and maths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Improvement since opening/UWE link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17% (since 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Park</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any five A*-C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Improvement since opening/UWE link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32% (since 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Park</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: UWE’s vision and mission

Our vision is to be the UK’s best Knowledge and Learning Partnership University.

Our mission is to make a positive difference to our students, business and society.

Our ethos of genuine partnership working enables U+WE to successfully promote and drive opportunity, social justice, creativity and innovation.

Together U+WE will INSPIRE

Our focus:

- **Innovation** – to pioneer and advance in all we do. We will be connected, engaged and enterprising.

- **Nurturing talent** – to provide an excellent staff experience. We will encourage development and value excellence across the broad range of activities that are important at UWE. We will make sure we achieve this in a healthy and sustainable working environment.

- **Student experience** – to provide an excellent student experience. We will be the best for student representation; the best for preparing graduates for work and life after graduation; and the best for supporting student learning and wellbeing in a vibrant, healthy and sustainable learning environment.

- **Participation** – to raise aspirations and widen participation in higher education. We will engage and excite learners with the opportunities of an innovative and dynamic university experience.

- **Internationalisation** – to be globally connected through our staff, students and curriculum. We will be a regional university with a strong global outlook. We will provide international opportunities, and experience for our students and staff, both at home and abroad.

- **Research** – to produce world-class research in areas of growth. We will engage in research that is relevant to society and which feeds back into our learning, teaching, and knowledge exchange.

- **Exchange** – to make knowledge exchange and public engagement thrive throughout the university. We will ensure we are a first-rate partner for businesses, the public-sector and communities. We will work with our partners to produce choices and solutions for today, and for tomorrow’s world.
Appendix 4: UWE vision and strategy for schools and college partnerships

UWE schools and college partnership strategy
2009/10 – 2010/11

This document sets out a vision and strategy to develop a cohesive and collaborative model of engagement with schools and colleges in the south west region which aims to:

- make a distinctive contribution to changes in learner identity and attainment;
- support the raising of aspirations at key transition points of the learner progression journey;
- facilitate progression to UWE Bristol for learners with the potential to benefit from its undergraduate programmes;
- enhance learner retention, completion and success rates;
- learn from schools and colleges to inform academic portfolio and student experience;
- enhance the university’s local and national reputation.

The vision and strategy statement can be found at: http://www.uwe.ac.uk/schoolsandcolleges/vision-strategy.shtml

Overall responsibility for the implementation of this strategy will lie with Professor Ron Ritchie, assistant vice-chancellor, schools and college partnerships.

The implementation of the policy will be overseen by the schools and college partnership group which will report to the university learning, teaching and assessment committee.
## Appendix 5: UWE criteria for new enhanced partnerships

What follows is a set of suggested factors we use to inform the decision making process regarding the desirability or otherwise of any proposed alliance or partnership, which build on those which have been used to date, for example in the context of initial teacher education partnerships.

### Factors for consideration

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rationale for the alliance or partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the partnership congruent with our values, especially those related to social justice, and our strategic aims including those related to our work with local authorities and other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the rationale for the alliance/partnership clearly defined, focused on a common purpose and built, where appropriate, on existing links?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is this rationale shared and understood by all parties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Values and attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the articulated values of the partner institutions complementary?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is there a joint commitment at the highest level for the link to succeed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is there a willingness to share experience, expertise, information, resources, risks and rewards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is there the capacity for a culture of shared trust and openness to be nurtured within the alliance/partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the alliance/partnership appropriately inclusive and representative of all stakeholders' interests?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Costs and benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have partners taken a measured approach to the proposed alliance/partnership through a careful and balanced assessment of its costs and benefits, and the risks and challenges associated with particular developments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the proposed partnership impact on existing partnerships with other schools and colleges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the relationship have a positive impact on admission to UWE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is there strong political and executive support/leadership for the alliance/partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is there clarity over roles, responsibilities and expectations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Added value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the alliance/partnership raise the university and partner profile locally, regionally and nationally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the alliance/partnership make a distinct contribution to the education/skill base, economic wellbeing and social cohesion of the City of Bristol and/or other localities within the surrounding region/sub-region?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent will the alliance/partnership provide a real step change in existing arrangements with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school/college and create a more sustainable structure for collaborative working?

- To what extent will the alliance/partnership make a positive contribution to the school/college improvement plan in respect of aspirations, attainment and progression?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership make a distinct contribution to the university’s strategic objectives, especially in the areas of knowledge exchange and research?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership benefit from, or add to, the university’s professional expertise in matters of governance and leadership; professional development for staff; learning teaching and assessment; information, advice and guidance (IAG) and curriculum enrichment?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership strengthen and support existing WP activity aimed at helping to raise students’ aspirations for post-16 study and higher education?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership build on and support the university’s strategic priority of maximising access and progression and making its programmes available to a more diverse student body?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership benefit from the university’s HHP scheme which provides a targeted cohort of young people with insight, knowledge, advice and support, leading to a guaranteed, differentiated offer?
- To what extent will the university benefit from the professional expertise of school/college staff?
- Impact in relation to equalities and diversities?

6 Resources

- To what extent and how will the alliance/partnership be resourced to achieve its objectives?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership generate income for all partners?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership support diversification of university income?

7 Outcomes

- To what extent will the alliance/partnership deliver clearly articulated outcomes?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership be able to deliver early successes/achievements?
- To what extent will the alliance/partnership monitor and evaluate delivery and value for money and evaluate?

Process for agreeing ‘enhanced’ partnerships

Proposals for new ‘enhanced’ partnerships will be channelled through Ron Ritchie, who will seek advice, where appropriate, from the schools and colleges partnership group and, where necessary, approval from the university management group. Subsets of the criteria above will be used as appropriate to the particular partnership. Risks associated with enhanced partnerships will also inform decisions.
## Appendix 6: Mapping of forms of school-HEI partnerships in Bristol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>LA partner</th>
<th>Business partner(s)</th>
<th>Other partners</th>
<th>FE part.</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Student engagement</th>
<th>Curriculum development</th>
<th>IAG / WP</th>
<th>Research &amp; KE</th>
<th>Prof. development</th>
<th>ITT</th>
<th>Eg – in some cases, predicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy – single school</td>
<td>UWE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BATH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy – single school</td>
<td>UOB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple (Merchants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanam Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy – single school</td>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchants Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy – multiple schools, local</td>
<td>UWE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large company (Rolls Royce)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabot Learning Federation BEAUMANICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic – independent School</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol Cathedral Choir School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust – federated schools – all through</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridget Learning Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croxhall School Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust – single school – Co-op model</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaminster Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust – multiple schools across phase – Co-op model</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol City Football Club</td>
<td>Partnership, Co-operative, Children's Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashton Park and partner schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community school</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church School</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary Redcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE partnerships</td>
<td>UOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UWE Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 7: Enhanced partnerships contextual information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Ashton Park School</th>
<th>Bridge Learning Camp</th>
<th>Bristol Broad Acad</th>
<th>Bristol Metropolitan A</th>
<th>City Academy</th>
<th>Merchants Acad.</th>
<th>Orchard School</th>
<th>Bristol LA average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Contextual information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School population (at age)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students qualifying for free school meals</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch for Ambitious intervention-Ac</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch for Ambitious intervention-Bc</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhanced partnerships: key stage 4 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Ashton Park School</th>
<th>Bridge Learning Camp</th>
<th>Bristol Broad Acad</th>
<th>Bristol Metropolitan A</th>
<th>City Academy</th>
<th>Merchant's Academy</th>
<th>Orchard School</th>
<th>Bristol LA average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Key Stage 4 achievement and attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students enrolled</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students at end of KS4</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KES results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students with Level 2 (5+ A*-C) including English and maths</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students achieving Level 1 (5+ A*-C)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students achieving level 1 (5+ A*-C)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students achieving at least 1 qualification</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total point score per pupil</td>
<td>354.6</td>
<td>380.7</td>
<td>452.1</td>
<td>341.2</td>
<td>325.1</td>
<td>417.3</td>
<td>354.2</td>
<td>365.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected progress from KS2 to KS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students making expected level of progress in English</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students making expected level of progress in maths</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% overall absence</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% persistent absence</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhanced partnerships: key stage 5 results and year 11 leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Action Park School</th>
<th>Blundon Learning Campus</th>
<th>Bristol Diesel ACE</th>
<th>Bristol Metropolitan A</th>
<th>City Academy</th>
<th>Merchant Academy</th>
<th>Orkney School</th>
<th>Bristol 11+ average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>455.2</td>
<td>457.2</td>
<td>458.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>531.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>205.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4 to 5 value added score</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Year 11 leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Year 11 Leavers</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>125</th>
<th>127</th>
<th>129</th>
<th>131</th>
<th>133</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>137</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>143</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% FE</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 5+A* Form</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 5+ BGC</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 5+ WELD</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NEET</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** denotes 'not applicable' or 'not available'

Data sources:

- DCSF school performance tables (KS4 and KS5) 2007 - 2009
- DCSF School Census Autumn 2009
- Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2007 (Overall Score)
# Appendix 8: Resource library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Page</th>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Title of Publication</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Date of publication</th>
<th>Weblink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>John Bird and Won Ching Yee</td>
<td>From compacts to consortia: a study of partnerships involving schools, college and HEIs</td>
<td>University of the West of England, Bristol</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td><a href="http://www.elibrary.co.uk/hook-search/detail?pid=5883446955&amp;browse=1&amp;qwork=24653778&amp;qset=1&amp;page=1">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Baroness Warwick</td>
<td>White paper on social mobility</td>
<td>Universities UK</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><a href="http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Chris Croucher</td>
<td>Nature and extent of pre-entry initiatives aimed at encouraging young people from local schools and colleges to participate in higher education.</td>
<td>University of the West of England, Bristol</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uwe.ac.uk">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
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