The School Improvement Partnership Programme:

Using Collaboration and Enquiry to Tackle Educational Inequity

Phase 1 Report to Education Scotland
November 2014

**Chapman, C., Lowden, K., Chestnutt, H.,
Hall, S., McKinney, S., Hulme, M. and Watters, N.**

Disclaimer

Please note that the views contained in this report are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of Education Scotland.

Contents

Executive summary

In November 2013 Education Scotland commissioned the Robert Owen Centre for Education Change at The University of Glasgow to evaluate and support the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) for the first year of its implementation. The overall objectives for the evaluation support for SIPP were as follows:

- To provide tailored support to up to 10 individual partnership projects which are part of the SIPP;

- To assess how well the overall SIPP, and each individual partnership project within it, have been initiated;

- To assess the extent to which the SIPP has contributed to its intended intermediate outcome;

    and

- To make recommendations for the future development and potential scale-up of the SIPP.

The collaborative improvement strategies that underpin the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) aim to build on a body of international research that confirms the value of school-to-school networking and cross-authority partnership work as key levers of innovation and system improvement (e.g. Chapman and Hadfield, 2010; Fullan 2013). Such research demonstrates that the most effective school improvements are locally owned and led by teachers and school leaders working in partnership and collaboration with like-minded professionals.

Core principles that underpin the Programme are:

- Partnership work across schools and local authorities with a focus on exploring specific issues relating to educational inequity;

- The use of Action Research and evidence to identify key challenges, experiment with innovative practices and monitor developments;

- The creation of leadership opportunities and professional learning of staff at all levels;

- A commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit for all involved;

- The development of arrangements to support long-term collaboration and new approaches to capacity building;

- Explicit links to strategic improvement planning in schools and local authorities;

- The involvement of a diverse range of partners including schools, local authorities, Education Scotland and other agencies.

Guided by these overarching principles, the projects across the SIPP take into

consideration in their conception, design and evaluation, the needs of children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. This long-term and challenging activity is undertaken working in partnership with Local Authorities (education and other services), Education Scotland, University of Glasgow researchers and other relevant partners in order to assess the needs of targeted pupils, develop appropriate data-informed approaches and evaluate impact.

To date, SIPP has focused on eight partnership projects in different locations across Scotland. A number of professional networks have emerged within and across the SIPP partnerships. All partnerships have the common feature of tackling inequality but have taken this forward in different ways. Some involve collaboration within a local authority and others involve schools from different authorities. Some involve partnerships from the same phase of schooling while others are cross phase. Some have a tight focus on teaching and learning whilst involving multi-agency approaches but all have the common feature of focusing on tackling educational inequality. The key feature that spans all partnerships is the targeted focus on improving outcomes for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Research methodology

The research adopted a number of interlinked quantitative and qualitative methods including:

- Two surveys of the key representatives from all SIPP partnerships;
- Secondary analysis of partnerships' own data and materials on progress and impact;
- Individual interviews and focus group discussions across the partnerships;
- Researcher observation during support visits to schools and events;
- Evaluation feedback from monthly drop-in events/surgeries hosted by the research team at the University of Glasgow.

Summary of findings

How well was each project and the overall programme initiated?

- Most partnerships took time to develop and agree their proposals with Education Scotland. The setting up of Partnerships has been typified by professional dialogue and professional involvement. School staff and other partner professionals were substantially more likely than parents and pupils to have been engaged in tasks associated with the setting up of the SIPP.

- Feedback from local authority representatives and teachers attending national events and research support visits indicated that the programme had been well supported and well conducted at local and national levels. As the various partnership projects matured, partnership members found that organisational issues improved as roles and lines of communication became better established.

Did teachers build effective working relationships, and what factors supported or inhibited this?

- The SIPP initiative has facilitated greater professional dialogue, collegiality and networking across professionals involved in the partnerships. This has helped drive the work of the partnerships and led to sharing of ideas and practice relevant to the specific project aims as well as broader teaching and learning. Ninety percent or more of survey respondents indicated that: collaborative working across the Partnership increased collegiality between colleagues and created more opportunities for teachers to share their ideas and plans with colleagues.

- Respondents have increasingly noted that the University team and Education Scotland have been major sources of support in the development of their Partnership.

What forms of collaboration were most and least effective in identifying a focus for partnership projects?

- Staff indicated that working teams, constituted to develop the various SIPP projects and activities within each partnership, were important in promoting the sharing of ideas for teaching associated with the SIPP aims and also helped develop new skills, including research capacity and leadership opportunities. This process also promoted confidence and motivation among teachers.

- Research support events facilitated by the local authorities, the University, and Education Scotland staff were seen as valuable support for helping partnerships to develop their collaborative enquiry capacity.

- The National SIPP events provided those involved in SIPP initiatives with opportunities for cross partnership sharing of ideas and demonstration of progress.

Did teachers have an increased understanding of evaluation, and what factors supported or inhibited this?

- The research team observed a high level of teacher engagement with the collaborative enquiry process in operationalising their specific partnership plans. Despite varying levels of research expertise and experience, the surveys revealed an increase in teachers' understanding and use of research and enquiry in their practice.

- Teachers' accounts, gathered during national and local events, focus groups and interviews, highlighted the role of the University team in helping to develop their capacity and skills regarding collaborative enquiry.

Did teachers find out more about leadership development, opportunities to take on new roles and responsibilities, and effective teaching and learning approaches?

- More than half of survey respondents indicated that SIPP had a positive impact on leadership opportunities and developments within their Partnerships. Ninety-three percent of respondents also indicated that the Partnership had promoted a commitment to developing leadership opportunities in their school.

Do teachers have an increased understanding of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and student outcomes?

- There was a clear indication from the surveys that partnerships had begun to positively impact on teachers' understanding of disadvantage and aspects of the inequality agenda. Eighty-two percent of respondents reported that the Partnership had encouraged a focus on closing the achievement gap while just over three quarters (76%) agreed that the initiative had also fostered a commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit for all involved.

Are teachers using more effective teaching and learning approaches with learners from disadvantaged backgrounds?

- A majority of survey respondents indicated that the Partnership had increased the extent of teacher networks addressing inequality in education and had begun implementing more approaches to address inequality in education across schools.

- However, there are still notable proportions of respondents indicating that awareness of strategies to address educational inequality and disadvantage and related teaching and learning approaches require attention. This reflects partnerships' levels of development given their different starting dates and also the complex nature of understanding and tackling educational inequality.

Impact on pupils

- To date, impact on pupils has been less evident than in other activities associated with SIPP developments. This is unsurprising given the longer -term nature of this objective. However, there were some indications from survey respondents that partnership stakeholders believed their work was beginning to have an impact on pupils.

Conclusions

Partnerships are at differing stages in their development and this is reflected in their individual narratives and progress to date. Establishing partnerships involving different local authorities, schools and other stakeholders is a complex process, particularly when the focus of the SIPP is to impact on educational inequality. It is not surprising then, that the partnerships have often taken time to become established and develop their strategies and activities.

However, the external evaluation and teachers' own enquiry provides encouraging evidence that, even at a relatively early stage in its development,

the SIPP is making a demonstrable impact regarding the majority of its stated objectives. The most apparent progress has been partnerships establishing collaborative networks that have supported teachers' learning and teaching approaches in addressing inequality as well as their ability to integrate research and enquiry to assess progress and inform developments.

While impact on learners is less easy to evidence at this stage, those partnerships that have been established longer and have focussed on particular interventions or approaches are reporting that their measures are making a difference. For example, those partnerships that have applied particular models and approaches in learning and teaching to enhance the achievement and attainment of disadvantaged primary pupils and have integrated evaluation into these measures are able to demonstrate impact and explain reasons for this impact.

While still in its early stages, emerging evidence from within SIPP combined with the literature which underpins this approach suggests that, with further support combined with longer-term strategic planning, the SIPP has an increasingly important role to play in supporting national efforts to combat educational inequity.

Our findings are largely positive, particularly given the relatively short period of time. However, there are particular aspects of the Programme that require careful attention in order to fully achieve its objectives. In particular, our findings indicate that the partnerships need to further develop their awareness and capacity to explicitly address the inequality in their strategies and to increase the extent to which pupils and parents/ carers are consulted and involved in the collaborative process of project conception and construction.

Recommendations

In light of the above findings and conclusions we recommend that the SIPP should receive further investment to support the deepening of existing partnerships and to extend the Programme's reach across the system through the initiation of a number of new partnerships. Specifically we recommend that

Programme level recommendations

- Further develop practitioners' expertise in a range of collaborative enquiry methods within the partnerships.

- Encourage continued and systematic monitoring of progress at individual partnership level to evidence impact of the collaborative enquiry.

- Engage learners, parents/ carers and other stakeholders in the SIPP process consultation and decision-making and in taking forward strategies that address local needs.

- Ensure partnerships continue to develop a greater range of methods for evidencing impact on student outcomes for learners from disadvantaged settings.

6

Agency level recommendations

- Education Scotland should focus on developing its strategic perspective on the Programme.
- Education Scotland should play a key role in supporting coherence, making linkages between the SIPP and other policy initiatives.
- Education Scotland has a key role to play in work with SCEL to use the SIPP as a key mechanism to build leadership capacity within the system.
- Education Scotland should develop a coherent set of guidance materials and associated tools to provide an overarching framework that supports collaborative enquiry in schools and partnerships.
- Education Scotland should ensure that partnerships have access to a range of high quality and proportionate external support from their Local Authority colleagues, the University team and Education Scotland.
- Education Scotland should develop a coordinated virtual learning environment that connects the partnerships together.

Recommendations for the System

- Ensure early identification and mobilisation of individuals at different levels who are well placed to lead and manage educational change and improvement through partnerships/collaboration in schools and local authorities.
- Consider establishing innovation hubs as centres of education expertise that can play a key role in moving knowledge to action around the system and link with Education Scotland to co-ordinate and guide the strategic direction of the programme.

1. Introduction

In November 2013 Education Scotland commissioned the Robert Owen Centre for Education Change at The University of Glasgow to provide research support for, and evaluate the impact of, the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) during 2013 and 2014. This report focuses on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations emerging from the first phase of the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) programme. We have structured the report around the key aims and evaluation questions:

- How well was each project initiated and could it have been improved?
- How well was the overall programme implemented and could it have been improved?
- Did teachers build effective working relationships, and what factors supported or inhibited this?
- What forms of collaboration were most and least effective in identifying a focus for partnership projects?
- Did teachers have an increased understanding of evaluation, and what factors supported or inhibited this?
- Did teachers find out more about leadership development, opportunities to take on new roles and responsibilities, and effective teaching and learning approaches?
- Do teachers have an increased understanding of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and student outcomes?
- Are teachers using more effective teaching and learning approaches with learners from disadvantaged backgrounds?
- What has been the initial impact of SIPP activity on learners?

The report also draws on relevant research literature regarding the attributes of effective networks and learning communities (e.g. Kerr et al. 2003). This supports an analysis of the SIPP which is located in the broader evidence base pertaining to what works and why in terms of partnership working and also considers what further action is required to support the partnerships in reaching their full potential.

1.1 Context: The SIPP

Scotland's education system performs relatively well in cross-national comparisons, however there are enduring social inequalities in participation and achievement (OECD 2007, Machin et al. 2013, Russell 2013). Raising educational outcomes, especially in disadvantaged communities, requires the alignment of change processes in curriculum development, teacher development and school self-evaluation (Menter et al., 2010: 26). Devolution of responsibility and supported risk taking requires robust evaluation and the ability to effectively use data to aid decision making at local level. Empowering Scotland (Scottish Government 2013: 54) recognises the importance of

evidence-informed decision making in 'closing the opportunity gap' and has pledged to 'continue to improve the level, focus and frequency of evidence used by education staff to improve standards and drive up attainment.'

The collaborative improvement strategies that underpin the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) aim to build on a body of international research that confirms the value of school-to-school networking and cross-authority partnership work as key levers of innovation and system improvement (e.g. Chapman and Hadfield, 2010; Fullan 2013). Research has demonstrated that the most effective school improvements are also locally owned and led by teachers and school leaders, collecting and using data appropriately enquiry and working in partnership and collaboration with like-minded professionals and stakeholders (Ainscow et al 2012; Chapman 2014, 2008; Chapman et al 2012; Cochran-Smith and Lytle 2009; Earl and Katz, 2006; Hadfield and Chapman 2009; Kerr et al 2003). Such research also highlights the value of school-to-school networking, collaborative enquiry and cross-authority partnerships as levers of innovation and education system improvement.

The SIPP is driven by collaborative enquiry. This involves the partnerships drawing on a range of methods including lesson study, collaborative action research and instructional rounds which have been shown to provide effective processes for supporting change and improvement. This approach combines school-to-school collaboration with locally initiated bottom-up enquiry. The knowledge which underpins this approach has been generated over decades of development and research activity including *Improving Quality Education for All*, *Coalition of Research Schools*, *Schools of Ambition*, *Networked Learning Communities Programme*, *Best Practice Research Scholarship programme*, *20:20 Initiative*, *City Challenge* etc. For example, the findings from a three-year research project involving schools in England, suggested that collaboration between schools is more effective than if it is restricted to within a single school because '…deeply held beliefs within schools prevented the experimentation that is necessary' (Ainscow et al., 2012: 201). Similarly, competing beliefs or priorities were listed as an inhibitor to success in the *Schools of Ambition* 2009 report (Scottish Government 2009). The greater efficacy of teacher collaboration between partnered schools has also been reported by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) *Networked Learning Communities* programme. Their findings suggested that colleagues, outwith their own school, might be more likely to take risks revealing their own weaknesses and gaps in their knowledge than teachers collaborating within their own school (DfE 2005).

Further benefits of school partnerships were found in *City Challenge* when the collaboration extended beyond schools and across local education authorities where schools were grouped as families. Partnerships between schools residing at greater distances appeared to benefit from the elimination of competition which exists between schools serving the same neighbourhoods (Ainscow 2012). Ainscow contends that these long-reaching partnerships '…allowed a wider range of pupils to benefit from best practices by both transferring and "*generating context specific knowledge*"' (Ainscow 2012: 296).

The best examples of collaborative improvement strategies tend to align a so-called "bottom up" approach with national co-ordination. Where there is a shared commitment to improving outcomes for all children and young people then well supported partnerships can lead to significant and sustained improvement and raised attainment. Long term partnerships where schools tackle issues of mutual concern bring mutual success – especially where this forms part of existing improvement planning.

The SIPP, then, can be seen as a 'solution-focused approach'[1] to Scotland's attainment issues with an emphasis on supporting innovation and promoting sustainable collaboration across classroom, school and local authority boundaries to tackle educational inequality. The features of this approach align with the education system outcomes identified within Education Scotland's Corporate Plan 2013/16 − specifically that educational outcomes for all learners must improve and inequality in educational outcomes need to be eradicated. It also sits with Education Scotland's third strategic objective to build the capacity of education providers to continuously improve their performance, to move from self-evaluation to self-improvement and so change the focus of organisational change. The SIPP is seen as a natural development of the implementation of the *Curriculum for Excellence*, with its emphasis on social inclusion and policies and approaches to career-long professional learning outlined in *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson 2010).

The Programme aims to encourage staff to embed collaborative enquiry to learn from each other, experiment with their practice and monitor and evaluate change. The Partnerships also aim to promote leadership opportunities and professional learning at all levels. The Programme seeks to promote focused innovation by fostering a culture of mutual respect, 'co-production' and partnership, rather than replicating traditional hierarchies, an important component of any learning system.

The SIPP, therefore, places an emphasis on understanding and learning from similarities and difference across the partnerships and articulates this process within the wider policy and research context. The Programme is underpinned by a number of beliefs and principles:

- The Scottish education system has untapped capacity to improve itself;
- Strengthening partnership and collaboration between schools and across local authorities is crucial to releasing this potential;
- Schools and their partners have the expertise and experience to tackle the challenging circumstances they find themselves in by sharing and working together;
- Schools and partner agencies working together can promote an even deeper understanding of their collective responsibility to Scotland's children and young people;

---

[1] The Solution-Focused model was originally developed in psychological therapy approaches but has since been applied more widely, including in organisational change. It is based on a collaborative, personalised, approach that focuses on positives rather than deficits. It is characterised by enquiry, building on strengths and what is working well to develop action plans that work.

- The Programme is about systemic improvement of education provision that provides opportunities, through the Programme, for spread and sustainability beyond the individual partnerships;
- The Programme will support the implementation of other national priorities including Teaching Scotland's Future and Curriculum for Excellence.

Furthermore, the core principles that underpin the Programme are:
- Partnership work across schools and local authorities with a focus on exploring specific issues relating to educational inequity;
- The use of Action Research and evidence to identify key challenges, experiment with innovative practices and monitor developments;
- The creation of leadership opportunities and professional learning of staff at all levels;
- A commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit for all involved;
- The development of arrangements to support long-term collaboration and new approaches to capacity building;
- Explicit links to strategic improvement planning in schools and local authorities;
- The involvement of a diverse range of partners including schools, local authorities, Education Scotland and other agencies.

These key beliefs and principles provide an overarching framework giving coherence across the Programme from which systemic lessons can be learned while retaining the flexibility necessary for localities to develop arrangements that are matched to their specific contexts. For example, individual SIPP projects use their project plans to ensure young people from disadvantaged backgrounds are targeted and appropriate actions are incorporated into the project design and evaluation. This is done in a flexible way to suit the local context but all projects share the same goal of promoting educational outcomes and enhancing life opportunities for disadvantaged pupils.

The challenge of making a difference to outcomes for disadvantaged pupils is acknowledged across the partnerships and this involves developing particular approaches but also an awareness of the wider inequality issues and how they affect pupils' learning and opportunities. Working in partnership with Local Authorities, Education Scotland, University of Glasgow researchers and local multi-agency teams, the SIPP partnership projects have worked to assess needs of targeted pupils, develop appropriate data-informed approaches and to evaluate impact. Given the nature and scale of the challenge, this is a long-term process but the SIPP is fostering a culture and facilitating strategies to make a difference to the lives of disadvantaged children and young people.

The SIPP partnerships

To date the SIPP has focused on eight partnership projects in different areas of Scotland during the period December 2013 to June 2014 (two further partnerships were unable to submit finalised proposals during this period). Prior to the involvement of the University team, the partnerships had prepared proposals outlining their plans and had these assessed by a panel that included Education Scotland and other key stakeholders.

The SIPP involves a range of stakeholders in schools, local authorities, Education Scotland, university and other key partners. There is a range of partnerships emerging within and across the SIPP partnerships. Some involve collaboration within a local authority and others involve schools from different authorities. Some involve partnerships from the same phase of schooling while others are cross phase. Some have a tight focus on teaching and learning whilst involving multi-agency approaches but all have the common feature of focusing on tackling educational inequality.

Appendix 1 provides a summary of the current SIPP Partnerships with examples of progress at the time of writing. Here we present an overview of the partnerships and their main foci:

1. West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire Partnership Project

This partnership project currently includes 13 primary schools from across the two education authorities and involves building partnerships across sectors (including pre-5 partners). The specific areas for improvement include:

- Learners' attainment in numeracy/ maths and literacy;
- Pedagogical skills of practitioners;
- Leadership of the agenda to raise attainment by Head Teachers and across schools.

The Partnership is informed by national data (e.g. Scottish Survey of Literacy and Numeracy 2013) and local data, including that used in raising attainment strategies, analyses of school level writing scripts and maths tests. This has revealed that pupils from the most deprived areas performed less well than those from the least deprived areas at all stages. The focus of the Partnership across the two Local Authorities specifically targets schools in the most deprived catchment areas that share similar characteristics and challenges.

2. Angus, Edinburgh City and South Ayrshire Partnership Project

This Partnership includes Arbroath Academy, Holy Rood RC High School and Ayr Academy which are collaborating to improve attainment of young people in S4-S6 identified through analysis SIMD and other data including FSME. The Partnership strategies that the three schools have focused on include improving the quality of feedback to pupils, attendance and parental engagement. Their collaborative enquiry/ research questions are:

- Will regular feedback, both oral and written, result in raising attainment?

- Does improvement in attendance result in improved attainment?
- Does providing parents with clear expectations regarding parental engagement raise parental aspirations?
- Does involvement in parental engagement result in improved attainment?

3. South Lanarkshire Partnership Project

This project aims to drive forward a number of aspects of the wider 'closing the gap' agenda through the use of an Improvement Science model[2] to further review, evaluate and develop strategies to close the gap between the bottom achieving 20% of pupils and their peers. In this partnership, the project's focus on disadvantage entails addressing the needs of vulnerable young people who, for a variety of reasons lack the necessary skills and behavioural attributes to access and achieve in lifelong learning. These include young people who have the following characteristics:

- Most at risk of suspension and exclusion
- Educational ability below that of their peers and consistent placement in the bottom 20% of achievers
- Often have multiple deprivation hits (5+)
- Have been looked after away from home;
- Experienced Abuse/neglect;
- Have English as an additional language;
- Are school refusers;
- Practice self harm;
- Require Learning support;
- Present behavioural challenges.

The young people are identified from a range of data including information from Social Workers, Home School Partnerships etc. The project involves working initially in one targeted secondary school, Trinity High School, with the aim of applying small tests of change, evaluating the impact of a caring significant adult in improving outcomes for individual young people and then modelling these (scaling up) nurturing approaches across other secondary schools across the authority in the longer term with the particular aim of improving the attainment, attendance, exclusion rates and leaver destinations for these young people

---

[2] The Improvement Science approach has been popular in health services and typically involves using the PDSA approach to enable stakeholders to test out new ideas on a small scale before wider implementation: *Plan* - the innovation, *Do* – conduct a pilot or small-scale of the innovation, *Study* – gather evidence to assess impact and lessons learned and *Act* − plan the next cycle of PDSA, scaling up the innovation.

4. Glasgow City and Fife Partnership Project

This collaboration between Glasgow City and Fife involves Local Improvement Groups (LIGs) set up as key drivers of improvement. Across Glasgow City, many schools face challenges in promoting attainment and achievement that reflect severe socio-economic inequality in their communities. In Fife, schools with similar challenges are involved in exploring and sharing strategies to tackle these challenges. The emphasis is on early intervention and prevention.

Each LIG is identifying, using the various data and intelligence available to them, a series of key priorities for their grouping of establishments, with the LIG grouping bringing together a wide range of expertise and knowledge to identify priorities and develop tailored and bespoke solutions. The LIGs draw on rich data including: SQA; attainment data; pupil progress data at establishment level; attendance and exclusion data; inspection reports and views of pupils, parents, staff and other stakeholders.

The ethos of this approach is to devolve decision-making and responses that utilise a more intelligence led and increasingly proportionate approach to support and challenge at establishment level. There is an increasing emphasis on validated self-evaluation exercises reflecting each establishment's priorities as identified through their enquiry processes.

There is a greater focus on wider intra, and inter authority, partnerships to support school improvement that fosters the development of increasingly bespoke solutions to local priorities for improvement. It includes an increased role for Leaders of Learning in supporting aspects of school improvement and in modelling good practice in learning, teaching and assessment.

5. Falkirk Partnership Project

This project involves Falkirk High School and the Grangemouth High School community learning clusters. The Partnership's action research is targeted at the current P6 stage (session 2014−15) for those children who have the highest SIMD profiles within the Authority area and low attainment in literacy, and forms part of an extended transition across P6-S1. The learners have been identified via local and school level data and the project involves multi-agency and cross-service aspects, such that the interventions are as holistic and effective as possible. This includes targeted and sensitive interventions to support family literacy, involving schools, parents, CLD and family support workers.

6. Midlothian and East Lothian Partnership Project

This project involves six secondary schools from each local authority working as sets of 'trios'. As with the other SIPP Partnerships, the project here has used available SIMD, authority-level and school-level data to identify groups of students in particular year groups where levels of attainment and achievement have been identified as an issue. The 'trios' are exploring the level of need and developing responses on the basis of socio-economic deprivation, emotional/psychological issues and ASN that are consistent with a commitment to GIRFEC. The projects also have a particular focus on

transition points in the learner's education journey. Each 'trio' has agreed areas of focused improvement which include:

- Tackling inequality by improving learners' experiences;
- Improving monitoring and tracking;
- Improving the delivery of the CfE entitlement to 'personal support';
- Improving use of data, intervention and assertive mentoring and improved feedback.

7. East Renfrewshire Partnership Project

This partnership involves Crookfur Primary School and Thornliebank Primary School collaborating with a focus on raising attainment in maths for boys and learners from minority ethnic backgrounds through improved learning experiences. While economic disadvantage is one criterion for the focus of the project, in this Partnership the criteria for disadvantage also includes those young people found to face challenges because of their ethnic background (for example, those with EAL needs). A key approach is using Lesson Study to assess the impact of a pedagogical approach that is informed by Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) pedagogy. The project draws on the experiences of teachers involved with courses and professional learning and development provided by Dr. Lio Moscardini of the University of Strathclyde[3]. Dr. Moscardini provided the teachers at both Crookfur and Thornliebank Primary Schools with three staff development sessions on CGI in September/October 2014[4]. He supervised one teacher who had completed an introductory class on CGI in December 2013 and who was focusing on CGI and Lesson Study for a Masters thesis undertaken at the University of Strathclyde. He also tutored two teachers, one from each school, on the same University of Strathclyde Masters module that provided an introduction to CGI which they completed in December 2014. This is the only such module in the UK. Dr. Moscardini also provided an opportunity for the teachers from both schools to engage with an active and international online CGI discussion forum he had established and the teachers were invited to attend the face-to-face University of Strathclyde CGI Network meetings that Dr. Moscardini hosts for teachers in Scotland. Dr. Moscardini's work was independent of the SIPP project run by ROC and was contracted directly with the University of Strathclyde by the schools. The ROC team supported teachers to develop a CAR approach that would help them assess the impact of their SIPP project approach that was informed by their CGI course work and professional development.

Teacher's project evaluation will include impact on learners, parents and staff. Their collaborative enquiry/ research questions are:

---

[3] Moscardini, L. (2014) Developing equitable elementary mathematics classrooms through teachers learning about children's mathematical thinking: Cognitively Guided Instruction as an inclusive pedagogy. Teaching and teacher education. 43, p.69-79.

[4] CPD dates which took place in Crookfur Primary also attended by staff from Thornliebank Primary - 30 teachers in total: (3 x 2 hour twilight sessions);10th September 2014; 1st October 2014; 10th October 2014.

- To what extent has gender and EAL impacted on attainment?

- What learning and teaching approaches, including CGI-informed practice, would improve attainment for boys and pupils using English as an additional language?

- How can schools further engage these learners and their parents?

8. Inverclyde and Argyll and Bute Partnership Project

This project involves Clydeview Academy and Dunoon Grammar School collaborating to close the gap between their high attaining students and those of lower ability The Partnership uses SEEMIS and other available data to identify pupils across the S3 year group who are lower achievers in numeracy. Both schools involved in this Partnership, in particular Clydeview Academy, have learners from deprived areas and these are over-represented in the pupil groups that experience confidence and learning issues in numeracy. The premise for the project is that greater engagement and attainment in numeracy can be promoted through improving pupils' confidence to learn. The focus of their collaborative enquiry/ research is:

- Does the identified profiling champion with responsibility for a group of young people generate improvements in their achievement?

- Will the sharing of student progress through the use of profiling, lead to improved achievement for young people?

- Will increased regular professional dialogue focused on profiling, within and across establishments, lead to improved progress for young people?

All of the eight partnerships share common aspirations that reflect the SIPP beliefs and principles and mean they are characterised by:

- A desire to tackle the achievement gap with a commitment to long-term sustainability beyond the time-frame of the project;

- Creating leadership opportunities and professional learning for staff, involving students and the community;

- Building trust and relationships and confidence to take risks and innovate;

- Drawing on a range of expertise from different parts of the system with commitment from schools, Local Authorities, Education Scotland and The Robert Owen Centre at The University of Glasgow;

- Using systematic focused enquiry to develop innovative practices and monitor the impact of their development;

- A commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit for all involved.

1.2 Supporting SIPP and assessing its impact

In November 2013 Education Scotland commissioned the Robert Owen Centre for Education Change at The University of Glasgow to evaluate the impact and to provide research support for the School Improvement Partnership Programme (SIPP) during 2013 and 2014. The overall objectives for the evaluation support for SIPP were as follows:

- To provide tailored support to up to 10 individual partnership projects which are part of the SIPP;

- To assess how well the overall SIPP, and each individual partnership project within it, have been initiated;

- To assess the extent to which the SIPP has contributed to its intended intermediate outcome;

- To make recommendations for the future development and potential scale-up of the SIPP.

To address the evaluation objectives and questions set out previously in Section 1: Introduction, the evaluation adopted a two-strand approach.

Strand 1: addressed the first objective and involved the University team working with local authority colleagues in each partnership area, alongside a designated individual from Education Scotland, to support partnerships to develop and deploy their own enquiry approaches that would accurately assess the progress and impact of their activities. These support teams have been termed 'Trios'. The SIPP Trios' level and timing of support has varied to reflect the requirements of each partnership. The purpose of this support is to provide critical friendship to advise on:

- Collaborative enquiry approaches;

- Specific curricular and pedagogical knowledge relating to the particular activities;

- Building internal capacity for educational improvement;

- Developing sustainable ways of working beyond the duration of the Programme.

This support is primarily for practitioners and is most often requested when they are planning the integral evaluation as part of their partnership activities. The Trios have provided support in the form of: input to cross-local authority full and half-day events for partnership teams; input during National feedback events and bespoke participative input in schools upon request. One particular important source of support and cross-fertilisation of ideas and practice has occurred during monthly 'drop-in' meetings hosted at the University for partnership colleagues.

In addition, the Trios have supported partnership teams during the three national events held to share experience and progress. Here, practitioners and local authority personnel have also provided advice and support to colleagues within their own Partnership and across the SIPP in general. The most recent of these in June 2014 saw management and practitioner representatives from all partnerships meet with Education Scotland and the

University team to share accounts of progress and discuss their work, which provided an important forum for Programme-wide learning and reflection.

In practice, it proved challenging to deploy all members of each Trio at the same time to particular Partnership meetings or events. Therefore, the individual members of the Trios liaised with one another to ensure that the most appropriate person(s) was available. Given practitioners' needs and emphasis on building their research capacity, the University team was frequently deployed to Partnerships' sessions.

With each SIPP partnership having to deal with a specific context and needs, particular 'tools' in the form of various guidelines, research templates and exemplar case studies have been developed to inform and promote collaborative enquiry and partnership working. This has been informed by the work of Hadfield and Chapman (2009) who provide a number of instruments based on reflective questions for school staff to help identify what types of networking and collaborative working best suit their school context and capacity (Hadfield and Chapman 2009:40-44).

Strand 2: entailed the University team conducting an external evaluation that assessed progress across all of the partnerships to understand the effectiveness of the overall Programme. Whereas Strand 1 involved directly working with the individual partnerships to support them in devising, refining and conducting their own evaluations, Strand 2 of the evaluation involved the aggregation of the individual partnership evaluation findings along with our own primary data collection to provide a coherent overview of the SIPP impact.

1.2.1 Research methodology

A detailed account of the research methodology and methods is provided in Appendix 2. Given the nature of the Strand 2 research questions, a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods was deemed appropriate. In particular, it was necessary to gather data on key indicators across the partnerships using a survey at the start of the Programme − the February baseline survey − so that the same questions could be asked in a later survey − the June follow-up survey − to monitor any progress. To complement this evidence, a range of qualitative information was gathered to provide insights regarding the processes influencing progress or otherwise and to better assist interpretation of survey findings and themes emerging from teachers' own enquiry and accounts.

The research, therefore, adopted a number of interlinked but largely concurrent quantitative and qualitative research strands including:

I.   Two surveys of the key representatives from all SIPP partnerships. The first survey was administered near the start of the Programme in February 2013 (N=46) and the second was conducted when Partnership representatives met again during a national SIPP event in June 2014 (N=53). This provided an opportunity to ensure that the survey reached key Local Authority personnel, key school management personnel, key teaching staff and, where applicable, partner agencies in each of the partnerships. These were the

personnel best placed to comment on developments in their respective partnerships. The questionnaire included closed and open-ended questions to elicit information on progress to date in the respondent's SIPP project, impact and comments on any challenges that had emerged. At the June 2014 event responses to the survey were received from all Partnerships but one Local Authority representative was not present on the day. The follow-up questionnaire was almost identical to one used online in February 2014 and, wherever possible, findings from both surveys have been compared to give an indication of distance travelled over the intervening months. This exercise was not straightforward since the groups of respondents to each survey were not entirely the same. However, there was evidence from discussions with participants at the June event that many of them had also completed the February online survey;

II.   Secondary analysis of partnerships' own data and materials on progress and impact, including summaries of their own evaluation and scoping analyses;

III.   Information from interviews and focus groups across the partnerships:

Initial scoping interviews/paired interviews

- Eight paired interviews/ small group discussions with the partnership Local Authority representatives
- Eight focus groups and needs analysis discussions with Head Teachers and key partnership teachers

These were conducted as each partnership got underway with its planning and meetings (mainly from December 2013 - end of February 2014).

Follow up interviews and focus groups:

A series of follow up interviews and/ or focus groups were conducted with those instrumental to the development and operation of the partnerships with an emphasis on getting insights from teachers, Head Teachers and local authority contacts. This entailed:

- Eight paired interviews/ small group discussions with the partnership Local Authority representatives
- Eight focus groups with Head Teachers
- Eight focus groups with key partnership teachers involved in the design, delivery and evaluation of their project/interventions.

These interviews and focus groups were conducted in May/June 2014 to gather insights on emerging developments, progress, challenges and further needs. The interviews and focus groups were usually conducted in Partnership schools but occasionally telephone interviews were used to gather follow-up information when a key stakeholder could not attend the face-to-face meeting;

IV.   During the project ongoing evaluation feedback was also obtained from participants during the monthly drop-in events/ surgeries hosted by the research team at the University of Glasgow;

V.   Insights on progress and issues gathered as part of the monthly drop-in support sessions with partnership colleagues and from the ongoing research support liaison process with the partnership projects;

VI.   Researcher observation during support visits to schools and events from December 2013 to July 2014.

The findings from Strand 2 provide the main basis for this report but the University team's work in Strand 1 also provides valuable insights on the development of the Programme and factors influencing progress. The teacher-generated data that was presented at the National events also complemented the external Strand 2 research activity.

Approach to the analysis

The research used ex post facto evidence, expert and key informant judgment and focused primary data gathered at two key intervals to explore the extent to which changes in the observed outcomes were due to the SIPP activities. The analysis systematically identified the main factors involved in the observed outcomes. The overall framework for the analysis was the research objectives and research questions documented in Section 1 of this report.

Completed baseline and follow-up questionnaires were described and analysed using SPSS (Statistics Package for the Social Sciences). Frequencies, cross-tabulations, and relevant statistical tests were performed. The analysis also addressed, as far as was possible, the key factors which promote/hinder the impact of the SIPP approach and identified relevant associations between variables. The initial analysis was directed towards an exploration of the reported impact or otherwise of the projects drawing on stakeholders' reported responses to their survey questions and any secondary data from the schools on meaningful outcome criteria.

Qualitative evidence gathered during the individual and group interviews was recorded in both note-form and digital audio recording. A rigorous thematic analysis was conducted to illuminate participants' experiences of the initiative and detail their perceptions, aspirations and shifts in these as the Programme develops. The analysis also highlighted those processes that have influenced the implementation and impact of the SIPP. This analysis drew on transcription accounts for clarification and illustration.

The draft findings were tested for face validity by the research team's external expert panel and the advisory committee and feedback to partnership stakeholders at the National events.

2. Findings

This section of the report is structured around the main research and evaluation objectives findings. There is an emphasis in this section on the questionnaire surveys administered in February 2014 and June 2014 as they provide an opportunity to compare baseline and follow-up findings. However, relevant qualitative findings are presented where appropriate to provide illustrative examples.

Where relevant, the tables in this section include data from both surveys to allow basic comparisons to be made. Where available, other sources of evidence, particularly stakeholder's qualitative accounts, have also been drawn on to complement the quantitative findings within each of the finding subsections.

In addition to the surveys, there was also a substantial amount of evidence provided by participants at the June 2014 event. This evidence indicates that the partnership initiative was impacting positively in a number of areas including partnership and networking and leadership opportunities. There was also some evidence to suggest that, in the overwhelming majority of areas explored in the June survey, this impact appeared to have increased since the initial February survey took place. Not surprisingly, since it represents a longer-term goal, there was less evidence of the initiative having a large impact on pupils.

We first look at the process/ formative set of objectives and questions that the evaluation was tasked with addressing. This is followed by reporting of the limited number of intermediate outcome objectives.

Assessing how well the overall SIPP, and each individual partnership project within it, have been initiated (process/ formative questions)

2.1. How well was each project initiated and could it have been improved?

Evidence from interviews with partnership members and insights gained from research team initial meetings across the Programme revealed that most partnerships took time to develop and agree their proposals with Education Scotland and then had to invest further time to establish lines of communication to facilitate the organisation and operationalisation of the partnerships. This activity has been particularly important where there are many schools and organisations involved in a partnership and where more than one local authority has been engaged. Most partnerships needed time to preparing a suitable project plan underpinned by the Programme principles with a clear action research focus on tackling inequality. Negotiations between the parties involved producing several iterations of their project plans. Partnership stakeholders involved in this process sometimes reported that there could have been more clarification and timely advice and feedback during this time. Partnership members involved in the initiation of the projects did, however, recognise, the challenges and time involved in getting the often numerous, stakeholders to agree on the project plan content before signing off. The role and commitment of the local authority, school management and

those with responsibilities for developing and ensuring initial momentum of the partner initiatives has been crucial.

Qualitative feedback from local authority representatives across four of the partnerships, when discussing the initiation and inception phase, indicated that the process could have been improved and suggested the need for more direct support and guidance, ideally from an advisor, so that the plans could be completed more effectively.

Partnerships involved a range of people in different capacities during the setting up their projects. Tables 2a-c summarise responses for both the initial and follow-up surveys.

Table 2a – Who was consulted when setting up SIPP?

When setting up the SIPP we….?	Didn't do 1	2	3	% 4	5	6	Did very thoroughly 7	8	Not applicable
consulted school staff (n=48) (N=35)	2 (6)	4 (-)	15 (9)	8 (6)	17 (12)	15 (15)	19 (18)	17 (26)	4 (9)
consulted partner agencies (n=45) (N=34)	4 (18)	7 (3)	4 (3)	20 (12)	13 (3)	9 (9)	20 (24)	13 (15)	9 (15)
consulted parents (n=46) (N=34)	33 (44)	- (3)	15 (6)	7 (6)	7(-)	15 (6)	7 (15)	11 (9)	7 (12)
consulted pupils (n=46) (N=34)	37 (44)	7 (3)	4 (6)	4 (6)	9(-)	4 (6)	9 (15)	17 (9)	9 (12)

Table 2b – Who was included in decision making when setting up SIPP?

When setting up the SIPP we….?	Didn't do 1	2	3	% 4	5	6	Did very thoroughly 7	8	Not applicable
included staff in decision making (n=49) (N=34)	2 (3)	- (3)	4 (-)	12 (12)	18 (12)	25 (9)	12 (24)	20 (30)	6 (9)
included partners in decision making (n=49) (N=34)	6 (18)	4 (-)	4 (3)	12 (6)	8 (12)	14 (18)	14 (15)	27 (18)	10 (12)
included parents in decision making (n=48) (N=34)	36 (47)	2 (6)	15 (-)	10 (9)	13 (6)	6 (6)	6 (6)	4 (6)	8 (15)
included pupils in decision making (n=48) (N=34)	31 (44)	8 (3)	6 (-)	4 (9)	17 (3)	- (9)	17 (9)	4 (9)	13 (15)

Table 2c – Who was given delegated tasks when setting up SIPP?

When setting up the SIPP we….?	Didn't do				%		Did very thoroughly		Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
delegated tasks to school staff (n=49) (N=34)	- (9)	2 (3)	2 (6)	6 (3)	12 (6)	18 (12)	16 (24)	29 (24)	14 (15)
delegated tasks to partner agencies (n=48) (N=34)	8 (24)	2 (3)	13 (-)	10 (12)	6 (3)	10 (18)	13 (15)	15 (6)	23 (21)
delegated tasks to parents (n=47) (N=34)	30 (50)	17 (6)	6 (3)	4 (3)	4 (9)	9(-)	2 (3)	- (-)	28 (27)
delegated tasks to pupils (n=48) (N=34)	31 (41)	10 (6)	- (-)	6 (-)	6 (9)	4 (12)	8 (9)	2 (-)	31 (24)

Both surveys strongly suggest that the setting up of Partnerships has been typified by professional dialogue and professional involvement. Tables 2a-c demonstrate that school staff and other partner professionals were substantially more likely than parents and pupils to have been engaged in consultation, decision making and taking on tasks associated with the setting up of the SIPP.

2.2 *How well was the overall Programme implemented and could it have been improved?*

Feedback from partnership stakeholders, primarily from local authority representatives and teachers during the national events and research support visits, indicates that the implementation of the overall Programme was satisfactory. Apart from the issues highlighted in Section 2.1, partnership members indicated that the Programme had been well supported and well conducted at local and national levels. As the various partnership projects matured, partnership members found that organisational issues improved as roles and lines of communication became better established and apparent.

2.3. *Did teachers build effective working relationships, and what factors supported or inhibited this?*

The findings strongly indicate that the Programme has facilitated greater professional dialogue, collegiality and networking across those professionals involved in the partnerships. This has helped drive the work of the partnerships and led to sharing of ideas and practice pertinent to the specific project aims as well as broader teaching and learning.

The survey evidence, in particular, indicates that the SIPP activities were contributing to an increase in partnership and networking among school staff involved in the initiative. Table 2d details results for both surveys.

Table 2d – Development and impact − partnership and networking

% Development and impact - partnership and networking	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
Collaborative working across the Partnership (N=51) (N=34)	**71 (35)**	24 (29)	6 (21)	- (15)
Increased collegiality between colleagues across the Partnership (N=50) (N=34)	**70 (41)**	20 (32)	8 (9)	2 (18)
More opportunities for teachers to share their ideas and plans with colleagues across the Partnership (N=50) (N=34)	**58 (38)**	32 (35)	8 (12)	2 (15)
Partnership working across schools and local authorities with a focus on exploring specific issues relating to educational inequity (N=52) (N=34)	**50 (38)**	33 (32)	10 (15)	8 (15)
The development of arrangements to support long-term collaboration and new approaches to capacity building (N=52) (N=34)	**37 (24)**	48 (41)	12 (15)	4 (21)
The involvement of an appropriate range of partners to support the Partnership's activities (N=51) (N=34)	**35 (15)**	22 (36)	30 (18)	14 (30)

Ninety percent or more of the respondents to the follow-up June survey indicated that **collaborative working across the Partnership, increased collegiality between colleagues across the Partnership** and **more opportunities for teachers to share their ideas and plans with colleagues across the Partnership** had taken place *to some or to a large extent*. Moreover, Eighty-five percent and 83% of follow-up June survey respondents respectively also agreed that the SIPP initiative had, *to some extent or to a large extent*, encouraged the **development of arrangements to support long-term collaboration and new approaches to capacity building** and **partnership working across schools and local authorities with a focus on exploring specific issues relating to educational inequity.** Finally, just over half of follow-up June survey respondents (57%) agreed that the SIPP initiative **had involved an appropriate range of partners to support the Partnership's activities** *to some extent or to a large extent*. However, almost a third (30%) of respondents to this final statement indicated *little or no change*. Drawing on discussions and insights gained from the support visits across the partnerships, this appears to be explained by the figures reflecting those partnerships that were at an earlier stage in their development and were still establishing links with other partners that could help them address their objectives. These were sometimes partners that were outwith schools' immediate networks and included the Third Sector, health and social work services.

There was a consistent difference between the responses gathered from the follow-up June survey to those gathered from the baseline February survey. In relation to all of the statements in Table 2d, follow-up questionnaire responses were more positive and more likely to indicate seeing impact *to a large extent*. In the February baseline survey responses were more likely than the June follow-up survey responses to indicate *little or no change* or *don't know* for all of the statements associated with partnership and networking.

Specific experiences of working together within the SIPP initiative[5]

 Respondents to the surveys reflected on their individual experiences of working collaboratively within their Partnership[6] through indicating their agreement, or otherwise, with a series of statements, see Table 2e.

Table 2e – Individuals experiences of working together

% Working together has…..	Completely Agree	Mostly agree	Not sure either way	Disagree	Completely disagree
left me with a desire to work collaboratively with colleagues (N=51)	**75**	25	-	-	-
encouraged networking with other colleagues (N=51)	**73**	27	-	-	-
increased my leadership opportunities (N=50)	**72**	20	6	2	-
encouraged me to try new ideas (N=51)	**57**	37	6	-	-
promoted my skills in practitioner enquiry (N=51)	**51**	39	10	-	-
increased my awareness of sources of support to address our SIPP aims (N=51)	**41**	49	8	-	2
given me access to quality resources (n=51)	**33**	39	22	2	4
increased my knowledge of approaches to tackle educational inequity (N=51)	**31**	47	20	2	-
improved my teaching skills (N=45)	**22**	24	47	4	2

Findings from Table 2e are consistent with those detailed in the section on **Impact of staff involvement with SIPP activity** where there was a strong indication of developments in professional collaboration and networking and growth in leadership opportunities for staff and less indication of direct impact on staff knowledge and teaching in relation to educational inequity.

The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they mostly or completely agreed with all of the statements except the final one. In relation to the statement, *improved my teaching skills,* just under half of the informants (46%) agreed that working together had improved this. Moreover, in four instances, *desire to work collaboratively with colleagues, encouraging networking with other colleagues, encouraging participants to try new ideas,* and *promoting skills in practitioner enquiry* there was no disagreement indicated. In relation to the remaining statements only one or two individuals reported disagreement.

Major sources of support for the development of SIPP activity in schools

Respondents to the June follow-up survey most frequently identified *Partnership colleagues* (67%) and *colleagues in their own school* (57%) as major supports in the development of the initiative. This represents a change

---

[5] This section was only included in the follow-up survey.

[6] Respondents noted the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements concerning their specific experiences of collaboration within the SIPP on a five point scale comprising: completely agree; mostly agree; not sure either way; mostly disagree or completely disagree.

in the rank order of findings from the February survey where 69% and 55% respectively identified *colleagues in their own school and Partnership colleagues* as major supports. This may suggest that Partnership colleagues have become increasingly important as the initiative has developed.

Further, as the initiative has developed there has been a rise in the proportion of respondents indicating that the University team and Education Scotland have been major sources of support in the development of their Partnership. In the June survey 33% of respondents compared to 22% in the February survey regarded the University team as major supports. Over the same period the figures for Education Scotland rose from 11% in February to 28% in June. The figures for local authorities remained relatively stable, 43% in February and 38% in June.

2.4. What forms of collaboration were most and least effective in identifying a focus for partnership projects?

There are indications from the findings that there are forms of collaboration that reflect what is known from the literature about effectively developing a focus and system for activity. For example, we can see numerous examples where the local authority has been instrumental in fostering networks that are in line with those identified by Wohlstetter et al (2003) in her study of Los Angeles networks that drew schools together into networks that facilitated joint problem solving;

'   A network… is a group of organisations working together to solve problems or issues of mutual concern that are too large for any one organisation to handle on its own (Mandell, 1999). Applied to schools, the idea of networks suggests that schools working together in a collaborative effort would be more effective in enhancing organisational capacity and improving student learning than individual schools working on their own (Wohlstetter & Smith, 2000).'

(Wohlstetter et al., 2003, p.399)

As Section 2.3 has detailed, partnership members believed that their involvement in the SIPP had promoted collaboration and professional dialogue that improved their practice and capacity for enquiry. Drawing on information from the research observations, support visits and interviews with stakeholders, the forms of collaboration that were deemed to be effective were:

- Working teams constituted to develop the various SIPP projects and activities and interventions within each partnership. These were said to have promoted sharing of valuable ideas for teaching regarding the SIPP aims but also more widely, developing new skills, including research and enquiry capacities and leadership opportunities. This process also promoted confidence and motivation among teachers;

- Opportunities to get together during the research support events facilitated by the local authorities, involving the University and Education Scotland Trio members. Here, participants stressed the value in working with external partners to develop their collaborative enquiry capacity;

- The National SIPP events which provided opportunities for cross partnership sharing of ideas and demonstration of progress.

Teachers' feedback towards the end of this period of the evaluation provides evidence that collaboration and partnership with other schools were the main successful developments of the initiative. In particular, evidence from the partnership between 2 schools in East Renfrewshire suggests that the teaching staff involved had developed close working relationships and fostered an effective network. This was also echoed in one of the open responses in the follow-up June survey by the Argyll and Bute and Inverclyde Partnership who said, "*It is great to be able to share experiences and work together*". Teachers also commonly noted that being able to observe others' teaching was extremely useful for improving their practice. Teachers saw the increased opportunity for networking as a key benefit of the SIPP:

> *"Networking with colleagues from other schools and authorities…has broken down barriers and encouraged excellent opportunities for professional dialogue."*

> *"The most successful development in my school is the positive attitude developed towards collaborating with colleagues in other schools within and outwith the authority. This is a terrific foundation for a sustainable partnership and attitude."*

> *Teachers from West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire partnership project*

> *"Partnership working has been extremely beneficial as a CLD worker in maximising resources when working with young people."*

> *CLD worker in the Angus, Edinburgh City and South Ayrshire partnership project*

The outcome of the collaborative working partnerships meant that teachers were able to engage in professional dialogue, build confidence and develop leadership capacity.

Comments and evidence from teachers and local authority colleagues regarding positive outcomes as a result of the SIPP indicated that there were benefits from partnership working that were unforeseen at the proposal stage. For example, the opportunities provided by increased collegiate working and collaborative networking often led to synergies and new ideas such as new learning and teaching approaches, more critical reflection and new evaluation strategies. For some, this had had a motivating effect.

> *"This has inspired me to stay in teaching"*
> *(Supply Teacher)*

> Angus, Edinburgh and South Ayrshire partnership project

There is evidence of local authority representatives and partnership leaders recognising the importance of developing effective working relationships in establishing the partnership teams. Where local authorities have brought the key personnel together at the start of the process to plan and discuss their activity this has proven crucial in helping to focus the vision of the various initiatives and to build networks within and across partner establishments and organisations to drive and sustain their activities. However, parents and pupils

have generally not been consulted during the planning phase across the partnerships.

2.5. Did teachers have an increased understanding of evaluation, and what factors supported or inhibited this?

To date, the research team has observed a high level of teacher engagement with the collaborative enquiry process in those partnerships that have shown progress in operationalising their plans and have brought staff together to develop their initiatives. Despite varying levels of research expertise and experience, the June follow-up survey reveals an increase in teachers' understanding and use of research and enquiry in their practice.

Table 2f: Reported impact on teachers' understanding of evaluation

% Development and impact – Impact on evaluation	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
Increased teachers' reflective practice and self-evaluation (N=44) (N=34)	**41 (29)**	30 (32)	20 (15)	9 (24)
The use of systematic enquiry and evidence gathering to inform practice and monitor developments (N=46) (N=34)	**24 (24)**	46 (26)	20 (24)	11 (26)

Just over three quarters of respondents to the June follow-up survey indicated impact, *to at least some extent*, in relation to, **a commitment to professional learning of staff** while 71% also suggested seeing an **increase in teachers' reflective practice and self-evaluation***.* In both instances there was also a good indication of increasing impact from the February 2014 survey.

Seventy percent of respondents to the June follow-up survey also indicated that the **use of systematic enquiry and evidence gathering to inform practice and monitor developments** was happening to *at least some extent*. Once again this represents a positive increase on the figures from the initial February survey for the same items. Insights from support and research visits suggested that the 20% of respondents who were indicating little or no change in their use of systematic enquiry and evidence gathering at this stage were in partnerships that joined the Programme later than others and were still developing this capacity.

Teacher and local authority comments provided during national and local events, focus groups and interviews highlighted the role of the University team in helping to develop capacity and skills regarding collaborative enquiry. Teachers also learned from one another, with some in each group having research expertise gained during masters or other courses.

2.6. Did teachers find out more about leadership development, opportunities to take on new roles and responsibilities, and effective teaching and learning approaches?

Again there was evidence that the SIPP had promoted leadership opportunities and allowed teachers to develop greater responsibility as part of their partnership team. This included responsibility for developing interventions/ projects and enhanced enquiry roles.

More than half of the respondents to the June follow-up survey indicated that the SIPP had had *a large positive* impact on leadership opportunities and developments within their Partnerships. Table 2g provides results for the February baseline and June follow-up surveys.

Table 2g - Development and impact - leadership

% Development and impact - leadership	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
A commitment to developing leadership opportunities (N=48) (N=32)	**58 (38)**	35 (38)	2 (9)	4 (16)
The creation of leadership opportunities and professional learning of staff at all levels ((N=49) (N=33)	**55 (30)**	33 (36)	8 (12)	4 (21)

Ninety three percent of respondents to the June follow-up survey indicated that the Partnership had, *to some extent or to a large extent*, promoted **a commitment to developing leadership opportunities in their school** while 88% also reported that the project had supported the development of **leadership and professional learning of staff at all levels** to the same extent. Comparing June responses with those from February, we can again see that the follow-up responses were substantially more likely to report seeing a large impact in both *a commitment to developing leadership opportunities* and *the creation of leadership opportunities and professional learning of staff at all levels.*

While a number of the partnerships have been developing integrated strategies, including tracking and monitoring systems, and sometimes including other services to identify target pupils and holistically address their needs, some partnerships have also focused on specific learning and teaching approaches to tackle the achievement gap. Examples of such developments have included a new mathematics course for identified groups that also involves parental engagement in the Inverclyde partnership. Similarly, in the East Renfrewshire Partnership a maths course has been developed. In the West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire Partnership schools have been collaboratively researching and implementing approaches that were aimed at promoting target learners' attainment in numeracy/maths and literacy and developing the pedagogical skills of practitioners to complement this. There has also been cross-partnership sharing of learning and teaching approaches, with the East Renfrewshire approach catching the attention of

West Dunbartonshire colleagues and now being piloted in schools in that Local Authority.

It is important to note that the collaborative approach at the heart of the SIPP was frequently cited by practitioners and management involved in the partnerships as facilitating the development, implementation and evaluation of these new learning and teaching approaches.

Assessing the extent to which the SIPP has contributed to its intended intermediate outcomes.

In the next part of this findings chapter, we look at the intermediate outcome objectives of the SIPP. These outcomes are those where we would expect some progress but are likely to require more time in order to demonstrate notable impact.

2.7. Do teachers have an increased understanding of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and student outcomes?

There was a clear indication from the surveys that the partnerships had begun to have a positive impact on teachers' understanding of disadvantage and aspects of the inequality agenda. Table 2h details results from both the February baseline and June follow-up surveys.

Table 2h - Development and impact – Inequality agenda

% Development and impact – Inequality agenda	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
Focusing on closing the achievement gap (N=50) (N=34)	**58 (38)**	24 (18)	12 (18)	6 (27)
A commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit to all involved (N=50) (N=33)	**48 (40)**	28 (12)	14 (18)	10 (30)
Implementing approaches to addressing inequality in education across your school (N=49) (N=32)	**35 (16)**	31 (31)	23 (25)	12 (28)
Increased teacher networks addressing inequality in education (N=49) (N=33)	**25 (15)**	41 (39)	22 (21)	12 (24)
Increased understanding across staff of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and pupil outcomes (N=49) (N=33)	**20 (10)**	35 (33)	24 (30)	20 (27)
Introduction of particular teaching and learning approaches for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds (N=51) (N=33)	**20 (12)**	29 (33)	29 (27)	21 (27)

A large majority of respondents (82%) at the June follow-up survey reported that the Partnership had encouraged a **focus on closing the achievement gap** to at least *some extent* while just over three quarters (76%) agreed that

the initiative had also fostered a **commitment to reciprocity and mutual benefit to all involved**. Table 2h also clearly shows a growing positive awareness of and impact on the inequality agenda between the February and June 2014 surveys. However, these findings also show that there is room for progress regarding promoting awareness of the inequality issues and agenda and developing related approaches.

Specifically, there are still notable proportions of respondents indicating that such awareness and responses require attention. This appears particularly evident regarding developing particular teaching and learning approaches for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds (50%) and where wider factors such as health could be considered in approaches (44%). Insights from support visits suggests that this partially reflects partnerships' level of development given their different starting dates but also the complex nature of understanding and tackling educational inequality.

2.8 Are teachers using more effective teaching and learning approaches with learners from disadvantaged backgrounds?

Two-thirds of respondents also indicated that the Partnership had, **increased teacher networks addressing inequality in education** and **begun implementing more approaches to address inequality in education across schools**. However, while substantial numbers of respondents also noted impact in relation to **increased understanding across staff of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and pupil outcomes** and the **introduction of particular teaching and learning approaches for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds** there were also growing percentages indicating that there had been *little or no change* in both these areas (24% and 29% respectively). This again appears to be explained by the fact that while more partners have become established over the intervening period, not all have yet developing and deployed their teaching and learning approaches for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Impact on individual staff

There was also evidence of the Partnership having a positive impact on teachers' confidence, knowledge and skills. At the June follow-up survey respondents recognised the following percentage increases *in teachers'* **confidence (67%)**, **knowledge (61%),** and **skills (64%** in **tackling inequality in education** *to some extent or to a large extent.* Again, there was evidence of increasing impact in these areas since the February survey, albeit that this was less dramatic than some of the other findings in this section. Table 2i details results from both the February and June surveys.

Table 2i - Impact on staff

% Development and impact – Impact on staff	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
A commitment to professional learning of staff (N=46) (N=34)	**54 (29)**	26 (26)	13 (21)	7 (24)
Increase in teachers' <u>knowledge</u> of approaches to address educational inequality (N=46) (N=34)	**39 (26)**	26 (35)	17 (15)	17 (24)
Increase in teachers' <u>confidence</u> of approaches to address educational inequality (N=46) (N=34)	**28 (12)**	39 (44)	20 (18)	13 (26)
Increase in teachers' <u>skills</u> of approaches to address educational inequality (N=45) (N=34)	**24 (21)**	40 (35)	20 (21)	16 (24)

Strategic planning and capacity

The majority of respondents to the follow-up June survey reported that their partnership project had begun to impact on strategic planning and capacity within their schools. Table 2j details results for both surveys.

Table 2j - Impact on Strategic planning and capacity

% Development and impact – Strategic planning and capacity	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
Explicit links to school improvement planning across the Partnership and local authorities (N=51) (N=33)	**53 (24)**	35 (30)	10 (18)	2 (27)
A commitment to long-term sustainability and capacity building regarding the Partnership's aims. (N=49) (N=33)	**49 (27)**	41 (30)	6 (15)	4 (27)

Nine out of ten respondents (90%) in the June survey indicated that **explicit links to school improvement planning across the SIPP schools and local authorities had developed** *to at least some extent* and almost as many (88%) suggested that **a commitment to long-term sustainability and capacity building regarding the partnership's aims** was also in evidence to the same extent.

2.9. Impact on pupils

To date, impact on pupils has been less evident than in other activities associated with SIPP developments. This is unsurprising given that it will probably take longer for the SIPP activities to demonstrate a notable impact on inequality in learners' achievement and opportunities. However, there were some indications from the February survey, and slightly stronger indications in the June follow-up survey, that partnership stakeholders believed their work was beginning to impact on targeted pupils (see Table 2k).

Table 2k - Impact on pupils

% Development and impact – *Impact on pupils*	To a large extent	To some extent	Little or no change	Don't know/does not apply
Increased pupil achievement (N=46) (N=30)	**17 (17)**	17 (17)	24 (20)	41 (47)
Increased pupil aspirations (N=45) (N=33)	**27 (21)**	22 (10)	20 (18)	31 (52)

Almost half of respondents (49%) in the June survey reported an **increase in pupil aspirations** to *at least some extent* while a third (34%) also noted a similar impact on **pupil achievement**. However, substantial proportions of respondents at this time were also indicating *little or no change* or *don't know* in response to both these statements. There were no changes in the percentages indicating increased pupil achievement between the February and June surveys. Again this is perhaps not surprising given the short period of time between the surveys and the longer-term nature of such aims.

It is important to note that, in most cases, these teacher reports of impact on pupils were based on their own research and monitoring. Indeed, a key feature of all of partnerships' planning and work was the presence of an integral research component that focused on target groups' needs, baseline indicators and follow-up measures.

Teachers in a number of the partnerships were able to present to the researchers and colleagues at the later National event in June 2014 examples of their findings regarding the impact of their SIPP activity on learners. For example, research conducted by the Angus, Edinburgh and South Ayrshire partnership has found that, following the implementation of their project that included regular feedback to pupils, addressing attendance strategies and providing parents with clear expectations regarding parental engagement, there has been:

- Improved attendance for targeted children;
- Improved self-esteem for these children (as demonstrated via the Rosenberg self-esteem scale);
- Improved teacher awareness of individual pupil's context;
- Increased teacher awareness of SIMD;
- Growing teacher awareness of the need to take account of research;
- Increased professional reading;
- Better engagement with parents in the identified group.

One partnership teacher added, 'Parental engagement is improving and we're getting better feedback from the pupils'.

The South Lanarkshire Partnership has also monitored the target young people involved in the Nurture Programme and found improved engagement, attendance and achievement. Feedback from participants highlights the positive impact for them:

> *The nurture group helped me in a number of ways in school. It helped with my behaviour. It also helped me control my feelings and helped me get over my dad's death. Finally, it helped build my confidence because I met new people and made new friends.*

Following the deployment of a CGI-informed maths programme and Lesson Study to collaboratively research the impact of the innovation, The East Renfrewshire Partnership has demonstrated, via before and after pupil tests, that there has been an improvement in target pupils' maths attainment and motivation in tackling maths.

> *We didn't have a good idea of where the children were [before using Lesson Study]. Even if the children were getting the right answers we weren't able to identify which strategies each child was using. Now we're able to ... The impact CGI is having on the children is huge.*

East Renfrewshire Partnership teacher

3. Conclusions

The partnerships are at differing stages in their development and this is reflected in their individual narratives and progress to date. Establishing partnerships involving different local authorities, schools and other stakeholders is a complex process, particularly when the focus of the SIPP is to impact on educational inequality. It is not surprising then, that the partnerships have often taken time to become established and develop their strategies and activities.

However, the external evaluation and teachers' own enquiry has provided evidence that, even at a relatively early stage in its development the SIPP is making a demonstrable impact regarding the majority of its stated objectives. The most apparent progress has been in partnerships establishing collaborative networks that have supported teachers' learning and teaching approaches to address inequality as well as their ability to integrate research and enquiry to assess progress and inform developments.

While impact on learners is less evident at this stage, those partnerships that have been established longer and have focussed on particular interventions or approaches are reporting that their measures are making a difference. For example, those that have applied particular models and approaches in learning and teaching to enhance the achievement and attainment of targeted pupils and have integrated evaluation into these measures are able to demonstrate impact and understand key factors involved.

It is clear that there are a number of partnerships that have made considerable progress, often against considerable odds. The SIPP has injected new ideas and processes into the system that have resonated with those involved. It has provided a model with a flexible but rigorous framework that has supported localised capacity building and ownership of the initiative that has supported those involved in experimenting, taking risks, reflecting on, and monitoring developments and outcomes.

The SIPP has tended to have traction, initially, with a group of committed practitioners who have then been able to engage other staff and expand the influence of the Programme to affect behaviours more widely across schools and partnerships. This is challenging and complex territory but this type of work is crucial in developing a robust Scottish approach to move the education system forward.

While still in its early stages, emerging evidence from within the SIPP, combined with the literature which underpins this approach, suggests that, with further support combined with longer-term strategic planning, the SIPP has an increasingly important role to play in supporting national efforts to combat educational inequity.

Our findings are largely positive, particularly given the relatively short period of time. However, there are particular aspects of the Programme that require

careful attention in order to fully achieve its objectives. In particular, our findings indicate that the partnerships need to further develop their awareness and capacity to explicitly address the inequality in their strategies and to increase the extent to which pupils and parents/ carers are consulted and involved in the collaborative process of project conception and construction.

Summary of key findings arranged by the research questions

A) Objective: **To assess how well the overall SIPP, and each individual partnership project within it, have been initiated. (Process/ formative question)**

Research questions and key findings

1. How well was each project initiated and could it have been improved?

A number of partnerships reported that the development of their proposal and inception was time-consuming due to the need to negotiate an appropriate design and then communicate the plans to colleagues. However, all those who were successful with their proposals were able to see progress thereafter. Improvements could include greater support for partnership development teams when developing their focus of their collaborative enquiry.

2. How well was the overall Programme implemented and could it have been improved?

The overall SIPP has been successfully implemented in that participating partnerships have been able to develop appropriate plans, infrastructure and collaborative networking in line with that recognised by the literature of collaborative enquiry and improvement. This is already producing positive impact depending on the 'maturity' of the partnership.

3. Did teachers build effective working relationships, and what factors supported or inhibited this?

Teachers have quickly developed collaborative networks, supported by their partnership colleagues and the external Trio teams. This is seen as facilitating positive developments in joint projects and enquiry, with initial impacts on learners being reported in those partnerships that have been established longest.

4. What forms of collaboration were most and least effective in identifying a focus for partnership projects?

Effective collaboration was most evident in working teams constituted to develop the various SIPP projects within each partnership. These promoted sharing of valuable ideas for learning and teaching and developing new skills, including research and enquiry capacities and leadership opportunities.

Opportunities to get together during the research support events, facilitated by the local authorities and involving the University and Education Scotland Trio members were also effective.

The National SIPP events provided opportunities for cross partnership sharing of ideas and demonstration of progress.

5. **Did teachers have an increased understanding of evaluation, and what factors supported or inhibited this?**

   Overall, there has been progress regarding this objective but a notable minority of partnership members report that it is taking time. However, the support from the University team and collaborative networking was said to have facilitated teachers' evaluation capacity.

6. **Did teachers find out more about leadership development, opportunities to take on new roles and responsibilities and effective teaching and learning approaches?**

   Teachers generally reported that the SIPP experience has promoted their leadership opportunities through their activity in developing innovative learning and teaching approaches and enquiry.

B) External evaluation Objective: **To assess the extent to which the SIPP has contributed to its intended intermediate outcomes. (Outcome objective)**

Evaluation Questions and key findings

7. **Do teachers have an increased understanding of disadvantage and its relationship with other factors such as health, wellbeing and student outcomes?**

   The majority of teachers report enhanced awareness and understanding of disadvantage.

8. **Are teachers using more effective learning and teaching approaches with learners from disadvantaged backgrounds?**

   The majority of partnership members report adopting teaching and learning approaches that aim to tackle disadvantage. However, a notable minority have yet to do so. This appears to be explained by the fact that those partnerships that have embarked on their SIPP activity more recently have yet to develop and deployed their learning and teaching approaches for learners from disadvantaged backgrounds

9. **Impact on learners (this was not originally included in the research questions but there was sufficient evidence emerging to indicate progress on this criteria)**

   To date, impact on pupils has been less evident than in other activities associated with SIPP developments. This is unsurprising given that it will probably take longer for the SIPP activities to demonstrate a notable impact on inequality in learners' achievement and opportunities. However, there

were some indications that the longer established partnerships were beginning to demonstrate an impact on pupils.

Overall, the partnerships demonstrate the nine core attributes of effective networks identified by Kerr et al. (2003) which are particularly pertinent to SIPP:

- *Forms of participation* currently involve teachers in ways to further the aims of their partnerships and are being sustained;

- There is evidence of *new relationships and trust* being developed that further promote the collaborative activities;

- There have been notable developments *in coordination, facilitation and leadership* with partnerships demonstrating vertical and horizontal coordination, facilitation and leadership to keep participants engaged;

- This has promoted *communication within and across* the partnerships;

- In terms of *'structural balance'* there appears to be a balance between network processes and structures with the right amount of structure to promote dynamism of the networks, yet sufficient direction and structure to avoid confusion and lack of focus;

- There is also some *diversity and dynamism* in the network, bringing together appropriate people and ideas. Staff have volunteered to take on roles in their partnerships, including responsibility for coordination and evaluation. However, at this stage there are indications that this mainly involves teachers and greater involvement of pupils and parents has yet to occur;

- There are also signs of *growing decentralisation and democracy*, that allow participants to address local issues while still facilitating a collaborative environment that encourages inclusive and transparent decision making;

- *Time and resources* have been highlighted as challenges. However, partnership teams have often found ways to creatively address such issues to ensure momentum is sustained;

- Finally, there is evidence of partnerships actively developing and integrating *monitoring and evaluation* as part of their SIPP activity in order to identify what works and to understand why. This is most evident in the more established partnerships. Here, there is delegation of evaluation responsibility across the teams.

All of the above features are seen to a greater or lesser degree in all of the partnerships. However, the extent to which each feature permeates the network is dependent on a number of conditions, including partnership maturity, leadership capacity and the capacity to engage with new ways of working. Perhaps, most importantly, it seems that the extent to which each of

the partnerships has engaged with the questions associated with each of the factors offers an important proxy for the level of progress made.

Looking across the SIPP we would argue that successful partnerships are characterised by:

- A focus on closing the achievement gap with commitment to long-term sustainability beyond the time-frame of the project;

- Being underpinned by creating leadership opportunities and professional learning for staff, involving students and the community;

- Building trust and relationships and confidence to take risks and innovate;

- Drawing on a range of expertise from different parts of the system and commitment from schools, Local Authorities, Education Scotland, and the University team;

- The use of systematic, focused practitioner enquiry to develop innovative practices and monitor the impact of their development.

The findings then, strongly suggest that the SIPP is an evolving but largely successful model for promoting collaborative networking that stimulates and promotes innovation in teachers' expertise, confidence and practice to promote educational equality. There are tentative emerging indications that, in some more established partnerships, this is impacting on the attainment and wider opportunities of the targeted children and young people.

4. Recommendations

In light of the above findings and conclusions we recommend that the SIPP should receive further investment to support the deepening of existing partnerships and to extend the Programme's reach across the system through the initiation of a number of new partnerships. Specifically we recommend that:

Programme level recommendations

- **Further develop practitioners' expertise in a range of collaborative enquiry methods within the partnerships** by engaging in a wide range of learning experiences including with University staff, and other practitioners, Education Scotland and policy makers. This will continue to build capacity for enquiry and deepen our understanding of the range of practices that challenge educational inequalities;

- **Encourage continued and systematic monitoring of progress at individual partnership level to evidence impact of the collaborative enquiry.** This will provide a basis for longitudinal analysis and development of a deeper understanding of how knowledge translates into action and of which models are most effective. Local Authorities might play a key role in curating this. This will support system level learning about 'what works' and 'why'.

- **Engage learners, parents/carers and other stakeholders in the SIPP process consultation and decision-making and in taking forward strategies that address local needs.** The findings indicate that school staff and other partner professionals were substantially more likely than parents and pupils to have been engaged in consultation, decision making and taking on tasks associated with the setting up of the SIPP. In order to achieve greater impact it is likely that the partnerships will need to be more inclusive in their engagement with learners and their parents/ carers regarding consultation on needs and views on how the strategies might make a difference.

- Ensure partnerships continue to develop a greater range of methods for evidencing impact on student outcomes for learners from disadvantaged settings. This is an issue that the external evaluation component and support Trios will need to monitor closely at partnership level to inform appropriate support if and where necessary. This will also support system level learning about 'what works' and 'why'.

Agency level recommendations

- **Education Scotland should focus on developing its strategic perspective on the Programme.** As the Programme expands, Education Scotland must continue to develop short, medium and long-term strategies, including the provision of a blend of local and national level learning opportunities. This will involve further co-ordination across partnerships so that knowledge mobilisation can be maximised, thus promoting system-level learning and opportunities for quality assurance.

- **Education Scotland should play a key role in supporting coherence, making linkages between the SIPP and other policy initiatives**. This involves making connections both vertically and horizontally within the system. This will ensure different parts of the system articulate with each other and can learn to implement a diverse range of policy initiatives.

- **Education Scotland has a key role to play in work with SCEL to use the SIPP as a key mechanism to build leadership capacity within the system.** The SIPP is an on-going naturally occurring experiment for supporting and developing individual and collaborative leadership practice across the system.

- **Education Scotland should develop a coherent set of guidance materials and associated tools to provide an overarching framework that supports collaborative enquiry in schools and partnerships**. These should not be prescriptive or directive, but rather models and sets of associated tools and ideas which individuals, schools and partnerships can engage with. This will support the Programme in moving to scale, whilst maintaining its flexible approach and rigour.

- **Education Scotland should ensure that partnerships have access to a range of high quality and proportionate external support from their Local Authority colleagues, the University team and Education Scotland.** These partners should continue to provide support but explore ways to ensure the quality of support is maintained as additional partnerships join the SIPP.

- **Education Scotland should develop a coordinated virtual learning environment that connects the partnerships together.** This may be located within Glow and will support learning across partnerships and provide an overview of progress.

Recommendations for the System

- **Ensure early identification and mobilisation of individuals at different levels who are well placed to lead and manage educational change and improvement through partnerships/collaboration in schools and local authorities**. These will be people with the capability to become system leaders or 'equity champions' within the Scottish education system. This must be in conjunction with appropriate support from all stakeholders, particularly Local Authorities who have a key role in talent management. This will maximise pace and momentum from the outset, continue to raise awareness of the issues and provide a conduit for moving education knowledge and expertise around the system.

- **Consider establishing innovation hubs as centres of education expertise that can play a key role in moving knowledge to action around the system and link with Education Scotland to co-ordinate and guide the strategic direction of the Programme.** These innovation hubs could also link to international developments and research outside of Scotland. This will support the implementation of the above recommendations.

5. Commentary

The first year of the SIPP has involved scoping, implementing and supporting the development of a diverse range of partnerships in a number of very different settings.

To date, emerging evidence is very encouraging. The partnerships have identified and refined their foci on challenging educational inequity and begun to draw on a range of collaborative enquiry-based approaches to collect and analyse data to inform the formation of key questions, develop interventions, monitor their impact and then refine practice in light of the new understandings that have emerged from this process. In 'early adopter' partnerships there are indications from teachers' own research and evaluations that partnerships are having an impact in a number of areas including teachers' practice, pupils' motivation and achievement.

There has been no one size-fits-all model for the SIPP, rather, partnerships have developed different approaches within an overarching framework, based on a coherent set of principles, to fit their own purpose, the needs of disadvantaged children and young people and individual contexts. This bespoke approach has been particularly helpful because it has avoided major limitations associated with a prescriptive single method approach that tends to reduce the possibilities for investigation to specific types of questions or lead to inappropriate investigations being developed that would be better served by an alternative method. The range of enquiry methods used by partnerships includes collaborative action research, improvement science, instructional rounds and lesson study. While there is variation in the intensity and breadth to which these methods have been utilised, the Programme now has a significant opportunity to embed and spread this newly developed capacity within the system as the Programme moves into its second year.

In making the transition to the next phase of development there are a number of lessons to reflect on from the first phase of work. First, the nature of support and co-ordination for individual partnerships must match available capacity and capability within the system. This means the processes and structures put in place must reflect what is possible in terms of local authority, Education Scotland and university priorities, capabilities and capacity to engage. For example drop-in 'surgeries' proved to be a better fit for the Programme than supporting 'trios'. The next phase of the SIPP has the benefit of being able to draw on these early lessons to develop and refine the day-to-day support of partnerships by the local authority and Education Scotland. Underpinning the support for the SIPP partnerships will be a need to continue to ensure that they build capacity to collect and use appropriate data. This will be imperative in understanding the nature of local inequality gaps in attainment and wider education opportunities, in identifying the needs of target groups and in understanding the impact of the various measures and projects.

Second, we suggest that a long term strategic plan for the Programme needs to be developed with a view to promoting sustainable ways of working and to maximise the impact on outcomes for learners This should involve the

development, implementation and communication of a complete work plan for the following two years of activity at the outset of phase two. Education Scotland should review coordination of the Programme to ensure appropriate advice, support and challenge for projects is provided in partnership with Local Authorities, the University and Education Scotland. While this was an intention during phase one, the complex and competing demands placed on Education Scotland prevented it from being fully operationalised. The recommendation is for investment in dedicated Education Scotland staff who are allocated to the project to ensure timely and effective project management and support and advice to partnerships regarding drafting and refining of their proposals. Both evidence and experience suggest that this is a key factor in securing success.

Third, Education Scotland should develop a range of opportunities for partnerships to learn and work together, building on the successes of the 3 national events in the first phase. These could take the form of interactive regional workshops and larger national events that connect into other policy initiatives and agendas. These opportunities should be publicised at the beginning of each year to allow partnership schools and local authorities to build them into their planning cycle. We also recommend that there should be an annual system-wide event involving all partnerships, and a further knowledge exchange activity at the Scottish Learning Festival or equivalent.

Fourth, the Programme has added to our knowledge about how complex partnerships work to implement and sustain collaborative action that benefits learners, practitioners and, arguably, their wider communities. These lessons are valuable for conceptualising how the SIPP approaches could extend to and involve wider partnerships to contribute to broader public sector improvement efforts including, for example, Community Planning Partnerships through other initiatives such as *What Works Scotland*.

Overall, we argue for the development of a longer-term strategic approach that places the SIPP at the centre of an Education Scotland strategy for knowledge generation and mobilisation. We propose that Education Scotland should further develop its Knowledge Management capacity to archive, synthesise and facilitate knowledge mobilisation across the system. This could be achieved through the establishment of a number of 'Innovation Hubs' within the system.

We propose that the first four of these 'Innovation Hubs' should focus on drawing on developing the capacity and expertise created in phase one of the Programme:

- Collaborative Action Research;
- Improvement Science;
- Instructional Rounds;
- Lesson Study.

Over time, as the Programme evolves, this first tranche of innovation hubs would be joined by a second and third tranche on an annual basis. This would broaden the range of expertise within the hubs and diversify from a methodological focus to include: *Thematic Innovation Hubs* focusing on

"wicked issues", *Curricula Innovation Hubs* for curriculum areas and *Phase Innovation Hubs* focusing on specific phases of education, for example. These Innovation Hubs would be expected to act as reservoirs of expertise and facilitate and coordinate capacity building in their area of focus across the system.

We expect Innovation Hubs to act as a conduit between individual schools, networks, local authorities and Education Scotland's Knowledge Management team to systematically generate new knowledge and support the spread of instructive and illuminating practice across the system.

In summary, we propose that the SIPP model should move from a series of stand-alone and semi-connected partnerships to a series of innovation hubs, supported by Education Scotland's centralised knowledge management function. Our findings suggest that there is significant potential in developing inter-hub connections and learning underpinned by strategic, co-ordinated yet flexible leadership which places this way of working at the centre of an agency-wide approach to developing a self-improving school system.

References

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Goldrick, S., and West, M. (2012) Making schools effective for all: rethinking the task. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(3), pp.197-213.

Chapman, C. (2008) Towards a framework for school-to-school networking in challenging circumstances. *Educational Research*, 50 (4). pp. 403-420.

Chapman, C. (2012) S*chool improvement research and practice: a case of back to the future?* In: Chapman, C., Armstrong, P., Harris, A., Muijs, D., Reynolds, D. and Sammons, P. (eds) *School Effectiveness and Improvement Research, Policy and Practice: Challenging the Orthodoxy*. Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Chapman, C. (2014) *The role of scrutiny in improving education systems*. Presentation to HMI Inspectors conference. Dunblane. 26 June 2014.

Cochran-Smith, M., and Lytle, S.L. (2009) *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Commission on School Reform (2013) *By diverse means: Improving Scottish education.*
http://reformscotland.com/public/publications/bydiversemeans1.pdf

DfES (2005) *National Framework for Mentoring and Coaching*, London DfES.

Donaldson, G. (2010) *Teaching Scotland's Future*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/01/13092132/15

Earl, E. and Katz, S. (2006) *Leading Schools in a Data-Rich World: Harnessing Data for School Improvement.* Corwin. ISBN-10: 1412906466

Fullan, M. (2013) *Great to Excellent: Launching the Next Stage of Ontario's Education Agenda*.
http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/fullan.html

Hadfield, M. and Chapman, C. (2009) School Based Networking for Educational Change. *Second International Handbook of Educational Change*, Springer, Vol 23 (3).

Kerr, D., Aiston, S., White, K., Holland, M. and Grayson, H. (2003) *Literature Review of Networked Learning Communities*, NFER, NCSL commissioned research.

Machin, S., McNally, S. and Wyness, G. (2013) *Education in Scotland: performance in a devolved policy area.* Paper No' CEPCP391.

Menter, I., Hulme, M., Elliot, D., Lewin, J., Baumfield, V., Britton, A., Carroll, M., Livingston, K., McCulloch, M., McQueen, I., Patrick, F., and Townsend, A. (2010) *Literature Review on Teacher Education for the*

Twenty-First Century. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/09/24144019/14

OECD (2007) *Quality and equity of schooling in Scotland.* Paris: OECD.

Russell, M. (2013) *From Good to Great: building equity and success in Scottish education.* Glasgow University, March 27 2013. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Speeches/school-attainment-27032013

Scottish Government (2009) *Research to Support Schools of Ambition Annual report.* ISBN 978-0-7559-7710.

Scottish Government (2013) *Empowering Scotland. The Government's Programme for Scotland 2013-14.* http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/09/8177/downloads

Vogel, I (2012) *Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in International development,* DFID Research Paper, Department for International Development

Wohlstetter, P., Malloy, C., Chau, D. and Polhemus, J. (2003) Improving Schools through Networks: A New Approach to Urban School Reform. *Educational Policy.* Vol. 17 no. 4 399-430. doi: 10.1177/0895904803254961

Appendix 1: Overview of the SIPP partnerships and examples of impact

Note: Partnerships are all at different stages with some in the early stages of their initiatives while others have implemented their plans and conducted initial evaluations.

Partnership	Description	Examples of impact based on University team data gathering and schools' own research
1. West Dunbartonshire and Renfrewshire partnership project	This partnership project currently includes 13 primary schools from across the two education authorities and will involve building partnerships across sectors (including pre-5 partners). The specific areas for improvement include: • Learners' attainment in numeracy/ maths and literacy • Pedagogical skills of practitioners, • Leadership of the agenda to raise attainment by Head Teachers and across schools.	• Increased and more effective professional dialogue • More effective Learning Visits • enhanced assessment Tools • improving teachers' critical reflection
2. Angus, Edinburgh City and South Ayrshire partnership project	Arbroath Academy, Holy Rood RC High School and Ayr Academy are collaborating to improve attainment of young people in S4-S6 through improving the quality of feedback, attendance and parental engagement. Their action research enquiry questions are: • Will regular feedback, both oral and written, result in raising attainment • Does improvement in attendance result in improved attainment? • Does providing parents with clear expectations regarding parental engagement raise parental aspirations? • Does involvement in parental engagement result in improved attainment?	• Developing leadership • Sharing practice – willingness to try something different • 'Critical Friend' approach • Increased awareness of SIMD • Growing awareness of need to take account of research • Increase in professional reading • Staff lifting heads to look at bigger picture • Strong partnership between the three schools established • Better connections with parents in identified group • Improved attendance • Improved self-esteem • Improved teacher knowledge of individual pupil context
3. South Lanarkshire partnership project	This project aims to drive forward a number of aspects of the wider closing the gap agenda through the use of an Improvement Science model to further review, evaluate and develop strategies to close the gap between the bottom 20% of pupils and their peers. Working initially in one targeted secondary school: Trinity High School, with the aim of applying small tests of change, evaluating the impact of a caring significant adult in improving outcomes for individual young people and then modelling these (scaling up) across other secondary schools across the authority in the longer term.	• Improvement in targeted pupils' attendance and motivation to learn • Boxall profile demonstrating substantial improvements in pupil mental wellbeing.

47

4. Glasgow City and Fife partnership project	This collaboration between Glasgow City and Fife involves Local Improvement Groups set up as a key driver of improvement. There will be increasingly bespoke solutions to local priorities for improvement. It includes an increased role for Leaders of Learning in supporting aspects of school improvement and in modelling good practice in learning, teaching and assessment. There will be a greater focus on wider intra, and inter authority, partnerships (e.g. Fife) to support school improvement.	• Effective Area Meetings • Partnership colleagues working effectively across their areas, the wider city and with partners in Fife. Formal & Informal networking working well and sharing of ideas and practice. Also linking with partnership groups e.g. G15/Glasgow Life. • Stronger Primary/Secondary Curricular Links • Effective QIO Support and challenge for individual Curricular Areas • Improved CPD opportunities for all staff and peer shadowing • Psychological services and LC practice level agreement (PLA) in place • Staged Intervention embedded • Emerging involvement of pupil groups in SIPP process • Increased parental involvement • Validated self-evaluation and greater use of varied evaluation methods • Impact on School Improvement Plans • HMIE & Care Inspectorate results and external accreditation awards including SQA results
5. Falkirk partnership project	This project involves Falkirk High School and the Grangemouth High School community learning clusters. The action research is targeted at the current P6 stage for those children from disadvantaged backgrounds with low attainment in literacy, and would form part of an extended transition across P6-S1. It considers multi-agency and cross-service aspects, such that the interventions are as holistic and effective as possible. This includes targeted and sensitive interventions to support family literacy, involving schools, parents, CLD and family support workers.	• Intensively researched a transition programme to increase the probability of children being able to access the secondary curriculum and achieve success • Established the joint literacy intervention between Schools and Community Learning and Development services • Developed targeted interventions to support family literacy, involving CLD workers and Family Support Workers • Developed appropriate Action research and CPD to increase the capacity of staff, to promote longer term sustainability of gains at school level
6. Midlothian and East Lothian partnership project	This project involves 6 secondary schools from each local authority working as sets of trios. Each set has agreed areas of focused improvement which include: • Tackling inequality by improving leaners' experiences • Improving monitoring and tracking • Improving the delivery of the CfE entitlement to 'personal support' • Improving use of data, intervention and assertive mentoring and improved feedback.	• Valuable partnerships have been fostered between schools • Project Leadership Team has been formed • Set up SIPP Working Groups in all partnership schools • Identified key milestones for the 2014-15 session, including INSET and CAT sessions to share good practice across the partnership • Research-based discussions have begun, focusing primarily on the work of wider studies

7. East Renfrewshire Council partnership project	This partnership involves Crookfur Primary School and Thornliebank Primary School collaborating with a focus on raising attainment in maths for boys and learners from minority ethnic backgrounds through improved learning experiences. Evaluation will include impact on learners, parents and staff involving Psychological Services. The action research questions are: • To what extent has gender and EAL impacted on attainment? • What learning and teaching approaches would improve attainment for boys and pupils using English as an additional language? • How can schools further engage these learners and their parents?	Self-evaluation evidence shows that: • Pupils are far more confident and have a more 'can do' attitude to problem solving. • Children are developing their own strategies and exploring their learning through discussion and questioning. • Pupils are seeing themselves as problem solvers. • They are fully engaged in the sessions and most pupils are choosing more challenging questions • Pupils are beginning to explain findings both orally and in writing in pair, group and class situations. • All pupils were highly motivated - teachers identified that this is not always the case in other areas of the curriculum. • Teacher questioning is being used effectively to identify all pupils' understanding.
8. Inverclyde and Argyll and Bute partnership project	This project involves Clydeview Academy and Dunoon Grammar School collaborating to close the gap between their high attaining students and those of lower ability. The focus of the action research will be: • Does the identified profiling champion with responsibility for a group of young people generate improvements in their achievement? • Will the sharing of student progress through the use of profiling, lead to improved achievement for young people? • Will increased regular professional dialogue focused on profiling, within and across establishments, lead to improved progress for young people?	The partnership has planned and implemented: • A variety and innovation in teaching & learning techniques • Reliable and varied measurement of success and improvement • Improved measures to engage parents further

Appendix 2: Project methodology

Introduction

It is important that measuring the success of the SIPP Partnerships goes beyond using only traditional attainment data, particularly in the short-term. Therefore, each Partnership has been asked to indicate what success will look like and from this appropriate measures have been developed. This has included a mixture of quantitative data, such as attendance or exclusion figures, and a qualitative assessment of engagement levels regarding a target group of young people. It may also include evaluating a new approach to learning and teaching and what have been the subsequent outcomes and developments.

The specific success measures, therefore, have been different for each Partnership, reflecting their particular circumstances and objectives. However, we have worked on the assumption that, while schools will have specific criteria for success grounded in their plans, we can also look for more general criteria of progress regarding school improvement. These include:

- evidence of distributed leadership where more staff take up leadership activities to operationalise and manage their school plan;
- positive developments in staff attitudes regarding leadership commitments and their roles within the SIPP partnership;
- developments in the curriculum to better address the needs of young people;
- changes in staff awareness and knowledge regarding the needs of the target groups;
- increased levels of staff confidence to try new approaches etc. and, particularly, developments in learning and teaching approaches;
- increased staff confidence and use regarding research and enquiry approaches;
- a shift in children's and young people's engagement with learning;
- a shift in young people's confidence and satisfaction with their learning;
- increased partnership working with other schools and, where appropriate, other agencies.

Longer-term success criteria are seen as likely to include:

- improved attainment and achievement for the target groups, evidenced by a wide range of national qualifications and accredited programmes now available to schools and community partners;
- increased positive destinations;
- evidence of cultural and organisational change in the Partnership schools.

It was also important that each Partnership constructed a narrative, drawing on the accounts of school and partnership representatives, including young people's views, of developments in the Programme such as what they thought had worked or was beginning to work, what had been less successful and the

50

reasons for success or otherwise. This qualitative evidence provided explanatory information to help understand the processes involved across the partnerships.

Methodology for the partnership support and external evaluation

To effectively address the research objectives and questions and taking into account the particular issues and context across the partnerships the evaluation adopted a two-strand approach. Strand 1 supported partnership teams to develop and deploy their own action research enquiry/ evaluation. Strand 2 entailed an external, yet collaborative, evaluation that assessed progress across all of the partnerships to understand the effectiveness to date of the overall project.

These two complementary and related strands have:

- supported action research and enquiry across the partnerships;
- mapped and monitored the development of relationships, networks and practices within partnerships;
- identified and examined emerging key themes, patterns and trends, including encouraging emerging practice within partnerships (e.g. the types of activities that are effective in addressing their objectives);
- identified and examined developments and intermediate outcomes in line with planned objectives emerging from the initiative;
- identified and examined facilitating and inhibiting contextual conditions within partnerships;
- provided formative feedback with implications for policy and practice, including initial indications of the impact of Partnerships and their potential for developing more equitable educational outcomes in Scotland.
- provided support to build capacity for self-evaluation across the partnerships.

Strand 1: Supporting partnerships to evaluate their activities

To be effective, the School Improvement partnerships required an approach based on action research and the process of collaborative enquiry. Strand 1, therefore, developed stakeholders' confidence and expertise in action-research and collaborative enquiry to gather the types of evidence required to address their evaluation objectives. The research team provided support to the partnerships as they used the processes of enquiry to move thinking and practice forward. The research team worked as an integral part of the support network provided by individuals from Education Scotland and Local Authorities to give critical friendship, assisting the partnerships to build capacity for educational improvement and to develop sustainable ways of working beyond the duration of the Programme. The nature of the support activity provided by the research team evolved over time as the needs of the partnerships developed but it generally involved:

- supporting workshops for each Partnership team in order to strengthen their skills in gathering and using evidence and in sharing each others' experiences to drive improvement efforts;

- providing direct support (using email, telephone and face-to-face advice) to the schools in designing and carrying out their research and evaluation in relation to their enquiry agendas;

- linking the work of the partnerships to relevant development and research activities nationally and internationally;

- occasional meetings with Head Teachers, staff and local authority personnel in order to explore strategic implications of the findings of the research activities;

- supporting the partnership teams in writing their evaluative accounts.

The researchers also analysed and documented processes and outcomes of activity and impact in each of the partnerships they supported. This led to the production of detailed evaluative evidence that was used to inform developments of future activity within the Programme and contribute to wider understanding in other contexts in Scotland and internationally. This data and evidence also informed Strand 2, the external evaluation.

Each member of the research team was assigned to two or three partnerships and worked collaboratively with the local authority officers and Education Scotland teams allocated to support each partnership. This approach and process helped to build the evaluation skills of the authority officers and Education Scotland personnel and promoted professional dialogue. It also promoted the University team's awareness of local and national policy and practice developments.

The partnerships worked on a collaborative enquiry approach guided by an overarching framework comprised of eight broad overlapping phases:

1. analysis of context
2. agreeing enquiry questions
3. agreeing purposes
4. making use of the available expertise
5. collecting data
6. making sense of the evidence
7. deciding on actions to be taken
8. monitoring outcomes.

These eight phases together made up a cycle of reflective collaborative research. The insights and findings from Strand 1 allowed partnerships to understand the extent of their progress and the factors involved. The findings across the partnerships also fed into the external evaluation's overall assessment of impact and progress (Strand 2).

Strand 2: External evaluation approach

This strand primarily addressed the second and third project aims, i.e.:

> to determine how well the overall SIPP and each individual Partnership projects have been implemented and to assess whether the Project as a whole has contributed to teachers' learning and development – particularly in the area of tackling disadvantage in Scottish education.

Whereas Strand 1 involved directly working with the individual Partnerships to support them in devising, refining and conducting their own evaluations, Strand two of the evaluation involved the aggregation of the individual Partnership evaluation findings along with the University teams' own primary data collection to provide a coherent overview of the SIPP impact.

The research team's strong involvement in the design and implementation of Strand 1 ensured that the evaluation plans and projects devised and operationalised by the different partnerships were sufficiently robust and valid to support the additional analysis carried out by the research team in Strand 2. Moreover, direct involvement with partnerships helped them maximise the formative element of the action research.

Strand 2 had four main components (detailed below).

(i) Identifying the range of partnerships

The research team worked in collaboration with Education Scotland and other key stakeholders to develop a framework that characterised the range and nature of the partnerships, including their particular aims, preliminary plans and networks of partners.

(ii) Mapping and monitoring the partnerships

The research team applied a range of approaches for this activity including gathering descriptive data, documentation and information on partnerships' plans and objectives. Originally, Social Network Analysis (SNA) was to be used with a small number of partnerships to explore in detail how influential networks developed and shaped the work of the respective partnerships. However, following initial discussions with partnerships this approach was seen as more appropriate to a later phase of the SIPP when the partnerships were more established.

(iii) Developing accounts of practice

This strand of activity involved developing in-depth qualitative accounts and case studies of activity across the partnerships. The case studies identified key developments and systems put in place and processes within the partnerships and examined their outcomes against their intended objectives. This analysis helped to interpret the quantitative findings. As part of the analysis of this material, the research team used an appropriate logic model to understand the relationships between the preconditions and resources invested and the inter-connected activities, outputs and outcomes of the Programme. This analysis informed the final section and reflections in this report. While causal relationships would have been difficult and inappropriate to identify, this *Theory Of Change* approach looked at outcomes and applied

critical thinking to the design, implementation and evaluation of the SIPP and supported change in the various contexts (Vogel 2012). This allowed the research team to track developments and practice in the field and identify critical incidences that facilitated or impeded the development of partnerships and their expected outcomes.

The design of the case studies was informed by the initial and base-line analysis and involved site visits to each school in the Partnership, documentary analysis, interviews with key stakeholders and observations of partnership meetings and activities.

(iv) Overview of all projects and synthesis

This part of Strand 2 involved a number of activities designed to collect additional data where necessary and produce a synthesis of findings from the other evaluation strands and a distillation of the major lessons from all of the partnerships. The evaluation gathered together evidence from individual partnership evaluations to produce an overview of findings. Although each partnership had specific and different aims and/or emphases in their work e.g. ethnic and gender equality, improving transitions, etc., the individual evaluations reflected the overall research questions detailed in Section 1. This 'framework' supported the aggregation of findings where appropriate and the discussion of experiences to allow:

- collation and analysis of relevant documentation, evaluation findings, and summary reports generated across all the partnerships;

- secondary analysis, where required, of available partnership data relating to their respective objectives.

In addition to gathering and analysing partnership data, a number of primary data gathering research activities were also conducted, with the main methods being:

- questionnaire surveys of relevant staff involved across the partnerships. These surveys provided baseline and follow-up data on partnership activity and progress. The second data collection point towards the end of the Programme enabled the team to identify any shift in progress criteria within and across the partnerships;

- targeted interviews and focus groups conducted with staff and those at strategic level to discuss and reflect on emerging themes from the evaluation;

- A brief literature review of research on school improvement initiatives which informed the analysis and provided a wider perspective on collaborative networking and enquiry in the context of school change and improvement.

For the evaluation of the SIPP, the views of pupils, where appropriate, were collected via partnerships' own data collection approaches, which had been informed by the University team. As partnership representatives have highlighted throughout the study, the impact on pupils will be more evident in the coming months and years.

Table A2a provides a summary of the proposed methods, rationale and expected outputs for this component.

Table A2a. Summary of the Strand 2 research methods, rationale and outputs.

Activity	Rationale	Output
Analysis of partnership documentation, evaluation findings, and reports.	Identification of partnership aims, methods of working, key issues, successes. Provide complementary external component to internal partnership evaluations.	Contribute to the overview of projects, aims, methods of working, identified successes, and issues concerning sustainability
Secondary analysis of partnership data	Further analysis (where possible) of existing partnership data. Aggregation of individual partnership data to improve its robustness. Provide complementary external component to internal partnership evaluations.	Provide generalised and more comprehensive findings. Contribute to the indication of overall success. Identification of key drivers of success and an indication of overall sustainability.
Questionnaire survey of SIPP partner representatives including Head Teachers, local authority staff, key teachers and other staff involved across the partnerships. Conducted in February 2014 and repeated in June 2014	Supports the identification of initial initiative impact. Provide complementary external component to internal partnership evaluations.	Quantifiable indication of the specific and aggregated impact of the initiative over a fixed period of time using broader criteria of success.
Qualitative research strand including: Interviews Focus group interviews with partner representatives including Head Teachers, local authority staff, key teachers and other staff, involved	In-depth material to help identify the impact of the partnership towards the end of the evaluation Reflection and validation of emerging external findings. Provide complementary external component to internal partnership evaluation	Qualitative dimension to the impact of the initiative. Material supported the generation of illustrative examples and accounts of practice.

Approach to the analysis

The research used ex post facto evidence, expert and key informant judgments and focused primary data gathered at two key intervals to explore the extent to which changes in the observed outcomes were due to the SIPP activities. The analysis systematically identified the main factors involved in the observed outcomes. The overall framework for the analysis was the research objectives and research questions documented as set out in Section 1 of this report.

Completed baseline and follow-up questionnaires were described and analysed using SPSS (Statistics Package for the Social Sciences). Frequencies, cross-tabulations, and relevant statistical tests were performed. The analysis also addressed, as far as was possible, the key factors which promote/hinder the impact of the SIPP approach and identified relevant associations between variables.

The initial analysis was directed towards an exploration of the reported impact or otherwise of the projects drawing on stakeholders' reported responses to their survey questions and any secondary data from the schools on meaningful outcome criteria. Depending on the nature of the data, and where

there were robust numbers, the team applied cross-tabulation and ANOVA to explore both association and difference of variables within and across the different projects. However, this was limited by the numbers of respondents available for statistical calculation once the data was attributed to respective partnerships. Likewise, comparison on the basis of stakeholder group was a focus for the analysis but again, numbers of responses limited the level of analysis to the whole 'population;' so that analysis was not feasible at the local authority and project level.

Qualitative evidence gathered during the individual and group interviews was recorded both in note-form and through digital audio recording. A rigorous thematic analysis was conducted to illuminate participants' experiences of the initiative and detail their perceptions, aspirations and shifts in these as the Programme developed. The analysis also highlighted those processes that have influenced the implementation and impact of the SIPP. This analysis drew on transcription accounts for clarification and illustration.

Analysis involved coding to distil and sort the data to enable comparisons to be made and analytical insights developed. During this process memos were used to define emerging ideas and interpretations and to develop analytic categories. In addition to identifying key themes, patterns and trends these categories assisted in identifying any gaps in our data which were then addressed through further data collection. As categories developed they were built through successive levels of analysis. As the analysis developed, additional data collected served to check and refine the categories, culminating in a deep theoretical understanding of the studied experience and generation of findings that highlighted the reported impact of the projects. The draft findings were tested for face validity by the research team's expert panel and advisory committee. In addition to the expertise within the core group the research team included external key experts who acted as critical friends for the evaluation process. These experts, Professor Graham Donaldson (University of Glasgow and Professor Mel Ainscow (University of Manchester), both of whom have unparalleled vantage points and expertise regarding the direction of Scottish education and school improvement. These individuals provided expert insights and assessment regarding the emerging findings and themes at key stages of the research.

Appendix 3: Details of survey respondents

Fifty-two participants completed the questionnaire at the Partnership event on 19 June. Twenty-six were male and 26 were female. Forty (77%) were school staff, 23 (43%) were secondary based and 16 (30%) were based in primaries. Sixteen (30%) were Head Teachers and there were 10 local authority education representatives. By comparison, the initial survey was completed by 45 respondents, 28 males and 17 females. Seventy three percent were school staff, with 28% secondary based and 44% primary staff. Fourteen (32%) were Head Teachers and there were 10 local authority representatives.

While there are similarities in the profile of respondents to both surveys it is clear that more secondary than primary staff completed the February questionnaire and more primary than secondary staff completed the June questionnaire. Moreover, looking at responses by local authority we again see some differences in the profile of respondents. Such differences are likely to reflect changes in participation and levels of involvement in the SIPP over the past year. See Table A3a for details.

Table A3a – Participants by Local Authority (survey one in brackets)

Local authority	Participants	Percentage
Angus	- (2)	- (4)
Argyll and Bute	2 (1)	4 (2)
East Lothian	7 (-)	13 (-)
East Renfrewshire	7 (9)	13 (20)
Edinburgh City	3 (9)	6 (20)
Falkirk	2 (1)	4 (2)
Fife	1 (1)	2 (2)
Glasgow City	4 (3)	8 (7)
Inverclyde	3 (1)	6 (2)
Midlothian	6 (1)	11 (2)
Renfrewshire	4 (6)	8 (13)
South Ayrshire	1 (1)	2 (2)
South Lanarkshire	3 (1)	6 (2)
West Dunbartonshire	10 (9)	19 (20)
Total	**53 (45)**	**100**

Partnership roles
Sixty-two percent of participants in the June survey indicated that they *had a role in implementing partnership activities*, 49% reported that they were responsible for *coordinating the partnership activities within their school* while 17% said they had a role in *conducting research and enquiry regarding the partnership activities* and 2% noted that they had *no active role within the SIPP*.

In the February survey fewer than half (43%) of respondents noted a *role in implementing partnership activities* and a further 43% reported being *responsible for co-ordinating partnership activity within their schools*.

T +44 (0)141 282 5000
E enquiries@educationscotland.gov.uk
W www.educationscotland.gov.uk

Education Scotland, Denholm House, Almondvale Business Park, Almondvale Way, Livingston, EH54 6GA

Transforming lives through learning