

**THE LEARNING COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE
IN GLASGOW**

Phase 2 Evaluation

**REPORT
TO THE
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION**

VOLUME 1

**Professor Stephen Baron
Mr. Stuart Hall
Ms. Margaret Martin
Mr. Douglas McCreath
Professor Martyn Roebuck
Mr. Dominic Schad
Professor J. Eric Wilkinson**

**Faculty of Education
University of Glasgow**

April 2003

CONTENTS

Volume 1

	Page
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>v</i>
Chapter 1 - Introduction and context	1
Chapter 2 - Methodology	10
Chapter 3 - Progress towards the Success Criteria	15
Chapter 4 - Curriculum innovation	31
Chapter 5 - ICT	45
Chapter 6 - Perceptions of pupils and parents	57
Chapter 7 - Assessing the impact of New Learning Communities	67
Chapter 8 - Discussion	73
Chapter 9 - Conclusions and Recommendations	78
Chapter 10 - The way ahead	80
Bibliography	83

Appendices (Volume 2)

Appendix A - Conclusions & Recommendations from Phase 1 Report

Appendix B - Success Criteria to be addressed in the Evaluation (Phase 1)

Appendix C - Supporting Effective School Clusters (Dowling and Gooday)

Appendix D - Deprivation Index Scores in each Learning Community

Appendix E1 - LC Principal's Interview Schedule

Appendix E2 - LC Principal's Interview Schedule (2nd Part)

Appendix F - Membership of three Support Groups as follows:

An LC Progress Group, a Curriculum Development
Group and an ICT Group

Appendix G - Questionnaire on ICT development in Learning Communities

Appendix H - Pupil Pro-forma: Likes, Dislikes and Wishes on Learning, School
and Local Area

Appendix I - Achievement in Learning Community Schools 2000-2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report wish to place on record their appreciation to all who contributed to this piece of work. Those invited to participate in the evaluation process did so willingly and enthusiastically. As in our previous report, special mention must be made of the support from Learning Community Principals, Head Teachers, Teachers and Pre-five staff in each of the four Learning Communities involved in the evaluation. Their perceptions and experience of the Learning Community initiative during 2002 proved invaluable.

Particular thanks are due to the several parents and pupils who willingly gave of their time to participate in various activities associated with the evaluation. Our gratitude is also due to the various Support Groups who provided useful feedback in the early part of the evaluation, to staff in SEEMIS and in Glasgow City Council headquarters who also gave helpful advice when required.

The authors also wish to thank Fay Barclay for her consistent and diligent commitment to the various administrative tasks throughout the duration of the evaluation and the painstaking way she has addressed the generation of this report. We also are indebted to our colleague Stephen Boyle who assisted us with the work on ICT.

Last but not least we wish to thank the funders of the work - the Scottish Executive Education Department under the Futures Learning and Teaching Programme, Glasgow City Council and the University of Glasgow. Without this support, either directly or in kind, the work could not have been undertaken.

Professors Baron and Wilkinson

on behalf of the Evaluation Team
April 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary is based on the second evaluation report on the Learning Community initiative undertaken by the Education Department in Glasgow City Council. The initiative is now in its fourth year having started with two Learning Communities - St. Mungo's and Eastbank - in 1999 and expanded to six in 2000 - the additions being Lochend, Smithycroft, St. Andrews and Whitehill. The first evaluation report, based on four of six Learning Communities, was published in October 2001. The second report (April 2003) covers the period of January 2002 to the Spring of 2003. The aims of the second report were:

- to continue to monitor the extent to which the initiative achieves the agreed Success Criteria and to monitor the response of the Learning Communities to the recommendations made in Phase 1
- to illuminate staff and pupils' experiences of specific curriculum innovations introduced by the four Learning Communities involved in Phase 1 of the evaluation. Examples of innovations were in Science, Writing, Modern Languages and Maths
- to examine how ICT is being used in the Learning Communities, specifically in streamlining administration and releasing time for teaching
- to ascertain parental and community attitudes to the initiative to date
- to investigate the quantitative information held in the SEEMIS system that would allow identification of changes in attainment in those pupils attending Learning Community schools and to develop initial multi-level models of pupil attainment in the context of the socio-economic structures of Glasgow
- to explore the processes of policy development as the largest authority in Scotland considers the fundamental re-organisation of its establishments

The report takes the recent Scottish Indices of Deprivation to examine the income, employment, health and education records of each of the six Learning Communities in 2001. Detailed calculations have been made for each Learning Community area which show that these areas are suffering from some of the most acute deprivation in Scotland in a city which has the worst deprivation in terms of income, employment, education and health yet with the best geographical access to services. The Learning Communities have an uphill struggle to challenge these powerful negative influences if the ultimate goals of raising achievement and promoting greater social inclusion are to be realised.

To address the above aims of the evaluation, the dominant research methods used were 1:1 interviews with key stakeholders, questionnaires and focus groups with teachers, pupils and parents.

It was found that positive advances were made by the Learning Community initiative during 2002. The following conclusions were drawn:

- the advances in curriculum innovation at the local level has been the main hallmark of the initiative in 2002. A sense of ownership in the Learning Communities coupled with a recognition of the value of networking has generated a will to invest ideas and resources to the benefit of children's schooling in each Learning Community.
- a greater collaboration across sectors has emerged within each Learning Community in terms of joint decision-making in the deployment of resources. More staff have become identified with the initiative and feelings of suspicion and threat have significantly diminished.
- a significant effort has been made in clarifying the roles of senior staff in each Learning Community thus helping to improve the efficiency in decision-making and administration.
- tentative steps have been taken towards addressing the central issue of social inclusion through the establishment of Child Support Teams.
- significant progress has been made in the deployment of ICT for enhancing the efficiency of administration in each Learning Community

The report identifies a number of points for action, which are:

- It was right and proper during the pilot phases of the Learning Community initiative (1999-2003) that each Learning Community be given freedom to find its own way forward. A new steer, such as that articulated in the Council's Children's Services paper in 2002, is essential for the future success of the initiative. Such a steer should be supported by clear, overt and sustained commitment by the Council to the twin aims of the initiative, that is, raising achievement and enhancing social inclusion.
- Within the Learning Communities themselves, further consideration and action is required to facilitate cross-sector learning and teaching. In particular, Principal Teachers in the Secondary Schools might be given more opportunities to be involved in the work of the Learning Community Primary Schools. An interactive working relationship requires to be established between Primary School Headteachers and Principal Teachers in the Secondary Schools if significant pedagogic advances are to be made. Such a relationship would facilitate the cross-sectoral deployment of staff.
- Also, at the pedagogic level, greater attempts should be made to use consistent assessment information in planning children's learning experiences, particularly at the points of transition from one stage to the next.

- As mentioned in the first report, the initiative has not yet substantially addressed the relationships between school, pupils, parents and community. Recognition needs to be given to parents and community interests as ‘stakeholders’ in the educative process such as is witnessed in the Networked Learning Communities in the Educational Action Zones in England.
- A new initiative needs to be taken in the use of ICT. Whilst ICT is now being deployed to enhance administration in each Learning Community, the opportunity to extend this to learning and teaching in Learning Communities must be seized.
- In the Learning Community initiative to date there has been variation in the involvement of other agencies. Such involvement, where it is in evidence, has depended on personal contacts and good will rather than appropriate structural arrangements to sustain collaboration. New relationships with other agencies should now be developed involving health, social work, careers, police, Children’s Panels and community education. Such “integration of services” as outlined in the report *For Scotland’s Children* (SEED, 2001) is an essential step in the pursuit of greater social inclusion.
- There is a need to set in place a systematic process for identifying measurable outcomes in order to demonstrate whether the initiative is impacting as expected.

This Report, as did its predecessor, provides an encouraging endorsement of the Authority’s policy for raising achievement and enhancing social inclusion in the City of Glasgow. Whilst it is still premature to expect movement in ‘output’ factors such as systematic and consistent changes in examination results, the tentative early signs are encouraging.

There are promising signs that might suggest the initiative will hold out hope that, in the years to come, the cycle of under-achievement in Glasgow will be broken. But it will require the dedication and sustained commitment of all the stakeholders - central government, local government, service agencies, teachers, pupils, parents and community leaders.

Chapter 1 Introduction and context

This is the second evaluation report on the Learning Community initiative in Glasgow. It covers the period January 2002 to March 2003. The background to the initiative was provided in the first evaluation report (Baron et al, 2001):

In June 1999 the Education Committee of Glasgow City Council (GCC) agreed to establish a major pilot project to improve the educational achievement of children and young people in the city by re-organising the management of its schools into local clusters (called Learning Communities). The clusters consist of a secondary school, its associated primary schools and pre-five establishments. Initially two clusters were set up in 1999. However, a year later it was decided to augment the initial two Learning Communities to provide a more significant basis on which to formulate future policy. In August 2000 four new clusters were added bringing the number of clusters involved in the initiative to six. Fifty three establishments are now involved in the initiative. The expansion was thought necessary in order to inform the Education Committee about the best way forward for the future management of its schools and pre-five centres as part of a wider social inclusion agenda.

(Baron, et al, 2001, p1)

In their first report, the evaluators provided evidence for the progress of the initiative in meeting the Success Criteria established by senior staff in the Education Department of Glasgow City Council (GCC) based on the perceptions and experiences of the professionals directly involved in the initiative. On the basis of this evidence the evaluators drew a number of conclusions and made several recommendations (see Appendix A). In particular, mention was made of the positive outcomes achieved by the end of the first two years and a list of Points for Action identified.

Further funding for the continuation of the evaluation (hitherto referred to as Phase 2), was made by the Scottish Executive Education Department under the new Future Learning and Teaching Programme (FLaT). In Phase 2 of the evaluation, the following tasks were agreed:

- to continue to monitor the extent to which the initiative achieves the agreed Success Criteria (see Appendix B) and to monitor the response of the Learning Communities to the recommendations made in Phase 1 (see Chapter 3)
- to illuminate staff and pupils' experiences of specific curriculum innovations introduced by the four Learning Communities involved in Phase 1 of the evaluation. Examples of innovations were in Science, Writing, Modern Languages and Maths (see Chapter 4)
- examine how ICT is being used in the Learning Communities, specifically in streamlining administration and releasing time for teaching (see Chapter 5)
- to ascertain parental and community attitudes to the initiative to date (see Chapter 6)

- to investigate the quantitative information held in the SEEMIS system that would allow identification of changes in attainment in those pupils attending Learning Community schools and to develop initial multi-level models of pupil attainment in the context of the socio-economic structures of Glasgow (see Chapter 7)
- to explore the processes of policy development as the largest authority in Scotland considers the fundamental re-organisation of its establishments (see Chapter 10).

Given the emphasis placed on the role of professionals in Phase 1 of the evaluation of the Learning Community initiative, of particular interest to policy makers in Phase 2 were the perceptions and experiences of the learners and those who support them. Views were therefore sought from pupils involved in particular curriculum initiatives (see Chapters 4 and 6) and from selected groups of parents (see Chapter 6).

In Phase 1 it was deemed too premature to undertake a robust summative evaluation of the overall purpose of the initiative viz. to raise the attainment level in Glasgow schools. It was thought that more time was required for the initiative to impact on the learning process to the extent one might reasonably expect changes in achievement levels. Whilst this judgement also applies to Phase 2, the evaluators deemed it appropriate to begin the process of defining how the impact of the initiative on achievement levels could properly be assessed in order to facilitate a more summative evaluation in the medium term.

1.2 Clustering of schools

The idea of clustering schools is not new. It has been practised, mainly in rural primary schools, both on informal grounds, where mutual support was the main purpose, and formal grounds involving financial arrangements. Dowling & Gooday (2000) undertook a useful review of the relevant literature on clustering and developed an evaluation framework for the development of effective clusters based on seven 'effective' clusters. A summary of Dowling & Gooday's findings is given in Appendix C. The components of this framework focus on the following issues:

- curriculum, teaching and learning
- ethos
- management and resources
- leadership and QA

A number of recommendations for the development of effective clusters were proposed. For established clusters these were:

- *continue to build and develop collaborative activities*
- *liaise with other cluster schools to highlight and promote cluster benefits in the community*

- *consider how the National Grid for Learning might be used creatively to promote collaboration of staff and pupils, to enhance pupil attainment and cluster ethos.*

(Dowling & Gooday, 2000, p 9)

Dowling and Gooday, concluded that despite the difficulties on establishing and developing clustering arrangements, the advantages of such arrangements were beneficial to all.

Clustering of schools is also being promoted by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) in England. The development of Networked Learning Communities (NCL) is of particular relevance to the Glasgow policy where it is located in Educational Action Zones (EAZ) (DfEE, 1998) with its emphasis on tackling disadvantage:

At the core of the stated aims of the EAZ policy was a focus upon the development of innovative practices to improve teaching and learning, raise standards and tackle social exclusion.

(Carter, 2002, p 42)

Carter recognises the significance of the EAZ policy for examining the changing pattern of leadership and management of schools:

By virtue of its focus upon 'tackling disadvantage', the EAZ initiative has necessarily embraced schools in inner-city, urban locations, operating within the sorts of challenging contexts associated with schooling in areas of disadvantage and amongst disadvantaged populations. On this basis, an analysis of the EAZ initiative provides a focused opportunity to address the changing patterns of leadership and management amongst schools in urban and challenging contexts as they have been affected by the introduction of the EAZ policy.

(Carter, 2002, p 43)

Of critical importance to the success of NLCs, as Carter sees it, is the governance of such clusters of schools which are attempting to enhance the quality of pupil learning, professional development and school-to-school learning. A central feature of the NLCs in England is the networking model of school management at the local level. The challenge facing such a form of management is whether this group-based mechanism is more effective than headteachers operating independently in managing:

A delicate interplay between attending to local needs and generating the freedom (and confidence) to innovate on the basis of local initiative, whilst at the same time meeting the demand of an external change agenda driven from the centre.

(Carter, 2002, p 53)

1.3 The wider context

In the report on Phase 1 of the evaluation of the Learning Community initiative in Glasgow, the evaluators provided an outline of the severe social and economic difficulties facing the vast majority of families living in areas served by schools involved in the Learning Community initiative in the City of Glasgow:

The context of the City of Glasgow presents the local authority and its schools with a set of issues unique in Scotland and with few parallels in Britain and Europe.

(Baron et al, 2001, p 3)

The evaluators identified appropriate data from the Revised Scottish Area Deprivation Index of 1998 to set the Learning Communities in context (see Tables 1.1 and 1.2).

Table 1.1: The Six Learning Communities and Deprivation Index Scores

Learning Community	Post-code	Ranking out of 895 Post codes	Deprivation Index Score	National Average Index Score	Glasgow Average Index Score	Z Score in National Distribution	Z Score in Glasgow Distribution
Lochend:	G34.0	6 th	15.86	6.41	10.88	-2.98	-1.26
St. Andrew's	G32.6	26 th	14.76	6.41	10.88	-2.63	-0.98
St. Mungo's	G40.2	44 th	13.55	6.41	10.88	-2.25	-0.67
Whitehill	G31.2	90 th	11.23	6.41	10.88	-1.52	-0.09
Smithycroft	G33.2	136 th	10.22	6.41	10.88	-1.20	+0.16
Eastbank	G32.9	270 th	7.14	6.41	10.88	-0.23	+0.94

Table 1.2: The Learning Communities in National and City Context

Learning Community	Z Score in National Distribution	Z Score in Glasgow Distribution	% Scotland less deprived	% Glasgow less deprived
Lochend:	-2.98	-1.26	99.86	89.62
St. Andrew's	-2.63	-0.98	99.57	83.65
St. Mungo's	-2.25	-0.67	98.78	74.86
Whitehill	-1.52	-0.09	93.57	53.59
Smithycroft	-1.20	+0.16	88.49	43.64
Eastbank	-0.23	+0.94	59.10	17.36

Having outlined the main limitations of the Index the evaluators concluded:

The context within which the Learning Communities pilot has taken place, and in which much of the 'roll out' will take place, is one of deep and widespread deprivation where even the most advantaged area locally is still relatively disadvantaged nationally. Understanding the dynamics of this deprivation, and how education may combat it, is one of the issues for the Learning Communities initiative.

(Baron et al, 2001, p 5)

These more refined data reinforce the view that the pilot Learning Communities are working in some of the most demanding contexts in Britain and show that, with few exceptions, the consistency of deprivation within each Learning Community in Glasgow.

The most recent data to emerge on the socio-economic conditions affecting Glasgow comes from two recent reports: Noble et al (2003) and Turok et al (2003). The first report, undertaken in the University of Oxford, presents the domains and indicators for the Scottish Indices of Deprivation based on data from April 2001 for each local authority area. The second study, undertaken in the University of Glasgow, examines strategies to promote economic and social progress in the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow.

The Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 represent a significant advance in the resources available to understand and tackle multiple deprivation in Scotland. Whereas the 1998 Revised Index relied, in part, on data from the 1991 Census, the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 draw from a variety of current administrative data sources allowing the Indices to be updated constantly. The scale of precision (1222 Wards) is marginally better than the 1998 Revised Index (895 Postcode Sectors) and these boundaries are somewhat more relevant to social policy issues than Postcode Sectors.

The main advantage of the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 lies in the more comprehensive range of indicators which are used to scale deprivation. Where the 1998 Revised Index was compiled from six variables (selected by factor analysis from an initial list of 18) the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 is compiled, after exhaustive consideration of the possibilities, from five primary domains each containing multiple indicators (a total of 29 variables) see Table 1.3:

Table 1.3 List of Domains and Indicators of Deprivation in Scotland

Domain	Indicator Variables
Income Deprivation	Adults in Income Support Households Children in Income Support Households Adults in Income Based Job Seeker Allowance Households Children in Income Based Job Seeker Allowance Households Adults in Working Families Tax Credit Households (low income) Children in Working Families Tax Credit Households (low income) Adults in Disability Tax Credit Households (low income) Children in Disability Tax Credit Households (low income)
Employment Deprivation	Unemployment claimants under 60 Incapacity Benefit recipients under 60 Severe Disablement Allowance recipients under 60 Compulsory New Deal participants (not Unemployment claimants)
Health Deprivation and Disability	Comparative Mortality Factor for under 75s Hospital episodes related to alcohol use Hospital episode related to drug use Comparative Illness Factor Emergency Admissions to Hospital %Population prescribed drugs for anxiety/depression/psychosis % live singletons with low birth weight
Education, Skills & Training Deprivation	Working age adults with no qualifications Pupils >16 not in f/t education and % of 17+ population who have not successfully applied to Higher Education Pupil SQA performance Secondary level absences
Geographical Access to Services	Road distance to GP surgery Road distance to general store/supermarket Road distance to Primary School Road distance to a petrol station Road distance to bank or building society Road distance to community internet facility

Source: Noble et al (2003) **Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003**, Oxford.

Domain scores are calculated by totalling for the first two domains (Income; Employment) and by weighting according to loadings on factor analyses for the remaining domains (Health; Education; Geographical Access). The five domain scores were combined into an overall Index of Multiple Deprivation by converting the domain scores to domain ranks (out of the 1222 Wards) and transforming them exponentially to a value range of 0 to 100 structured so that the 10% most deprived wards in Scotland had values between 50 and 100. These transformed scores were then weighted at Income and Employment (30% each), Health and Education (15% each) and Geographical Access (10%). These data are available at Ward and Local Authority levels.

Before analysing the position of Glasgow and the Learning Communities in terms of this new measure of multiple deprivation some limitations on interpretation must be noted. First, as was specified in the Phase 1 Report, the Ward location of the

secondary school in each Learning Community may be different from that of many of the pupils of the Learning Community whose home may lie within other Wards. Secondly, it is important not to fall foul of the 'ecological fallacy' that all people from a deprived Ward are deprived. This is almost never true.

Thirdly the new Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 use exponential scores which are, in themselves, not easily interpreted. The position of a particular Ward or a particular Local Authority is thus best expressed in terms of its rank order on the index in question – i.e. its place in the ordering from 1 to 1222 of the Wards of Scotland on the specific measure of deprivation. Such rank ordering, in assuming that the distance between No 1 and No 2 is the same as between No 2 and No 3, which is the same as between No 3 and No 4 etc. loses information which scores themselves give. Techniques used in the Phase 1 Report such as z-scores are not applicable to such data but, as we suggest in Chapter 8, the range and quality of the data in the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 could be used by the Council radically to improve its monitoring of pupil attainments and its understanding of 'what works' in the context of Glasgow's multiple deprivation.

The final limitation of the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 which must be noted now is that it seeks to present a picture of deprivation across the whole of Scotland. The 1998 Revised Index explicitly was an index of urban deprivation and the attention to rural deprivation in the Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003 is to be welcomed. The implementation of this laudable concern in the new Indices is, however, questionable and indeed, nearly questioned by the authors who write:

The Geographical Access to Services measure appears to be a near inversion of other deprivation ... this difference is shown by the fact that Glasgow's wards feature prominently in the least deprived decile of wards on the Geographical Access to services domain whereas they are prominent in the most deprived decile of wards on the other domains

(Noble et al, 2003:43)

The conflation of what appear to be two distinct types of deprivation (urban and rural) in one measure tends to understate the deprivation rankings in Glasgow which are summarised in Table 1.4:

Table 1.4 Summary of Deprivation Ranks in Glasgow

Domain	Glasgow Minimum Rank	Glasgow Maximum Rank	Glasgow Mean Rank
Income	1	1108	239
Employment	1	1117	269
Health	1	976	177
Education	1	1216	296
Geographical Access	508	1222	984

Despite the impact of the rural oriented Geographical Access domain on the composite Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, of the 122 most deprived Wards 44 are in

Glasgow (55.7% of the city total) with Dundee next with 15 (51.7% of the city total) and no other council having more than 7 Wards in this category.

In order to summarise the position of local authorities in terms of deprivation the Oxford team develop six measures:

- Local concentration: the average weighted ranks of the most multiply deprived wards which contain 10% of the authority's population
- Extent: proportion of the authority's population who live the 10% most multiply deprived wards
- Income scale: the absolute number of people deprived in terms of income
- Employment scale: the absolute number of people deprived in terms of employment
- Average of ward ranks: the population weighted average of ward ranks on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Average of ward scores: the population weighted average of ward scores on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation

On each of these six measures local authorities are ranked from 1 (most deprived) to 32 (least deprived). If deprivation were randomly (i.e. evenly) distributed then we would expect the average of ranks for individual local authorities across these six measures all to cluster around 16; if deprivation were highly concentrated then we would expect a smooth distribution of such averages from 1 (the most highly deprived authority) to 32 (an authority with little deprivation). The reality, of course lies in between: the average rank of authorities across the six measures is (by definition) 16 but the range is from 1 to 27.5 with a standard deviation of 7.66. Glasgow's average rank is 1 (i.e. it is the most deprived authority on each of the six summary measures) with the next most deprived authority (Dundee) having an average rank of 3.5. Glasgow is thus 1.83 standard deviation units away from the Scottish mean, a position of extreme relative deprivation. These conclusions are consonant with those drawn from the 1998 Revised Index with its different method of representing deprivation.

Given the very recent release of the data for individual Wards it is only possible to give a preliminary assessment of how the catchment areas of the six Learning Communities fare in terms of this new definition of Multiple Deprivation at this stage (see Appendix D). In particular it has not been possible to conduct the analysis at the level of the Partner Primary Schools for each Community, the most robust level until pupil addresses/postcodes can be made available to link the analysis to the actual roll of the schools.

From Table 1.5 it can be seen that four of the six Learning Communities are in Wards which are the 10% most deprived in Scotland with the other two just outside this (arbitrary) boundary. Excluding the Access rank, 26 out of the 32 other rankings are within the 10% boundary (Rank 122 or less). All Learning Communities are located in areas with very significant Health deprivations.

Table 1.5 Deprivation Ranks for each Learning Community in Glasgow

Learning Community and Ward	Rank of Income	Rank of Employment	Rank of Education	Rank of Health	Rank of Access	Overall Rank
Eastbank: Shettleston 43	158	126	227	56	1053	140
Lochend: Easterhouse 50	9	37	30	25	801	19
Smithycroft: Gartcraig 39	35	60	44	36	1048	41
St. Andrew's Greenfield 41	136	128	344	55	1061	138
St. Mungo's: Calton 34	57	40	93	4	1058	40
Parkhead 36	1	1	27	2	1146	3
Whitehill: Milnbank	50	77	60	68	1176	55
Dennistoun 33	94	107	97	31	1214	77

The study by Turok et al (2003) was part of the major Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Programme of research on Britain's cities. The Glasgow team aimed to explore the often assumed positive relationship between social cohesion and economic competitiveness in Glasgow and Edinburgh. The study confirms the view from other research and the new Indices of Deprivation that Glasgow is a city with substantial economic and social problems - *some of the largest and most intense spatial concentrations of poverty and exclusion in Britain* (2003: vi). The study however presents a more variegated view of the deprivation in Glasgow noting that the city has had not inconsiderable successes in its economic regeneration. These successes have not spread to all parts of the city where public services were thought to be slightly worse and where problems of stigmatisation are common. The study notes that social cohesion in poor neighbourhoods was stronger than in more affluent areas but that these forms of cohesion may act as brakes on social and economic development - the strength of 'bonding social capital' (social capital for getting by) may tie a person into a group from which it is difficult to move while the absence of 'bridging social capital' (social capital for getting on) may mean that people do not have the networks of contacts through which economic and social opportunities present themselves. The consequences of these different forms of social capital have profound implications for educational action in the city.

As far as Glasgow is concerned the authors conclude that:

Areas such as the Clyde waterfront and Glasgow's East End are outstanding underdeveloped assets needing focused attention to bring about development in a coherent and integrated manner

(Turok et al, 2003)

Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1 Introduction

The methodology deployed in Phase 2 of the Learning Community evaluation was selected in relation to the context of the different tasks of the evaluation. Three dominant methodologies were deployed, that is, 1:1 interviews with key stakeholders, questionnaires to selected teachers and focus groups with teachers, pupils and parents. In addition, curriculum materials developed in the Learning Communities were scrutinised as exemplars of innovation initiated by the Learning Community initiative. Details of the deployment of these methodologies in relation to the tasks outlined in Chapter 1 are provided below.

In Phase 1 of the evaluation it was deemed appropriate to have an Advisory Group to advise the evaluation team in its task of pursuing the strengths and limitations of the Learning Community initiative. Such a group proved extremely valuable to both the Learning Community Principals and the evaluation team. However, given the diverse nature of Phase 2 it was thought appropriate to have a number of Support Groups which could also offer advice as appropriate, rather than from a single group as in Phase 1. Three Support Groups were established as follows:

- An Learning Community Progress Group
- A Curriculum Development Group
- An ICT Group

Membership of each group consisted of representatives of the various stakeholder groups associated with the initiative. These were: Learning Community Principals, Advisers, Headteachers and teachers in the Learning Community schools, parents and pupils and the evaluation team. A list of members of each group is provided in Appendix F. Each group met approximately three times during the course of Phase 2 and provided both useful advice and help to evaluators in pursuing the agreed evaluation agenda.

2.2 Progress towards the Success Criteria

As in the first evaluation report (Phase 1) the starting point for Phase 2 of the evaluation was the list of Success Criteria identified by the Education Directorate of Glasgow City Council. With the exception of the attainment criteria (see Chapter 1), these criteria were adopted as the criteria with which to evaluate the pilot initiative. In the context of these criteria, the purpose of the evaluation was to ascertain the extent to which each criterion was being realised (or otherwise) and the possible reasons for progress (or lack of it). Whilst the evaluators were able to identify specific instances of innovation in response to the Learning Community initiative, most of the evaluation relied on the perceptions and experience of key stakeholders (see 3.2) involved in the initiative.

The Success Criteria were categorised in 4 domains (see Appendix B for full details) as follows:

- A. Curriculum delivery and pupil attainment (12 criteria)
- B. Staff deployment and development (10 criteria)
- C. Administration (9 criteria)
- D. Process (11 criteria)

In Phase 1 of the evaluation, four of the existing six Learning Communities were involved in the collection of primary data. The same four Learning Communities involved in Phase 1 of the evaluation also participated in this aspect of Phase 2. Two sets of interviews were conducted with each of the four Learning Community Principals. The purpose of the first interview was to explore the Principals' perceptions of progress in the first two domains (viz. Curriculum delivery and Staff deployment); whilst the second interview was conducted to ascertain the progress made (or otherwise) in addressing the Points for Action identified by the evaluators in their first report and also to explore progress towards the success criteria in the last two domains (viz. Administration and Process).

In addition to the four Principals involved in the Phase 1 of the evaluation, three interviews took place with headteachers in each of the Harris¹ and Cumbrae's Learning Communities, four in Tiree Learning Community and one interview took place in Lewis Learning Community between May and October 2002 and focused on the following Success Criteria:²

- Curriculum Delivery
- Staff Deployment and Development
- Administration
- Process

The four Learning Community Principals involved in Phase 1 of the evaluation nominated members of staff in their own Learning Community for interview. Table 2.1 gives details of the staff interviewed.

Table 2.1 Interviewees by Learning Community and designation

Learning Community	Interviewed Staff
Harris	Principal, 2 Primary Headteachers, 1 Early Years Head
Cumbrae	Principal, 2 Primary Headteachers, 1 Early Years Head
Tiree	Principal, 1 Secondary Headteacher, 1 Primary Headteacher 2 Early Years Heads
Lewis	Principal, 1 Early Years Head

¹ The same pseudonyms used in the first evaluation report to refer to the four Learning Communities which participated in the evaluation are used in the report. Similar pseudonyms are used for the other two Learning Communities - Skye and Mull.

² Given the small number of staff interviewed and non-random selection process, findings contained in this report have to be viewed as illuminative and insightful rather than comprehensive and generalisable to the Learning Communities as a whole.

2.3 Curriculum Innovation

The methodology used to explore the selected curriculum case-study innovations was based on both interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders. Following the preliminary interviews with each of the six Learning Community Principals the following case studies were selected:

- Writing/Literacy (Harris)
- Maths (Tiree)
- Critical Skills (Skye)
- Science (Cumbrae)

In the **Science** case study, teachers in both the secondary school and the ‘lead’ primary school were interviewed. In addition, a focus group with P7 pupils moving up to the secondary school from the same primary school in 2002/3 was conducted.

In the **Critical Skills (CSP)** case study, the headteacher and two teachers in the ‘lead’ primary school associated with CSP were interviewed and focus groups conducted with five P3 pupils and six P5/6 pupils.

In the **Maths** case study, the Learning Community Principal, a primary school headteacher and two teachers (one secondary, one primary) were interviewed and a focus group conducted with eight S1 pupils.

The **Writing/Literacy** case study group discussion was conducted with seven teachers (4 secondary, 2 primary and 1 nursery) and interviews undertaken with three primary school teachers. A focus group was conducted with eight S1 pupils.

2.4 Developments in ICT

From the original Success Criteria specified by GCC (see Appendix C) three criteria domains were identified as:

- the Use of ICT to support Management Decision Making;
- the Impact of ICT on Learning and Teaching; and
- the Involvement of Staff and Communities in Developing ICT Use

These related to the following original Success Criteria identified by Glasgow City, but also took on board recent relevant developments:

- Increased and effective use of ICT (in management)
- Greater curriculum development as joint development planning
- Shared curriculum development as joint development planning
- Greater integration of activity between sectors including ILS systems
- Shared and flexible staff development opportunities (including use of ICT)

Within each of these separate areas, and following initial semi-structured interviews with a cross-section of staff drawn from GCC headquarters and the learning

communities, 10 sub-domains were identified. These formed the basis for a questionnaire (See Appendix G) which comprised 50 assertions across the 10 sub-domains, to which reactions were sought from a cross-section of Learning Community staff. The assertions were based upon the interviews and earlier work in Phase 1. The spread of interviewees, domains and the assertions for the questionnaire were discussed at meetings of the Support Group.

Interviews were conducted with:

GCC HQ staff	3 Advisers (2 primary, 1 secondary), 1 MIS Officer
Learning Community staff in Harris, Skye, Lewis & Mull	Learning Community Principal 2 Bursars 1 Secondary DHT 5 Primary HTs 2 Primary DHTs 4 Classroom Assistants

The questionnaires were issued to a stratified sample of staff in Harris, Cumbrae, Tiree and Skye. In total there were 32 responses (55%). By strata they comprised:

5 Principals/Bursars (1 joint response)
17 Primary HTs and ICT co-ordinators
6 Secondary teachers
4 Pre-five establishment heads

2.5 Pupil and Parent perspectives

The views of pupils and parents on the Learning Community initiative were also sought as part of this evaluation. As discussed at Support Group meetings, focus groups were the format of choice, in which different groupings of pupils and parents could be engaged and their views determined.

Six different groups were formed in the Spring of 2003, involving a total of 94 people, as follows:

Pupils Primary School Pupils, mixed years	5
Primary School Pupils, P7	31
Secondary School Pupils, S2	27
Secondary School Pupils, S1	26
Total	89

The parents or carers of these 89 pupils were all invited to one of two meetings to discuss their perception of, and reaction to, the initiative. Unfortunately only five

parents responded positively to these invitations. This disappointing response rate must be borne in mind when interpreting the results in Chapter 6 and is indicative of the uphill task facing the Learning Communities.

It could not be assumed that pupils and parents had knowledge of, or had heard of, the Learning Community initiative. Therefore the method sought to elicit from the pupils and parents the issues which they understood to be pressing and pertinent to them, in a manner relevant both to their circumstances and the purposes of the evaluation.

To that end, the groups were asked to focus their attention on three main areas:

- matters of learning,
- the school itself,
- the area in which they lived.

Each of these areas were explored in turn, and examined in terms of what the pupils and parents liked about them, what they did not like, and how they wished things could be different (see Appendix H for the pro forma). This provided a three-by-three grid of nine separate questions. Parents discussed these questions in turn while pupils discussed the question in small groups, wrote down and then discussed their answers between groups.

Fieldnotes of all such events were taken by an observer not involved in conducting the group. The answers and fieldnotes were collated by hand and then thematically grouped. These constitute the substantive basis of the pupil and parent perspectives.

Chapter 3: Progress Towards The Success Criteria

3.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on both the response of the Learning Communities to the Points for Action in the first evaluation report (Baron et al, 2000) during 2001 and the progress of the Learning Communities during 2002 in the context of the Success Criteria originally specified by the Education Department in Glasgow City Council (GCC).

Initially, the four Learning Community Principals were interviewed to ascertain the response the Learning Communities had made to the Points of Action identified in the evaluators' report for Phase 1 of the evaluation. They were then questioned on the progress their Learning Communities had made towards the Success Criteria.

3.2 Response of Learning Community Principals to the 'Points for Action' in the first Evaluation Report

The evaluators identified ten points which, in their view, required to be addressed if further progress in the Learning Community initiative was to be secured and sustained. Point by point these are:

Point 1:

Role definitions for the Learning Community Principal, the Head of School and the Bursar should be re-considered as the lack of definition is problematic.

All four Principals agreed that positive steps had been taken to address the uncertainties in the role of Principal. The Principal's Group (a group to co-ordinate the initiative convened by a Depute Director of Education in GCC) has re-written the role specification for the Principal and Head of School and clarified some of the uncertainties identified on Phase 2 of the evaluation. Re-consideration of the role of Bursar had yet to be undertaken.

The revised role and remit for Learning Community Principals first and foremost identified the Principal as the **leader** within each Learning Community. It is envisaged that the Principal will provide the necessary vision to drive the vision forward.

A key task will be to develop the vision for the learning community and develop shared ownership for the vision and be the guardian of the vision.
(GCC, 2002a)

He/she was also identified as the line manager for all heads of establishments in each Learning Community, though it was re-stated that headteachers retained the full management responsibilities for their own schools. The management tasks specified in the revised role are:

- responsibility for shaping the Learning Community development plan

- the co-ordination of Learning Community initiatives
- the development of effective partnerships in conjunction with colleagues in the Senior Management Team (SMT)
- the development of effective partnerships with other GCC departments and agencies
- taking forward the outcome of school reviews
- leading the professional review of head of establishment
- the preparation of the annual quality assurance report
- adopting the role of Director of Education in the selection procedures for key appointments in the Learning Community.

This re-definition is a step forward in clarifying the responsibilities of the Learning Community Principal. However, in addition to this Learning Community role, Principals would be expected to exercise continuation of their responsibilities as headteachers in their own establishments. So far in the Learning Community initiative there is little enthusiasm for the Principal's role developing into a local education officer. Principals still see a need to retain overall control of their own school. Re-enforcing this dual role for Principals raises questions about their priorities - how to balance community responsibilities with school responsibilities? In addition, where situations of conflict arise, which role assumes dominance? Reconciling such uncertainties depend in part on the relationships between the Principal and "Head of School" in their own school.

The Principals' Group also addressed re-definition of the role, remit and responsibility of the Head of School. The Group identified the difficulties in re-defining this role:

While the Head of School post might be regarded as developmental in some respects, it must also be a position of authority and able to provide personal and professional satisfaction.

(GCC, 2002a)

It was seen as desirable that Heads of School be given more authority. However, in attributing greater authority to Heads of School not only does the externally defined role of Depute Headteacher, but also the full responsibility of Principal as headteacher, place limitations on the extent to which authority can be re-distributed between Principals and Heads of School. The solution proposed is to define the tasks that the Principal/Headteacher should delegate to the Heads of School. These delegated tasks are:

- budget
- staffing: deployment and development
- pupils: safety, order and welfare
- development planning.

Point 2:

The ‘unit of administration’ should be clarified, that is, the individual school or the Learning Community. Uncertainty limits attempts to optimise the initiative.

In part, the resolution of this uncertainty has been addressed in the re-definition of the role of the Principal. Given that the Principal will have line management responsibilities for all headteachers in the Learning Community and responsibilities for the appointment of key staff, there has been a reinforcement of the Learning Community as a unit. However, the appointment staff with an explicit Learning Community responsibility has not yet taken place due in part to the pilot nature of the initiative. Appointments to individual schools in the Learning Community is still the rule, a practice which limits the extent to which staff are deployed across the full range of establishments in the Learning Community. However, some movement to introduce the staff with a cross-Learning Community remit within sectors (e.g. primary schools) has begun. For example, in the Tiree Learning Community a Network Support team has been established involving a primary school teacher working across three primary schools.

Point 3:

In promoting greater interaction between the different sectors of the schooling system, steps need to be taken to re-dress the balance in the use of resources across sectors.

Although the practice of top-slicing each school’s budget to form a Community Budget is generally acceptable, this budget has tended to benefit the primary schools and pre-five establishments more than the secondary schools.

Primary Heads are still very reluctant to share their resources.

(Learning Community Principal)

It is expected that, with the roll-out of the New Community School Programme in tandem with the Learning Communities (see Chapter 10), there will be much larger budget available to the Learning Communities. One Principal took the view that the allocation of resources to all schools in the Learning Community be pooled.

Point 4:

The limited involvement of ESS detracts from the greater success of the initiative. The role of ESS needs clarification, since, for example it is in a position to promote more effective inter-Learning Community relations giving greater cohesiveness to the initiative.

In response to this point, the Principals’ group has re-drafted the role and responsibilities of staff advisers in the newly titled Educational Improvement Service (EDIS). The re-drafted remit clearly identifies that the main areas of responsibility of the advisers would be in working with the Principals and the SMT, collectively and individually.

The new responsibilities for advisers are:

- Supporting the compilation of the development plan for the Learning Community and reporting on the extent to which the Learning Community Development Plan relates to the authority's improvement plan.
- Working with the senior team in embedding the processes of self evaluation in the Learning Community and its individual establishments, including the dissemination of good practice; participating in the establishment review process as a member of establishments' review teams.
- Monitoring establishments' Development Plans and progress of establishments against the National Priority Performance Measures and Quality Indicators.
- Supporting and monitoring curriculum and professional development within the Learning Community; bringing an education authority overview at the start of any Learning Community development to avoid duplication and ensure effectiveness of development process; advising on sources of support for developments within EdIS and elsewhere.
- Supporting the Learning Community Principal in professional review procedures, by undertaking the review of heads of establishment as appropriate, discussing the outcome of reviews with the Learning Community Principal and facilitating any follow up support and development required.
- Facilitating a range of staff development activities in collaboration with CPD co-ordinators, including arrangements for probationer teachers.
- Assisting the follow up to HM inspections of individual establishments, supporting as appropriate the elements within the establishment's Action Plan.
- The primary adviser will act as the link to pre-five establishments in the cluster, liaising with the pre-five team at headquarters. Such an arrangement will further develop pre-five/primary transition arrangements. The two advisers liaising with the Special Educational Needs (SEN) team at headquarters and with Psychological Services will maintain links with SEN establishments.

Such a redefinition is a necessary step forward if the curriculum innovation in the Learning Communities (see Chapter 4) is to be sustained.

Point 5:

The implementation of ICT facilities both for administration and generating more time for teaching has been disappointing, though it is understood that urgent steps are being taken to address these issues.

Addressing the use of ICT in a more robust manner has been linked to the introduction of the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) in the City.

On moving to the new building the ICT has been fully brought on-line e.g. computerised registration and reporting. We're trail blazing in Cumbrae. It's not yet generating more time for teaching but we hope this will emerge when we get over the learning period.

(Learning Community Principal)

Clearly most Principals felt disappointment at the lack of progress but some signs of improvement were evident (see Chapter 5). Nevertheless, it remains a matter of concern that introducing ICT to secure greater efficiency in staff workloads has not yet impacted on time for teaching.

Point 6:

The initiative has not yet involved sufficient numbers of subject, class-based teachers and pre-five staff. To generate major change in the learning and teaching process in the schools more teachers need to be actively engaged with the initiative.

The greater inclusion of staff in each Learning Community in the initiative has been a slow process. Progress varies considerably between Learning Communities.

On the one hand:

There is quite a lot happening - more staff are getting involved in this Learning Community. The Authority has encouraged it but not specifically promoted it. There is increasing contact with teachers in the secondary school, we need a lot more but some primary teachers and some AHTs are quite resistant.

(Learning Community Principal)

But on the other hand:

We're still dealing with this more slowly than is desirable. The Learning Community must not generate additional responsibilities. I'm doing a presentation to all my staff on the whole roll-out to encourage teachers to "buy into" the initiative.

(Learning Community Principal)

Point 7:

The potential number and the boundaries of the Learning Communities are problematic, due in part to the denominational issues; pre-existing local community boundaries; and the nature of pre-five establishments. Denominationally based Learning Communities may serve to reinforce the denominational divide in the wider community.

On the boundary issue, there has been little resolution. It is still regarded as essential in GCC that Learning Communities remain denominationally based. The small step forward in sharing good practice has been to 'twin' Learning Communities across the denominational divide in the roll-out of the New Community Schools programme (see Chapter 10). In time, such an arrangement may facilitate greater understanding and tolerance across the denominational divide and promote a more flexible approach to the allocation of pre-five establishments, which are non-denominational, across the Learning Communities.

We need to re-think the pre-five's situation and their location. The denominational divide is inevitable. We'll never break the mould! However, there is some degree of linking in the roll-out by grouping the Learning Communities.

(Learning Community Principal)

Point 8:

The initiative has not yet substantially addressed the relationships between school, pupils, parents and community. As a complement to the above, steps should be taken to re-formulate these relationships.

Little progress in re-defining the relationships between the schools in each Learning Community and their wider community has been made. However some attempts to raise community awareness have started:

We've done a lot about this through newsletters but we have difficulties - some parents will not cross local community boundaries so we organise parents' meetings at various locations. We're also taking children on residential trips. We also have a parents' group on the National Debate, I'd also like to have a joint School Board based on our community team of parents.

(Learning Community Principal)

Point 9:

Further thought needs to be given to the fundamental issues raised by transferring a whole Authority into a more strategic role as part of the further development of the Learning Community initiative.

Due in part to the pilot nature of the Learning Community initiative, little progress has been achieved in shifting responsibilities from GCC headquarters (HQ) to the Learning Communities:

This is a difficult one - staff in headquarters feel threatened - they feel resistant. There has been talking about this but no specific action. The Authority guards its position. There needs to be full devolution of information to Learning Community Principals.

(Learning Community Principal)

The Council's committee paper on the future of the Learning Community initiative in the context of SEED's New Community School policy outlines plans for more responsibility to be taken by Learning Communities. Plans to integrate the Learning Community initiative with the New Community School policy in the roll-out to all schools in the city now provides an optimum opportunity to re-vitalise this aspect of Council policy (see Chapter 10).

Point 10:

The initiative has not yet addressed the wider agenda of social exclusion. Steps should now be taken at the highest level of the Authority to harness the support and collaboration of related professional expertise in order to prevent the 'exclusion' of children with both behavioural problems and

learning difficulties. The peripheral engagement of Psychological Services with the initiative is of particular concern as is the non-participation of Special schools.

Of crucial importance for the success of the Learning Community initiative is the extent to which it can engage more meaningfully with the process of social inclusion. Current practice in collaborating with other professional groups varies considerably from Learning Community to Learning Community.

As one Principal commented:

On Social Inclusion - there are poor links with SW and GHB, we desperately need more support, it is crisis time. There's plans for an SI sub-committee in each Learning Community. On Psychological Services - we're very fortunate, we've a great deal of support. On Special Schools - we need better links and resources to ensure children remain in mainstream. Action needs to be taken on this.

(Learning Community Principal)

Whilst another commented:

There is potential for a more sensible link with special schools. The Head and teachers in a Special School should be encouraged to feel part of the Learning Community. Here in Lewis we have a link with a Special School which is taking off from the base of one contact to wider contacts. This very positive.

(Learning Community Principal)

Overall, however, it was felt that there was still a long way to go on the Social Inclusion agenda. Forming links with other agencies has had limited success in the Learning Communities. Where good working relationships have been established more fruitful collaboration is emerging. However such relationships depend at present on the goodwill of individual professionals. As yet there are no structural arrangements, other than Child Support Teams to promote more integrated work.

3.3 Curriculum Delivery

There was strong evidence of further developments in selected curriculum areas within the Learning Communities during 2002. Specific examples are being considered in Chapter 4. Across the four Communities interviewees suggested that the initiative had helped support:

- Continuity and consistency for identified curriculum areas
- Commonality in curriculum innovation
- The joint use of curricular materials and resources
- The sharing of community expertise in teaching and learning
- Effective and smoother transitions (Pre-five to Primary and Primary to Secondary)
- Enhanced breadth and balance in the curriculum

Progress in the following areas, however, was felt to be more limited:

- Increased pace of teaching and learning
- Avoidance of stagnation in teaching and learning

Differences of opinion emerged on the:

- Effectiveness of the joint planning working parties

A majority of interviewees agreed that there had been further integration of activities across establishments. In some instances developments were felt to have become more systematic and inclusive. The following statements were typical:

It has become more systematic with nurseries and we are building on good links with the secondary. There are also better links with other primaries.

(Primary School headteacher)

There is more interaction between pupils. We had a residential trip involving children from other schools.

(Primary School headteacher)

We ran a P7 drama project which went into S1. There was a health festival for pre-5s to S2 which was organised in the secondary school. Health promotion is a cross-sectoral priority.

(Secondary School headteacher)

However, there was also some evidence from pre-five heads which suggested that they still felt isolated from some developments. As one pre-five head noted;

We meet in the SMT but still feel that Pre-5 has not found a niche. We have a very positive principal but many meetings don't seem relevant. There are two levels, pre-5s and the rest, the teaching and non-teaching issue still exists.

(Pre-five head)

In a similar vein another pre-five head also suggested that the traditional divide between day care and nursery schools had carried over into the Learning Community and was responsible to some extent for the relative isolation felt by some centres.

We still feel isolated. The Learning Community has not impacted on the traditional Nursery School/Day Nursery divide. The nursery school is more involved than we are. The principal is more inclined to go to the Nursery school heads rather than us.

(Pre-five head)

In one Learning Community two interviewees suggested that the geographical spread of the Community mitigated against attempts to develop greater integration across establishments.

The use of resource materials across the community was identified by a number of interviewees as an area where sustained progress had occurred. ICT and Science materials were cited by several primary and nursery heads as being more readily available to them.

Much IT equipment from SEED has been made available to the Learning community pot.

(Pre-five head)

We have been using the same Science, Maths and Writing materials in the upper school. Others are planned for.

(Primary School headteacher)

Heads of pre-five centres regularly highlighted access to Area Finance Assistant (AFA) and Bursar services as important ongoing resources. However, the Learning Community initiative was felt to have been less successful in impacting on either the implementation of the 0-3 or 5-14 Curriculum Guidelines within establishments or the re-deployment of human resources within establishments. One informant pointed out that cross-sectoral support and the re-deployment of staff was hampered by the teaching qualifications limited to particular sectors, for example, PGCE (Primary).

The initiative was also thought to have had some impact on quality and consistency in curriculum developments over the previous 12 months. In one Learning Community monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Development Plan was felt to represent an important contribution to quality and consistency across educational establishments. In another access to 'Pacific Institute' training was felt to contribute to developing positive staff attitudes to teamwork, broadening the teaching perspective and capitalising on the expertise of others while in one other the consensus was that developments within this area were still at an early stage. The following quotes were typical:

The Learning Community has supported this [quality and consistency of curriculum development] especially in areas of gender, literacy and science. The Learning Community is keen to get practitioners working in establishments rather than just attending in-service.

(Pre-five head)

Issues on the Development Plan are enhanced and continue to be focused on. Lots of very early writers are moving on to school. This is unheard of in this area.

(Pre-five head)

[There is] increased awareness among staff of the need to have higher expectations of pupils. Staff realise they can't be so insular. There is a need to set targets in reading, writing and maths. The seeds are in place. Targets are set by the Learning Community.

(Primary School headteacher)

There was some evidence to suggest that the Initiative was beginning to impact on pupils sense of belonging. For example, one interviewee suggested that pupils were now aware that the Learning Community Principal was their Headteacher's 'boss'.

The secondary school is held in high regard by parents. Pupils are anxious to get into [the secondary]. We try to raise awareness of the Learning Community and its links. Even the youngest have commented on the Principal being the headteacher's 'boss'. We take every opportunity to highlight the Learning Community and its benefits to the school and its finances.

(Primary School headteacher)

In another situation the interviewee expressed the view that the use of the Learning Community logo was beginning to be recognised by pupils and parents as a meaningful image. In another instance a headteacher felt that joint residential experiences encouraged pupils to identify with those from other schools who were also part of their Learning Community. For a number of informants fostering a sense of belonging among pupils would always be problematic since pupils from their establishments (in some cases a majority) went on to other schools outwith the Learning Community.

When interviewees were pursued on their perceptions of whether the Learning Community initiative was making progress with other Success Criteria, there appeared to be little or no evidence of the initiative impacting on: the retention of pupils in schools; an increase in the number of placing requests received by member schools; a reduction in school exclusions and consistency of assessment across establishments at transitional stages.

3.4 Staff Deployment and Development

There was no evidence that there had been any staffing enhancement or more effective supply cover during 2002. On the other hand, a few pre-five heads intimated that there was still a need for additional SEN support and clerical assistance. There was little evidence of changes in staff deployment within establishments or across the Learning Community though two interviewees suggested that in two separate instances the needs of the Learning Community had been taken into account when tailoring the appointments of new staff.

There was little evidence of new developments in the provision of specialist support for pupils although a few interviewees highlighted increasing support from secondary staff for primary schools, and in some cases pre-five establishments, in subjects such as Science and Maths and English.

Communications between establishments and between establishments and parents were in some instances still felt to be patchy. While a few interviewees highlighted increasing amounts of contact between establishments within Learning Communities others suggested that communication with parents was generally poor and had changed little during the year. The following were typical:

A parents' newsletter is going out from the secondary to parents in P6/7. There is now a bit more from the school in raising the profile of the Learning Community with parents. There is some way to go here.

(Primary School headteacher)

There is a lot more information from the school – joint policy papers on parents and homework, attendance, and home school agreements.

(Secondary School headteacher)

We got a fax machine! Communication is better among people in the management team. People are more comfortable. There is more contact with the primary heads. They feel more comfortable in a group. There are more classes for parents as well as the Learning Community newspaper.

(Pre-five head)

Interviewees generally recognised that staff had been presented with a number of development opportunities over the previous 12 months. Examples given included inter establishment in-service and twilight courses in the secondary. One pre-five head was pleased that the Learning Community was supporting staff development opportunities for nursery nurses as well as teachers. In addition to having access to staff development opportunities a few interviewees also reported that a number of management development activities had taken place. While one head suggested that informal social gatherings for senior staff had increased confidence others generally highlighted the development potential of the committees and working parties which had been set up.

Interviewees were specifically asked about the progress of the Child Support Team (CST) over the last year. Responses generally indicated that each of the Learning Communities were pursuing different strategies in this respect. In one Learning Community CST developments and staff appointments were reported as being on hold awaiting lottery funding. In another the emphasis had been on providing existing staff with a number of training opportunities in, for example, health issues, and child protection. In the two other Learning Communities progress was still felt to be at an early stage and interviewees generally admitted to having little information regarding developments. Overall it was felt that the CST was still at an early stage of development. Interviewee comments highlighted the importance of having co-operative partner agencies involved in the initiative. Moreover it was felt that all too often the success of such ventures was dependent on the good will of enthusiastic individuals. The following statements were typical:

Progress has been made. There is a core group meeting, discussing referrals to the educational psychologist. In P7/S1 referrals go through normal channels. It is hoped to extend it to Social Work and Health. It has taken a lot of time to get there.

(Primary School headteacher)

I've been to a couple of meetings. The interagency strategies for referrals seem very positive.

(Pre-five head)

It established itself very well. It has provided staff with more training in-service sessions on health, child protection and policing. There is more awareness and consolidation of what the CST is about.

(Pre-five head)

I don't see any difference. The psychologist is very poor and badly organised. He/she is not a team player. He/she is not committed to the idea and has a lack of flexibility. The network support teacher has done a very good job in assessment and testing of children.

(Primary School headteacher)

In relation to the development of the Learning Community initiative and the local authorities overall strategic goals, opinions were divided. Some informants felt that the Learning Community had taken more responsibility for the Council's overall aims.

As one headteacher noted:

The principal has firmly taken over much of the City Council's goals and has a very clear vision at a local level, rather than a remote figure at Nye Bevan House.

(Primary School headteacher)

Others, however, felt the position had remained unaltered over the previous 12 months. A few interviewees still felt there was a need to clarify the Principal's role. Indeed one informant clearly felt the initiative had regressed in relation to the Learning Community taking on more of the Council's strategic goals with power being reclaimed by HQ:

The Bursar is no longer responsible for advertising and interviewing staff. It has gone back to personnel, there was a tussle. In some areas there is no clear remit.

(Pre-five head)

In one Learning Community the implementation of Development Plan monitoring and evaluation was felt to have made significant inroads in making headteachers more accountable to the Principal. This process was felt to support the Principal in becoming more able (than HQ staff) to monitor and develop quality in the Learning Community curriculum. As one primary headteacher in this Learning Community commented:

I'm being asked by the Principal for hard evidence for the Development Plan, Examples of pupil's work, assessment information, 'How Good is Our school' quality indicators, photographic evidence of children's activities, the breakfast clubs impact on attendance, attainment and national testing. The Learning Community produced an interim evaluation in January of progress towards targets in the Development Plan. I have to submit a calendar for collegiate activities as well as agendas and minutes.

(Primary School headteacher)

3.5 Process

Interviewees were asked to highlight what they saw as the most significant development activities undertaken by the Learning Community in the previous 12 months. In some cases specific curriculum developments in subjects such as Science were singled out. Other interviewees drew attention to developments in team building and fostering contacts between establishments and individuals.

The Learning Community has worked much more as a team with shared goals. Now there is more give and take and thinking about what is best for the Learning community. Shared professional expertise and informal management support is now more common.

(Primary headteacher)

Several early years heads highlighted the importance of support given to them by the Bursar. For example:

We have benefited from the Bursar's input in the clerical area. She ensures adequate training and support for DMR. The Bursar is a bonus, she helps us with building difficulties. She is very supportive in dealing with finance, is actually involved and can see my goals. She is a real coup for the Learning Community.

The Bursar was also seen to have played an instrumental role in the secondary PFI school refurbishment programme. In one Learning Community, a number of interviewees suggested that the implementation of monitoring and evaluation of development planning had been the most important.

The role of Bursar is critical, she has an immense role e.g. in reviewing the work of all administrative staff. But we need more funding downloaded.

(Learning Community Principal)

The impact of the first Glasgow University evaluation report appears to have been mixed. In one or two cases interviewees recalled the chapter on deprivation as being of particular interest while a similar number indicated they were either unaware of the impact of the report or felt it had had no impact.

A few interviewees indicated that the report had been discussed in the senior management group but gave no specific examples as to outcomes. Two pre-five heads felt the report had been useful in highlighting the relative isolation experienced by nurseries in Learning Communities. As one pre-five head noted;

It did highlight the position of pre-fives. I feel that this has been recognised and thus feel more included as a result.

(Pre-five head)

The second pre-five head went on to indicate that the Principal had appeared to make deliberate attempts thereafter to include her whenever possible. For another Head of Centre, it was the Report's recognition that such development work can be a long process that had made the greatest impact.

With respect to the relationship between the priorities of the Learning Community and the wider Glasgow City policy agenda, most interviewees indicated that both agendas were similar and that there had been little change in this situation over the previous year. One or two interviewees, however, felt that the Learning Community was in a better position than the Education Department to monitor the effectiveness of policy implementation.

In relation to the transformation of Headquarters into a more strategic role, many interviewees indicated that they either didn't know much about this or felt that little had happened during the previous year. However, when asked about strategic matters that Headquarters might adopt, several suggestions were made. Generally these encompassed the idea of headquarters providing an independent monitoring/arbitration service. For example, it was suggested that headquarters personnel had a role to play in the appointment of staff to the Learning Community as well as dealing with staff absences and disciplinary procedures. Moreover it was felt that Headquarters staff were better placed for interpreting and translating national policy.

In relation to the sharing of policies with staff and parents and pupils again there was broad agreement among interviewees that little had changed in the last 12 months. In most instances newsletters were used to keep parents informed of developments. One or two interviewees indicated dissatisfaction with the levels of communication between the Learning Community and parents. For example;

I don't think parents and pupils are aware of what a Learning Community is.

(Primary School headteacher)

Asked about the effectiveness of the Learning Community Senior Management Team (SMT) as a planning forum several interviewees from one Learning Community indicated that their group had become more efficient and better organised over the last year. However such improvement was not uniform and in the other Learning Communities interviewees suggested that there was room for improvement. In some cases it was suggested that the group was too large. Two of the nursery heads intimated that they often felt excluded from the meetings and that they were now less inclined to attend than they were a year ago.

When asked to indicate what new ideas had emerged from the Learning Community over the previous year interviewees suggested a number of areas. These included:

- Health fayre
- Twilight courses
- Buddy scheme
- Further staff training
- Community police liaison
- Liaison with Secondary departments.
- New curricular developments
- Social inclusion developments
- Home visiting project

Interviewees also reflected on developments in local support for children and on interagency links. Although a few interviewees suggested that interagency contacts had improved, it was apparent that the work is still characterised by ad hoc arrangements between motivated individuals. In one Learning Community interviewees highlighted the fact that Psychological services never sent the same representative along to successive meetings. Yet in another Learning Community, interviewees felt that the attending Psychologist was heavily committed to the initiative. Other informants chose to highlight a lack of involvement with Social Work, Health and Community Education services. One interviewee gave some insight to the difficulties with Social Work stating that:

There was some confusion resulting from Social Work re-organisation. We are in a separate [social work] area from the others in the Learning Community and this causes difficulties.

(Primary School headteacher)

This point about the different geographical remits and the extent to which those of the various agencies overlap was mentioned by a number of other interviewees as an ongoing difficulty for interagency co-operation.

3.6 Interviewees summary comments

Almost all of the final comments made by interviewees were positive and generally welcoming of the initiative. However this did not mean that interviewees were uncritical of particular developments or issues. The following quotes are typical.

I am surprised how much is being achieved by the Learning Community. It is a very positive step forward. It will ultimately benefit children through sharing resources and experience. Change takes time and requires skilful management. The Principal is very hardworking.

(Primary School headteacher)

Staff links have grown, we are aware of the Principal, the Bursar and others. I feel staff are well informed about developments. They seem interested.

(Pre-five head)

Relationships within the Learning Community are consolidated. There is stability in the SMT. It needs to look forward and establish long-term aims. Curricular delivery is always handled with commitment, we need less emphasis on this now and more on social inclusion.

(Primary School headteacher)

I was resistant to the Learning Community. I have worked with it. I've been given the opportunity to develop the Child Support Team. I'm more enthusiastic. It is important to look at staff development first, particularly in relation to the CST. It has been a long learning process to arrive at this point.

(Primary School headteacher)

I would like to see us as part of a community. The relationship we have with the parents is intimate. We can almost create a perfect setting for families and children. If we could be integrated [into the Learning Community], there is a lot more we could contribute. When children go to school parents step back. There are only occasional meetings at the secondary. Teachers and non-teaching staff issues have to be tackled, keeping parents involved in the Learning Community and right through education. We [pre-five centres] are currently running community schools if people would stop and look. ... The initial publicity and enthusiasm has gone. It's just not relevant. We're not part of it.

(Pre-five Head)

Chapter 4: Curriculum Innovation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter charts the continuing progress in the Learning Communities in the field of curriculum innovation. At the core of the Learning Community initiative is the drive for curriculum innovation at the local level in order to improve pupils' engagement with the learning process. The evaluators collected qualitative data which gave an indication of the perceptions of those involved in four selected case studies of curriculum innovation.

In the first instance, interviews were conducted with the Principals of all six Learning Communities in Glasgow. (See Appendix E1) The purpose of these initial interviews was to establish their perceptions of the curriculum initiatives which had begun in their own Learning Community and to identify the key players in these initiatives.

On the basis of these interviews, the following general picture emerged in relation to the context for curricular innovation:

- Curriculum development within the Learning Community is largely a top down model of secondary support for primary and pre five sectors. This ignores approaches to learning and teaching which can be found in the primary sector and from which secondary staff might learn,
- Liaison work focuses strongly on the use of secondary specialist expertise in the primary sector and on the development of cross curricular materials.
- The use of the secondary school budget is crucial in determining the extent of innovation. There are therefore issues for the appointment of Learning Community Principals who are not secondary Headteachers. The resource benefits both primary and pre-five.
- Pre-five – primary transition is being raised and addressed more explicitly.

Specifically, the views of the Principals were used to identify four curriculum case studies as examples of the a range of curricular innovation taking place across the Learning Communities.

The selected case studies were :

- Writing at Harris³
- Science at Cumbrae⁴
- Mathematics at Tiree⁴
- Critical Skills Programme at Skye⁴

³ The pseudonyms used for each Learning Community in the Internal Report have been used in this report with the addition of Skye for the fifth Learning Community and Mull for the sixth.

The second stage involved a further round of individual and group interviews with key staff in each of the four case studies. In these interviews, staff gave details about the nature of the curriculum innovation and their perceptions of its impact. The range and number of people involved varied across the case studies. In the primary sector Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers, Class Teachers and Senior Teachers were interviewed. In the secondary sector Principal Teachers and Subject Teachers were involved. Since the focus of the four case studies related mainly to primary – secondary liaison, there was less need to gather the views of pre five staff, although their views were represented at one of the group interviews.

Following these detailed descriptions of initiatives and perusal of the appropriate documentation, pupils were identified who would be able to comment on the impact on their learning. This third stage focused gathering the perceptions of pupils and four different focus group sessions were set up with both primary and secondary pupils.

4.2 Outline of the Curriculum Case Studies

Case Study 1 – Writing

The aim of this initiative was to continue to develop new, more effective approaches to writing in both sectors, to achieve commonality of approach across primary schools within the Learning Community and to develop joint approaches to this area of the curriculum which would impact on children’s learning.

The work grew out of two GCC initiatives – gender and teaching and New Horizons in Writing. The initiative built on the work in the city of language tutors and language/ literacy co-ordinators. When the Learning Community was set up in 2000, writing was identified as an obvious local priority on the joint Learning Community development plan. Support was provided through GCC by EDIS and a senior education officer. Joint planning took place at management level within the Learning Community, and cross sectoral working took place on the development of materials for use in Study Support time.

Case Study 2 - Science

The aim of this initiative was to develop the knowledge, skill and confidence of primary teachers in relation to the teaching of science, to ensure an active methodological approach to this area of the curriculum and to develop cross sectoral understandings which would impact on children’s progress.

The initiative was set up as a result of a GCC priority on science in the form of the Glasgow Science Pack. There was interest in adapting this material in the light of the revision of Environmental Studies 5 –14 and customising materials for use within the Learning Community. Two primary teachers were seconded to develop materials. They worked in collaboration with a secondary colleague and provided materials which were piloted in primary schools across the Learning Community as well as

providing staff development opportunities for primary teachers. Alongside this work GCC funded teachers from the Learning Community to attend the post graduate certificate in science at Strathclyde University and their expertise was utilised within the project. There was considerable interest and expertise in some schools within the Learning Community which could be built upon in this initiative. Support was given in both sectors through EDIS.

Case Study 3 - Mathematics

In this initiative the aim was to develop continuity and progression in Mathematics.

This area was identified as a priority on the Learning Community Development Plan. Joint planning took place at management level and a working party was set up in November 2001. Initial discussions pointed to the need for an improvement in the transfer of assessment information between the Primary Schools in the Learning Community and the Maths Department in the secondary school. Changes in arrangements have been developed. The Maths Department also identified a need for appropriate materials for use in S1. Two primary teachers, one of whom was a former Maths tutor in Glasgow, were commissioned to write maths materials for S1 at Level B and C.

Case Study 4 - Critical Skills Programme

The aim of this initiative was to develop innovative approaches to learning and teaching through the use of the Critical Skills Programme (CSP) which is based upon the creation of a collaborative learning community where learning is experiential, standards- driven and problem based.

The initiative grew out of an initial GCC staff development opportunity within the city where CSP was offered as part of range of approaches to teaching and learning. One of the primary headteachers who became interested in the approach, developed it and took further training. A proposal was then put to the Learning Community SMT, which fitted in with the existing emphasis on teaching for effective learning. The resulting commission involved a wide range of staff across the sectors being trained to use the approach. The absence of the headteacher involved because of illness, did delay the development of the approach, but it is now back on track. The Learning Community has applied to the Scottish Executive Education Department for FLAT funding to evaluate the project in greater depth and to extend its influence. This bid has been successful.

4.3 Impact of the Case Studies

The information gathered in interviews with the relevant stakeholders was designed to explore the extent to which progress had been made towards the Success Criteria, laid down at the outset of the project by GCC. These were :

- Greater consistency in 5-14 curricular delivery with faster pace of work
- Greater integration/ co-ordination of activity across schools / pre-five centres
- Common definition of curricular content
- Shared curriculum development as joint development planning
- Quality and consistency of curricular development
- Consistency of assessment pre school to P1 and P7 – S1

Key areas emerged as influential in developing curriculum change. Many of these were related to process. Indeed, although this part of the evaluation is concerned essentially with curriculum, it also focuses on the effects of structures within the Learning Communities and their impact of curricular change.

4.3.1 Greater consistency in 5-14 delivery

Development Planning

The starting point for the initiatives in the case studies was often cited as the Learning Community Development Plan. A wide range of priorities were identified, discussed and agreed at SMT meetings and translated into local initiatives. These were informed by nationally identified priorities, Glasgow City Council priorities and local needs. There was evidence of a strong perception on the part of those promoted staff in the primary sector who were interviewed that the Learning Community Development Plan was an important catalyst in determining priorities and an effective mechanism for translating them into practice,

Learning Community Development Plan is the driving force – joint development planning has made things happen. Feedback from consultation with schools established priorities and working groups were set up.

(promoted staff – primary)

HTs are all immersed in their own schools so there has to be someone to oversee – direct things, keep things going, keep up the momentum.

(promoted staff – primary)

The first round of planning took place at SMT level in the Learning Community as part of the establishment of development planning priority – Teaching for Effective Learning

(promoted staff - primary)

There is a joint development plan, pulled together from the common threads of the local establishment plans. Access to resources has aided this process of integration

(promoted staff – secondary)

4.3.2 Greater integration / co-ordination of activity across schools/ pre five centres

The joint working which took place at this level within the Learning Community is among the most successful aspects of the initiative in the case study schools. Most members of SMTs who were interviewed spoke positively about the experience of being involved in this new arrangement for decision making within the cluster of schools. Many reported the increased sense of purpose in curriculum development which had resulted from this mechanism.

Discussion of possible next steps in SMT that would not have happened before – more frank, honest discussion rather than organisational meetings.

(promoted staff – primary)

A more formal structure allows for progress to take place – although initially HTs found it threatening.

(promoted staff – primary)

Team work - a feeling of being on board..

(promoted staff – pre five)

It's different than when it was just a cluster – we're more focused and working more in partnership.

(promoted staff – primary)

We realised we had lots of skill around the table.

(promoted staff – primary)

There is ownership and it's a good way of moving forward.

(promoted staff – primary)

Even class teachers feel supported e.g. Rose Bowl.

(promoted staff – primary)

There is a common purpose, common goals, clearly defined and we're pulling together for the Learning Community.

(promoted staff – primary)

When compared with former cluster arrangements, the Learning Community development planning process was seen to be a more focused and accountable forum for decision making.

The most common approach, at this level, was to set up working parties to address each area. These groups would then report progress to the SMT at regular meetings. Many spoke of the effectiveness of the working parties, indeed some saw them as useful staff development opportunities in themselves.

It has been a positive experience to be in the development groups – staff development in itself.

(promoted staff – primary)

Secondary colleagues have a better understanding of where primary colleagues are coming from.

(promoted staff – secondary)

Joint working “on the ground” where it happened was also successful but often less formalised. At this level, joint working usually revolved around the creation of curriculum materials and the provision of staff development opportunities. Individual teachers involved in this kind of work in the case study schools created high quality materials and importantly, developed good professional working relationships which led to increased mutual understanding between sectors.

A considerable amount of joint working took place in the initial stages of this initiative. Key people from both sectors came together. We developed new resources and adapted existing materials for joint delivery in Study Support sessions. The focus of the work was to ensure joint approaches and understandings.

(promoted staff – primary)

There were also benefits in the area of staff development. The joint working has particularly benefited those of us closely involved and the relationships there have been very productive.

(promoted staff – primary)

One of the biggest barriers found in the case studies to consistency in delivery and pace of 5-14 curriculum was the apparent lack of connection between the work on the ground and the decision making process.

While there were mechanisms to report back on progress, this was mostly done through Headteachers at SMT meetings. More involvement, at this level, of Principal Teachers and other key players in curriculum development may have a beneficial effect on the long term impact of initiatives. In all the case studies the role of PTs was minimal. Typically they had no locus in SMT meetings where decisions were made about the direction of curriculum development and they were not involved in working parties where the detail of curriculum approaches and the development of materials were planned. It would seem that as key personnel in managing the curriculum, they would be important players to have on board to ensure the success of curricular innovation.

The pace of change reported below in the development of common curricular approaches in the primary sector may relate to the closeness of the decision making and curriculum development roles of Primary Headteachers. This is a gap which may need to be bridged in the secondary sector if curricular change is to be built in to the structures of the Learning Community. The person who “ makes it happen” across a department, and builds it into the policy, practices and procedures of the department, is the PT and without his/ her close involvement, curricular change will be piecemeal. The long term effects on continuity and progression between the primary and secondary sector require the structural mechanisms to be in place to translate innovation into everyday practice.

I have had little involvement in any planning related to the initiative.

(promoted staff – secondary)

Decisions were largely made above my level. I feel PTs would welcome involvement in decision making and that they may feel disempowered otherwise.

(promoted staff – secondary)

4.3.3 Commonality in curricular innovation across primary schools

Those interviewed reported many examples of an increase in common approaches across primary schools in the case study clusters. Initiatives identified in Learning Community development plans have been resourced through the use of Learning Community joint funding, provided by GCC or top sliced across the cluster, and also through the allocation of funding from secondary school budgets.

This resourcing has allowed common approaches to be developed often through the purchase of resources, most notably across primary schools. This targeted resourcing has been an important result of discussion, identification of priorities and planning for curriculum development. Many spoke highly of this joint approach to resourcing and of the resulting commonality of approach across the Learning Community.

There was a drive to support this joint approach through financial support for the purchase of common resources for use in the primary schools.

(promoted staff – primary)

This initiative is based on the creation of materials for use across the primary schools in the Learning Community.

(teacher – primary)

Additional resources were purchased to support the implementation of the pack. Advice and practical assistance was given here by secondary teacher.

(teacher – primary)

Funding was made available to make sure that all primary schools had same basic resources

(promoted staff – primary)

There is a sense that the children will be coming from the different primary schools to the secondary with the same basic understanding of science.

(teacher - secondary)

It seems that the resourcing which followed from joint discussion and curricular planning was an important catalyst in ensuring commonality of approach across the primary schools within Learning Communities. The implications for continuity and progression are clear.

The commissioning process, whereby proposals could be put to the SMT for possible funding, allowed local practitioners to work together with other classroom teachers to devise materials which would be appropriate. The involvement of class teachers in

one Learning Community, piloting materials and working alongside the writers, has encouraged a sense of ownership and ensured a wide uptake of the approaches advocated.

The materials were developed by a small team of primary teachers who were supported by a teacher from the department.

(teacher – primary)

Great efforts were made to involve ordinary class teachers in the process and there were many opportunities to pilot materials and give feedback on their usefulness.

(teacher – primary)

Evaluations are being carried out in all the Primary Schools and collated to future planning- topics will be adapted, materials altered, some investigations added.

(teacher – primary)

The use of local expertise has been cited as a strength and viewed as a positive outcome.

Efforts made to use the expertise available within the Learning Community. Lots of experience and talent which was shared and used for staff development.

(promoted staff – primary)

This involvement of practitioners seems to be helpful in ensuring commitment across a range of schools. The commissioning of teachers to develop and produce materials, their involvement in piloting and evaluating materials, encouraged a sense of ownership, which may have long term benefits in terms of lasting curriculum change.

Primary pupils in case study 2 showed insight into the active methodology being promoted in the Learning Community.

When asked “ What is science ?” They described it as:

- *a topic*
- *experiments*
- *something you do to find out what it is, if it's true*
- *you test things*
- *I think it's good because you don't just have to listen to the teacher telling you things, you can find out yourself*
- *We can find out the truth for ourselves*
- *I think science is an enjoyable task and you'll know a lot more after you've experienced it for yourself*

(primary pupils)

They described their increasing confidence in this area of the curriculum:

- *We're better than we used to be*
- *We've been practising*
- *We've done more experiments , we've got more experience*
- *The more we do the better we get*

(primary pupils)

And when asked about how they would cope in S1 with science, they were aware that they would *do more things with more advanced stuff than in primary, like physics and chemistry and all the different kinds of science.* (primary pupils)

They were, however, confident that they would be able to cope:

Once you get the hang of it you'll be able to do it (primary pupils)

They felt they knew what makes for a good experiment and that this would help them when they went to secondary school:

- *It's got to be a fair test*
- *You have to change things*
- *You have to keep things the same*
- *You're only allowed to change one thing*
- *You have to plan the experiment – the materials*
- *Because we've done all different kinds of experiments here then we might just do something the same up at secondary school, except they might just add a little bit on to see what you do*

(primary pupils)

4.3.4 Common definition of curriculum content

“Follow through” in curricular areas was of particular interest in the Learning Communities. Could the structure of the Learning Community allow for more effective progression and continuity ?

From the views of pupils in the case study above, it is clear that the curriculum changes are being translated into practice in the primary sector. The issue of follow through into the secondary school is more complex and has not been addressed in structural terms. The changes taking place in the Learning Community Primary Schools have implications for the design of the S1 curriculum. In some cases there is evidence of improved practices in the secondary sector, but little evidence of any properly structured connections between curricular innovations in both sectors, particularly in the use of assessment information.

However staff in three out of four case studies pointed to the general improvement they perceived in the transition from primary to secondary:

There is an awareness of secondary staff of quality of children's work.
(teacher – secondary)

The initiative has helped secondary staff to recognise what was going on in the primary schools.

This is especially so at classroom teacher level.
(teacher – secondary)

Children are more familiar with the methodology in the English Department since it is now practised in the primary schools.

(promoted staff – secondary)

Secondary staff are more aware of the quality of children's work. It has helped secondary staff to recognise what was going on in the primary schools, especially so at classroom teacher level.

(teacher – secondary)

Pupils in Case Study 1 were convinced that they had moved forward in the development of their writing skills. When asked how it was different at the secondary school they described the change like this:

It's different - It's more advanced

It's better. When you read your story there's full stops where they're meant to be and paragraphs and you feel good 'cos you know you can do it.

We do more working things out for ourselves

(S1 pupils)

When asked if they thought they were improving, they generally agreed that they were:

In primary I think I would have needed the teacher to give me like ideas what to write

If I was to look at a story I wrote in P7 and a story I wrote at the end of this year there would be real difference. The description – the words that we use to describe stuff - like they'd be better.... The vocabulary would be more advanced.

We would write a longer story now

It would look neater

There would be more full stops and commas and inverted commas.

(S1 pupils)

There is good work going on both sectors, but the connections between the two need to be better integrated into the structures of the Learning Communities, especially in relation to the transfer and use of assessment information. Much of the work of the case studies has been around the primary /secondary interface, especially in relation to 5-14 curriculum and the lessons learned can be applied to the pre five / primary interface. Pre five staff, although not greatly involved in all of these initiatives, mentioned the benefits they received mostly in terms of resources, but also in terms of involvement in development work and / or staff development activities.

In case study 4, it was felt to be too early in the process to make judgements about “follow through”. This initiative was more focused on teaching methodology than a discreet curricular area and so may indeed be more difficult to evaluate in the shorter term.

It's too early to say – it's at least a five year plan. We're beginning now to build up a picture of where CSP is fitting in naturally to the curriculum. This will inform programmes and policies for the future.

(promoted staff – primary)

Many of those interviewed pointed to the longer term impact of the initiatives under scrutiny and were keenly aware of the need to let the changes work their way through the system. This is especially so in cross sectoral innovation.

In case study 4 there was evidence of long term investment through training and development and an interest in external as well as internal evaluation to measure progress. There is a desire to create staffing flexibility to encourage change and evidence of good use of resources and joint working with GCC.

Early signs from interviews with class teachers and pupils, however, indicate that important advances are beginning to be made in approaches to teaching and learning. When asked about working in collaboration in problem based learning, Pupils had this to say:

Well you see we have to go in these groups and we have to decide what we're going to do. So we have to work together making it and we ask Miss A for all the stuff that we need.

It works out like you take different shots and you work together

It's a bit hard 'cos other people in your group decide different things from you

You have to decide it - you can't fight and argue

You have to agree – that means decide the same thing – the quickest way they would get it done is if they would work together, but if they kept on moaning they would hardly get anything done

They could vote

(primary pupils)

Older pupils had similar insights into collaborative learning:

It works out good except for the part when you don't agree

You've got to agree - If you don't agree, you never get it done

You would get it done but it isn't what you think it would be like because you've not worked as a team

You have to listen to your partner

You have to share the things

If they were doing something wrong you'd help them

(primary pupils)

And when asked about the value of presenting their work in pairs or groups to others in the class, they found it to be a valuable experience:

We can learn about the next person's thing

It's exciting

You learn to get self confident – standing up and speaking

(primary pupils)

Teachers were equally positive about the benefits of CSP:

I think they're all more engaged in what they're doing and it's definitely easier --I think ---for me to see the ones that are wanting to sit back or the ones that are not wanting to participate. If you put them into smaller groups – observing and things like that, I think I get better understanding of what they can and can't do.

(class teacher – primary)

The assessment - I quite liked that, going about with a clip board and actually stopping and listening and writing down what the children were saying to each other.

(class teacher – primary)

But I think the thing that struck me most about it was that the children were engaged and motivated.

(class teacher – primary)

Another member of staff felt that the approach was not ‘brand new’ rather that the tools provided brought together the really good aspects of good teaching. She felt the children were more in control, had more of a say and were given more responsibility. They had to justify their opinions.

You would have led it more in the past whereas I’m standing back from it.

(class teacher – primary)

It is worth considering the value of taking the long term view of development work and recognising the shortcomings of only valuing that which can be easily **and** quickly measured. The laying of sound and solid foundations for long term change may be equally or more valuable in terms of impact on children’s learning.

4.3.5 Consistency of assessment P7 to S1

This is an area where least progress appeared to have been made. With one exception where the transfer of assessment information was the actual focus for the initiative, the case studies yielded little evidence that those involved perceived this to be an area of great success. While many pointed to progress in the development of pupils skills and teaching approaches, few were as sure about the quality, consistency and usefulness of assessment information.

Although some did point to positive features of assessment practices planned for the future, the overall impression was of a lack of consistency in the sharing of assessment information and the use of that information to plan children’s learning.

In conjunction with advisers, approaches are being introduced which involve recording evidence in knowledge and understanding, practical skills and developing informed attitudes. These will be passed on through the stages of the primary and made available to the secondary school. Formats are being developed which include tick boxes and exceptional reporting. At the moment the formal passing on of assessment information is informal.

(teacher – primary)

National Test levels are unhelpful, unreliable and of limited use. The department administered tests when the children arrived. There have been no specific discussions about assessment as a result of the initiative. They come in with a clean sheet and we are starting from the beginning.

(promoted staff – secondary)

There have been no changes. (in arrangements for transfer of assessment information)

(promoted staff – primary)

There is no formal sharing of different transition assessment information.

(promoted staff – primary)

Case Study 3 focused its attention on this very area and showed early signs of success as well as the creation of sound foundations for building solid assessment practices. The approach taken in this Learning Community was to regularise the assessment information being passed to the Secondary School and to ensure that it was in a format which would be useful and used.

The purpose of this initiative is to ensure continuity – the handing on of more detailed information about children’s abilities is crucial. Basic to begin with – every Primary School agreed to send maths jotters to the secondary school. We wanted secondary colleagues to see the quality of work P7 pupils were producing, both in terms of content and presentation.

(promoted staff – primary)

The same information was requested from other Primary Schools who were sending pupils to this Secondary School on placing requests and most responded positively. This information was used as part of evidence to set children in S1 – along with National Test levels, notes from teachers in jotters, primary teachers’ forward plans and information from secondary staff visits to primary schools.

Staff who were interviewed were convinced that in the longer term, more sophisticated use of assessment information will have an impact on the pace of learning.

This allows more effective placement of pupils in sets in S1 which has improved pace.

More children are ready to sit National Tests at the appropriate time – this year almost every child in S2 will move up a level in National Testing.

(promoted staff – secondary)

The future development of the use of standardised tests will improve the position further This has already been piloted in one primary school and is now being considered for wider application across the Learning Community. These materials will be bought for all six primary schools from Learning Community budget. The purpose is to allow individual feedback on pupil progress as well as statements of overall attainment to supplement existing assessment information. In the longer term the intention to set up a data base of assessment information which will track pupil progress across the sectors. Input from each sector at appropriate stages will build up a picture of a child’s development in mathematics.

Although those involved reported that there was still a long way to go there was evidence that measures were being put in place which might sustain a level of understanding between the sectors about assessment information and its use.

When asked if they thought the teachers in S1 knew their ability when they arrived in secondary, pupils in Case Study 3 generally agreed that was the case. They were aware that the teachers had enough information to group them according to ability.

*See on the first day when we got maths we had to go all together and they told us each class and what level we were working at.....We're in ability groups for maths. Red, then blue then green
We all get the same work but the greens and yellows work slower so they would be behind us.*

(S1 pupils)

When asked if they thought they were better at maths now than they were in P7, most thought they had improved.

*You get to do things for longer so you get to know how to do them and don't forget.
You do different things – things you didn't know how to do in primary like equations, probability, ratio
I work better. I like my maths class
I feel as if I've went up a level. I think I've did alright with the new stuff.*

(S1 pupils)

Chapter 5: Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the evidence that the Learning Community operations were facilitated by developments in information and communication technology (ICT) for management support, and contributed to an increased use of ICT within the curriculum and the community⁴.

The chapter begins by outlining the national and local contexts, including the reasons for postponing this aspect of evaluation from Phase 1. Thereafter the findings from a series of interviews and follow-up questionnaires are presented and interpreted. These are set out under the headings (A) The Use of ICT to support Management Decision Making; (B) The Impact of ICT on Learning and Teaching; and (C) The Involvement of Staff and Communities in Developing ICT Use (see Appendix G).

5.1.1 ICT Context

The examination of the role of ICT in the Learning Communities has to be set in the national context and how this has changed over recent years. Since 1998, national developments promoting and facilitating the use of ICT within schools, for management and across the curriculum, have been far-reaching and substantially funded by central government. The main developments have involved: establishing an internet-based National Grid for Learning (NGfL) with associated equipping and networking of all schools with multimedia computers, and developing broadband networks across and within authorities. There has been separate training for all teachers and librarians funded through the New Opportunities Fund (NOF), and Teaching and Learning Scotland (and its predecessor SCET) also provided a wide range of subject-based training courses and software support. Alongside these there were other central funding initiatives for building, rebuilding and re-equipping schools, and for curriculum and intervention, all of which had ICT spin-off, but different timescales. As stated in 1999, the (then) SOEID aim was to lead to networked schools, trained teachers and one modern computer for every 8 primary school pupils by 2002 and one for every five secondary pupils. (SOEID, 1999)

The local articulation of this range of activities has differed between authorities. It has depended upon the state of each authority's previous strategic planning, investment policies and ICT infrastructure, and has also been affected by management structures adopted following local government reorganisation. The latter particularly affected ICT in schools where the policies of Corporate IT departments and the needs of ICT within education, were not always readily aligned.

At the time of the Phase 1 evaluation in 2000-2001 these various factors were in play, affecting individual schools differentially across Glasgow City, and within and across the Learning Communities. Glasgow City's own Project 2000 was under way, moving towards managed services for ICT in schools. At the same time it was adjusting to

⁴ See Section 2.4 for relationship with original LC Success Criteria.

the large inputs of targeted central government funding, some with schedules different from that of the City, and in 2000-2001 most schools had still to be equipped. The long established SEEMIS management information system was being upgraded, and due to be phased in. The NOF funding for training all teachers was available, aimed to build on the basic training provided as the managed services network and equipment were introduced. At the same time however, the NOF training was funded through a number of competing service providers, who negotiated training contracts with individual schools, so the take-up, which in some schools was just beginning, was not so readily co-ordinated.

Given this context it was decided that assessing the effect of the Learning Community structures on the use of ICT could not readily be addressed within the Phase 1 evaluation.

5.1.2 The Position in 2002

Significant changes had taken place. During calendar year 2002, schools were taking over their new or re-equipped buildings and extensions. (Under the Public Private Partnership Glasgow Project 2002, 8 schools were having new extensions, and 12 new (replacement) schools were being built, with 4 Learning Communities involved.) The programme of networking and equipping schools through NGfL funds was well forward. The managed services through MITEL for primary and secondary schools were in place. Pre-school and Special Education establishments were subject to separate arrangements with the managed services only going to tender late in 2002. By April 2002 two thirds of the mainstream secondary schools were connected to the new Glasgow Schools Network, and thereby also given access to an Integrated Learning System (Plato). Basic training was being provided for all equipped primary and secondary schools. The NOF training was underway, building on this basic training, but, as for Scotland overall, was uneven in its progress and adequacy of provision by the independent suppliers. (HMIE 2002) SEEMIS, with new developments in pupil reporting, electronic registration, pupil progress, and tracking data collection and analysis, presented in two main packages entitled "Click and GO" and "Vision", was being phased into schools including Learning Communities. The phasing was due to be complete by January 2003. Software to support primary school management (covering electronic forward planning, development planning and pupil reporting), was being written, and expected for delivery in session 2002/2003. (GCC 2002b, 2002c, 2002d)

There were, inevitably, a number of delays and frustrations for some schools, which in relation to this report on ICT in the Learning Communities, undoubtedly coloured the data collected, and are reflected in the views expressed (see later).

Delays included ensuring reliable access by primary schools to the network and key software. For example, one set of software (Granada Toolkit /Nelson-Thornes) was found to be incompatible with the network as configured. This meant that the main suite of programmes for introducing ICT skills in curriculum contexts could not be used with confidence or as planned during session 2001/2002. Software had to be re-written, and the programme of tutor-based training for primary schools across the City re-launched after the summer of 2002. The software companies acknowledged the

frustration in schools, and the loss of impetus of the programme, and contributed to the costs of a rerun of the training. (GCC 2002b) There were other issues such as the speed of the network for the 63 out of 203 primary schools which were linked via 128K ISDN lines, rather than the 2MB network; and the fact that pre-school establishments were on a different timescale and to have a separate managed service. There was also uncertainty in some schools over continuing support for facilities which pre-dated the managed services, such as separate within-school networks and internet access, and (non-Plato) Independent Learning Systems.

5.2 The Use of ICT to support Management Decision Making⁵

Four areas were identified as having significance if ICT is to realise its potential to support management decision-making within a Learning Community:

- the adequacy of the structure of the Glasgow City's ICT provision to meet the management needs of individual Learning Communities.
- the nature of the information required by staff at different 'levels' to support co-ordination and decision making within a Learning Community, and the reasons such information is required – and/or justified.
- the extent to which ICT allows administrative tasks to be undertaken more efficiently – making more time for learning and teaching.
- the ways in which emerging information requirements and related decision-making purposes within Learning Communities may challenge the means by which authority-wide strategic and resource allocation decisions are made.

5.2.1 The adequacy of the structure of the Authority's ICT provision to meet the management needs of the Learning Communities.

The survey evidence suggests that connectivity problems appear largely to have been solved. Earlier frustration, caused by the delayed linking of primaries, is no longer as vigorously expressed. Despite the use of a different server for Pre-Five establishments, e-mail contact is reported as being generally 'seamless'. Although there were minor variations between sectors, almost universally respondents claimed that they could "readily log-on for all requirements – including 'talking to' other Learning Community establishments."

Moreover, there is a similarly reported general perception that although routine usage is indeed intensifying (and welcomed), this increase is not, however, a direct result of an overt policy directive; rather is it a reflection of the on-going exploration of the possibilities offered by the technology. For example, although to date 'distribution lists' have been set up for a range of purposes, these (for a number of reasons) have not always been one hundred per cent successful.

⁵ Note that many of the findings and observations below do not apply exclusively to Learning Communities. They nonetheless shape the responses made by Learning Community members, and impact directly on perceptions of Learning Community development possibilities.

I would like more information to be delivered by e-mail and would use it more than I do if I could be assured that recipients would access it.

(Primary headteacher)

In addition, some respondents reported frustrations and concerns regarding duplication of effort where particular elements of the current HQ ICT-based system do not fully interface – in particular, the inability of personnel and finance systems to share data. This was a matter of concern for only one-third of respondents – though notably for those such as Principals, Bursars and Primary Heads who have a direct responsibility for such matters. This is a difficulty which although recognised does not seem to have an immediate solution.

In more general terms, the same group of staff expressed some concerns about the usability of the ‘Glasgow School Network’ in terms of access (largely primary schools) and down-load speed. The former may be in part a measure of prevailing staff knowledge and confidence. There is some evidence to suggest that such difficulties – perceived or real – have encouraged the emergence of Learning Community-based self-help groups. These networks act as a helpful filtering mechanism for contact with the MITEL help-line. While such developments may, of course, take place in any school cluster – Learning Community and non-Learning Community alike – it is likely that it is the formality of the institutional relationships within the Learning Community which is a key determinant. Indeed, one primary school head reported an emerging feeling of collective endeavour and a belief that solutions to problems, particularly ICT-related might be found in the first instance within the Learning Community Co-ordinator network.

5.2.2 The nature of the information required by staff at different ‘levels’ to support co-ordination and decision making within Learning Communities, and the reasons information is required.

Several primary heads considered that the key challenges for Learning Community Principals and managers of the individual institutions have been the creation of a climate of co-operation, the development of inter-institutional structures and the establishment of working relationships. From this perspective, developmental activity is viewed as being largely curricular in nature, orientated towards Glasgow City Council’s achievement raising agenda - and data collection is perceived as relating primarily to the monitoring and evaluation of this activity. Many respondents (some 60%) did not express a view. Those who did were divided equally, leading to the conclusion that, if not perceived by all as the main data gathering focus, it nonetheless a necessary activity which places demands on management time. An Learning Community-wide comparative framework is implied in these responses.

A similar stance is reflected in the responses to ‘the tracking of pupils’. Here, however, well over half the respondents (57%) considered the tracking of pupils to be emerging as a key area of interest within Learning Communities.

The collation of attainment targets for individual establishments (and their presentation in graphical form) is clearly evidenced. In one Learning Community, reading scores for each school for the previous two sessions were collated and used to inform and support strategic decision-making at meetings of its Senior Management Team. This experience is reflected in the experience of approximately half of the respondents overall. Similar steps have been taken in relation to attendance data.

Some 63% of respondents reported that, in their experience, Learning Community-wide school statistics are analysed to support the P7 to S1 transition process. A notable example of this process involves a retrospective look at 'patterns' in results of candidates - in the SQA 2002 diet, the preceding Standard Grade, and related attainment in SI and SII; as well as attendance. Importantly, although intended primarily to inform management decision-making, the results of this analysis were also used as a stimulus to discussion with parents.

Incidentally, the process of collection revealed gaps and errors in the data categories – 'not tested' or 'not attained' were in some cases being conflated.

I feel this is something that has definitely progressed here over the past year within our Learning Community. We use this for a variety of reports including attendance, 5-14 and SQA results.

(Bursar)

Generally there is a desire to produce or be able to access data which can support Learning Community-wide decision-making. It is conceded that presently the collation of data from SEEMIS Vision requires particular expertise and interest; and a number of 'enthusiasts' (largely headteachers and bursars) have begun this process. It demands time-consuming 'cutting and pasting' from different parts of the SEEMIS system. There is a belief that the establishment of 'Click and Go' may obviate some of this process – though this is most visible in secondary school staff.

5.2.3 The extent to which ICT allows administrative tasks to be undertaken more efficiently – making more time for learning and teaching

A significant number of respondents felt unable to comment in this area (from less than half to one 'prompt' to almost three-quarters to another). Not surprisingly, Principals and Bursars felt it easiest to respond. With this caveat, the interview evidence would still seem to suggest that the roles of senior staff and bursar are 'bedding down' – and that the benefits of complementarity of role is most evident where the bursar has well-developed knowledge of spreadsheet software. In addition to supporting the Principal, the Bursar can also enhance meaningful access to data and reduce the data presentation burden of SQA co-ordinator. 'Customising' ScotXED statistics can help relieve the data assembly burden of SQA co-ordinator and also provide data in more meaningful form to support analysis of decision-making by secondary subject departments. By this means, the time of SQA co-ordinator may be more meaningfully directed towards management support activities.

An additional positive factor related to the above process may reside in one individual having detailed knowledge of 'error codes' for checking purposes.

Finally, exactly half of the sample believed that the responsibility by Bursars for the EDR process has supported a more systematic, institutionally focused provision. It is suggested that it is the bursar's role within the Learning Community framework which supports this more systematic provision of staff training; for example, school representatives can be allocated to each available workshop thus ensuring even development across each of the Learning Community establishments. Additionally, the ICT network itself facilitates the planning and administration of such activities.

The use of ICT has been actively encouraged within our Learning Community and all staff have had access to training. The Learning Community has provided help from AFA's and this has been beneficial to DSM.

The Bursar has provided much help through her knowledge and this has impacted on teaching and learning and time for teaching perspectives.

(Nursery head)

Growing use of this (e-mail) facility since Jan 2003 ... Minimal support from Learning Community.

(Nursery head)

5.2.4 The ways in which emerging information requirements and related decision-making purposes within Learning Communities may challenge the means by which authority-wide strategic decisions are made.

Once again this proved to be an area in which the majority of respondents to the questionnaire claimed limited knowledge. Principals and bursars, as key users, confirmed that they have similar city-wide access to summary screens of SEEMIS Vision, as do HQ staff – though not access to data about individual pupils⁶.

Again Principals and Bursars confirmed that 'anonymised' comparative cluster reports have been assembled to inform Learning Community SMT discussion. One Principal believed that future development of city-wide software and the related interrogation framework should recognise this emerging data need.

Once more, Principals and Bursars felt most readily able to express an opinion as to the likely impact on the deployment of resources within Learning Communities, including staff, resulting from the process of tracking pupils and groups of pupils. They perceived an inevitably and progressive linkage between the two processes.

More respondents (33%) were able to identify with a process of Learning Community-based resource re-allocation (supported by budgetary virement) to allow HQ resource decisions to be 'customised'. A cited example was the decision by an Learning Community to provide ICT co-ordinators with lap-tops – despite a prior judgement by the authority not to support this provision.

⁶ Individual establishments can, obtain their own individual data.

5.2.5 Conclusions (Management):

- Generally, the Authority's ICT provision appears sufficient to meet the emerging management needs of the Learning Communities. Individual establishments have little difficulty in communicating with one another. Equally there is little technical difficulty in making contact between schools and headquarters.
- Interrogation of specifically collected data is emerging as a Learning Community management activity. In particular, tracking of pupils is emerging as a key area of interest. Currently, well-developed ICT skills are required to assemble this data from various sources. Although possible in any school cluster, it is believed by respondents that the Learning Community structure encourages such actions.
- A significant number of respondents felt unable to comment on the extent to which ICT has allowed administrative tasks to be undertaken more efficiently – though manifestly the bursars' involvement in data-gathering and analysis is impacting positively on the management of learning and teaching. It is a moot point whether or not time has been freed for learning and teaching to date. What seems clear is that qualitative differences in available management information have been made.
- Most respondents considered that it is too early to make a firm judgement on the potential impact of Learning Community decision-making on authority-wide strategic decision-making – though some were convinced that future decision-making would be much more an iterative, two-way process.

5.3 The Impact of ICT on Learning and Teaching

Data-gathering in this area focused on:

- the extent to which the Learning Community per se has supported ICT usage by teachers and staff.
- the influence of the Learning Community on the profile of ICT within learning and teaching in school development planning.

5.3.1 The extent to which the Learning Community per se has supported ICT usage by teachers and staff

The survey evidence suggests a divergence of view as to perceptions of the impact on learning and teaching of ICT. Fewer than half (43%) of the respondents reported the impact as significant. Secondary staff were more positive in responses than the primary headteachers and ICT co-ordinators who were most likely to have been affected.

Across the board, there is agreement (some 70%) that the main inhibitors to the use of ICT in learning and teaching have been external to the Learning Community and have impacted equally on non-Learning Community clusters; namely, the City-wide operational delays in the establishment of the managed service, software provision, and concurrent training.

There is some awareness of the use of Independent Learning Systems (ILS) such as 'Success-Maker' and 'Plato' – though largely, but not exclusively, by Principals and Secondary staff. In some primary schools, there is concern those pre-Learning Community initiatives, and pre-managed services investments, including in ILS, might not be maintained because of the lack of earmarked funds. In relation to the other Learning Community-supported ICT initiatives, the data suggests that, as yet, activities are embryonic. The view is held strongly that there were no significant Learning Community-based ICT initiatives. Unsurprisingly Primary Headteachers and ICT Co-ordinators report these views most forcibly. (86% of this group). Although there were some reported Learning Community-wide bulk purchasing arrangements, for key software, such as Nelson-Thornes, the system-wide practical problems with these packages inhibited their use. Such issues delayed schools' programmes for use, and presumably reduced motivation and potential for within Learning Community collaboration.

Difficulties experienced with Nelson-Thornes materials continue to inhibit the impact ICT has on learning and teaching, as yet Primary One materials are not accessible.

(Primary headteacher)

There was little reported commonality of view regarding possible need to address gaps in the central service provision by MITEL through Learning Community-based back-up. Most respondents did not have a view - and within the Principal's group there was no agreement; perhaps indicating that this was no longer an operational issue.

5.3.2 The influence of the Learning Community on the profile of ICT within learning and teaching in school development planning.

Although reported cross-Learning Community awareness of direct classroom practice is limited, on a more positive note, systematic, Learning Community-based planning for ICT development appears to be more firmly grounded. A convincing majority (some 60%) regarded development planning as ranging beyond the implementation of NOF training. Consistent with the stated delays, however, the impact of these endeavours is yet fully to be realised - in relation, for example, to there being a co-ordinated Learning Community influence on individual Primary school plans.

Views vary between sectors, and by implication between Learning Communities in the sample, as to the impact of the initial delays in establishing stability in the managed service. Some believe that developments have been 'put on a back burner', awaiting the bedding-in of the new system. Others are more up beat and do not regard this as a limiting factor. In support of the former position, there is some evidence to suggest that Learning Community-based ICT planning to support learning and teaching has yet to impact fully on the activities of individual establishments. As

a group, Principals appear most convinced of the impact of such planning, and do not see Learning Community plans as in addition to and on top of individual (primary) school plans. The views of the Primary headteachers and ICT co-ordinators are more mixed.

5.3.3 Conclusions (ICT and Learning and Teaching):

- Learning Community-based ICT planning is being supported but its unified impact on day to day classroom activities has yet to be fully exploited.
- Delays in achieving stability in the managed service appear to have reduced the within-Learning Community momentum identified in the Phase One Report. Nonetheless, there is clear evidence that the matter remains firmly on the collective agenda.
- With respect to ICT, planning has gone beyond coping with NOF training, but the relative roles of Learning Community-based development plans and individual school plans have yet to be crystallised.

5.4 Involvement of Staff and Local Communities in Developing Use of ICT

Matters examined in relation to staff development and wider community involvement included:

- The ways in which Learning Communities were attempting to make basic ICT training and NOF more effective;
- the relationship between Learning Community Development plans and the co-ordination and development of staff knowledge and skills in and through ICT;
- the role of different staff in Learning Communities;
- the involvement of the community and pupils (including the use of school web pages, adult classes and parental involvement).

5.4.1 The ways in which Learning Communities were attempting to make basic ICT training and NOF more effective.

Where a Learning Community had a common NOF training provider some centrally managed joint training had taken place; but there were Learning Community-specific variations. In at least one Learning Community no attempt was made to co-ordinate NOF training, since it was set up across the UK up to be delivered on a school by school basis. It was recognised by 77% that, where more than one training supplier operated within one Learning Community, Learning Community - co-ordination was not easily accomplished. However, there was widespread awareness (80% overall) of subsequent initiatives having been undertaken to organise clerical training and other support staff training on an Learning Community basis. A number of interviewees commented favourably on the benefits of this activity. This contrasted with the

perceptions of the externally managed NOF training. Only a narrow majority of the sample expressing a view believed that the training had been sufficient to secure staff confidence. Views varied between the sectors but the sample was too small to allow valid generalisation. There were no examples given of Learning Community-based planned follow-up to training, to ensure its application.

5.4.2 The relationship between Learning Community Development plans and the co-ordination and development of staff knowledge and skills in and through ICT.

School and Learning Community development plans individually reflected the authority priorities.

Over 33% of respondents believed that as a result of network and equipping delays, interest in joint Learning Community activity had declined. A similar number of respondents reported (as commented above) that ICT working groups had gone into abeyance, pending completion of facilities and access to hardware. Accordingly, the main driver for development, including staff development, remained the Council's subject priorities and related policies at school level. The NOF training put the onus on individual headteachers to agree when each teacher had achieved the necessary competences and had a personal development plan. It is clear from responses from Principals, Bursars, Primary Heads and ICT co-ordinators, that cross Learning Community documents have been developed, probably incorporating staff development elements, but they have generally yet to be applied. Their impact has therefore yet to be felt by some staff, elsewhere they were beginning to be implemented:

Following the establishment of the NLC Policy we are now concentrating on staff training and resources etc. therefore there is currently no requirement for this group (ICT Group) to meet separately. (Bursar)

While there had been some planning at individual school level to link ICT training, and ICT use, with curriculum delivery, none was identified at Learning Community level. Notably such links did not exist at authority level either, where the ICT programme was seen as a separate issue from the curriculum priorities. Awareness of an apparent lack of linkage at authority-level was, not unexpectedly, greatest in the Primary Head/ ICT Co-ordinators group (75% of positive responses to the question); those most directly involved. Significantly, there was also strong disagreement from this group to the proposition that that ICT and subject development groups within Learning Communities were working together on the use of ICT in priority curriculum areas. Thus any potential Learning Community-based co-ordination, to apply and develop ICT skills in the delivery of the curriculum, even in its infancy, was battling against practical difficulties and a lack of leadership in such co-ordination from the authority.

5.4.3 The Role of Different Staff in Learning Communities

In addition to training for teachers and librarians via NOF, some central training had been provided for classroom assistants. In addition, for a range of clerical and auxiliary staff, there had been other initiatives in individual schools, and through Bursars obtain access to separate training resources.

Joint Classroom Assistant training is currently being organised for Nelson Thornes materials. Classroom Assistants were also invited along to October Learning & teaching In-service and participated in their chosen workshops alongside their teaching colleagues

(Bursar, Primary headteacher)

There was overall agreement that Classroom Assistants can and do make an important contribution to ICT usage. There was recognition however (over 55% of the total sample), that their deployment in any particular role was dependent more on ‘chance’ than policy, and more related to the priorities of individual teachers at the time. It was confirmed (most visibly by Primary Headteachers and ICT Co-ordinators), that timetabling of Classroom Assistants to provide support on specific ICT aspects was extremely limited. Furthermore some 75% of respondents agreed that even where Classroom Assistants had acquired ICT skills they were not consistently capitalised on at school level.

There was general agreement (some 75% of respondents overall), that, as part of the Learning Community management team, the Bursar has significant potential to act proactively in the acquisition of training materials through bulk purchase, to organise cross-Learning Community training, to identify and where possible to deploy funds for such purposes, and for cross-Learning Community hardware acquisition. However, only 40% of respondents overall believed that Bursars have been able to pursue such roles – a figure paralleled in the responses from Principals and Bursars as a group; suggesting that there were individual Learning Community operational variations.

5.4.4 The involvement of the community and pupils (including the use of school web pages, adult classes and parental involvement).

It is clear that to date Learning Community-based ICT activity has largely focused on inter-institutional development and that understandably, at this stage, wider parental and community involvement has been limited. Where there had been Learning Community-organised adult ICT classes, these did not affect individual school/community contact, and were restricted to attendance at the classes in one location only. Taken together with the fact that some 66% of respondents agreed that ICT involvement with parents or other community groups has been minimal, this indicates an as yet limited general impact of such activities. Further, it was agreed that Learning Community-based web pages to provide wider links and contacts had yet to be developed, and only 10% of respondents reported ICT links with local libraries or through libraries.

5.4.5 Conclusions (Involvement of staff and community):

Engagement in joint activity Learning Community activity appears to have declined, a number of respondents blaming network and equipping delays. Although Learning Community-based co-ordination is in evidence its impact has yet to be realised widely in classrooms throughout Learning Communities.

Where a Learning Community had a common NOF training provider some Learning Community-based co-ordination had taken place. However, there was widespread

awareness of valued initiatives having been undertaken to organise clerical and other support staff training on an Learning Community basis.

Where classroom assistants had been given ICT training there was no evidence of a policy to make consistent use of their skills, either at school or Learning Community level; but active involvement varied. There were some positive cross-Learning Community examples, as there were of follow-up to other training and Learning Community policy papers.

The potential of linking ICT development and curriculum delivery was yet to be addressed. There was no pattern of joint working at Learning Community level and as yet no clear lead from the authority.

Using ICT with the wider community or as a link to the community was, as yet, an undeveloped area.

Chapter 6: Perspectives of Pupils and Parents

6.1 Introduction

As specified in Chapter 2, the methods used to explore pupil and parent perspectives on the Learning Community initiative sought to explore participants' experiences of schooling and the relationship between school and community in the East End of Glasgow rather than focus on direct questions about the initiative. It was decided that direct questions about 'Learning Communities' would not be readily answerable by participants and that this would put them on the defensive. This assumption was shown to be realistic when towards the end of the parents' groups such a direct question was introduced and answered:

Is that the GOALS Project?

This confusion between two initiatives should not be taken as a criticism of either parents or school: for parents knowledge of specific programmes and the boundaries between them is of little general relevance; for Learning Communities one possible model of operation is such that the organisational structure is invisible behind a series of activities meeting the twin objectives of the initiative.

Parents had however noticed an increased level of communication from the schools (and would welcome more):

*The News Letters are great. They keep the 'info' coming. And feedback needs to go back from this school right the way back to the nurseries.
Need more meetings with a wider remit.
Could we get a leaflet about this research?*

The focus of our exploration of perspectives with pupils and parents focused on three domains: the curriculum; the hidden curriculum; and priorities for the local area. These will be reported in order.

6.2 Pupil and Parental Perspectives on the Curriculum

When asked about what they particularly liked learning in school Primary School children answered largely in terms of 'subjects' and gave priority to Physical Education, Art, Computing and, for some, Maths. The main grounds for these preferences were the intrinsic enjoyment of the activity (which of course varied between children) and the pleasure of exploring new areas of knowledge. Pupils also gave weight to more extrinsic factors in their evaluation of the curriculum: valued types of learning were seen as bestowing both physical and mental benefits. Definite achievements, positive feedback and, crucially, good relations with the teacher, were also important in creating a valued learning environment. Some sense of the utility of learning did emerge tangentially:

Learn so that when older will be qualified enough to get a good job.

Negative experiences of learning for the Primary School pupils surveyed lay in English, Maths and Spanish. Prominent in the dislike of English was the practice of the school of ‘setting’ pupils for this subject which pupils felt fragmented their friendship groups and brought some of them into contact with a disliked teacher. A slow pace of work, or covering material already known, were some of the components of the portmanteau ‘boaring’. Conversely material which was too challenging (for example, some Spanish vocabulary and long multiplications) made for negative learning experiences.

Prominent amongst the responses to questions about what Primary School pupils would like to see added to the curriculum were more physical and expressive subjects: the introduction of different sports would be valued for fitness and teamwork while there were varied suggestions for a wider range of musical inputs – dance, orchestral instruments and ‘*screetchy and cool*’ DJ mixing. The creative potential of science was a noticeable theme in some of the talk. Particular pupils also had clear views of the utility of some forms of learning: different foreign languages were suggested for holiday and familial communication as were specific occupational skills such as practical biology to help look after animals or business studies to help establish:

A little ‘jewlary’ shop with real diamonds in the ‘jewlary’.

One symbolically important suggestion was for more cookery lessons on the grounds that it was good:

Eating what you’ve learned.

Responses from Secondary School pupils about what they liked to learn similarly elicited responses in terms of ‘subjects’. Active and practical subjects (classically Physical Education, ‘Techie’ and Art) were the most highly valued with the Sciences, Music and Modern Foreign Languages being the least. The intrinsic enjoyment of the subjects was the main reason given for their evaluation, for example:

Enjoy running about.

Because we do cool experiments.

Because you learn new things every day and enjoy it.

Always doing new stuff.

These reasons were cross-cut, as in the Primary School, by reactions to the particular teachers and, newly, by avoidance strategies:

The teacher makes it enjoyable.

Because the teacher is funny and does not give you any work.

Don’t have to write ‘mush’.

The Secondary School pupils displayed an increased sense of the utility of learning from that of the Primary School pupils. Learning was valued variously for:

Because it keeps us fit.

Because you can build stuff - something I can use.

Because of the more you can get a better education when you are older.

If you are in the middle of chemicals you would know what to do with them.

A wider view of social relevance appeared in the talk of the Secondary School pupils. In particular ‘*modies*’⁷ was valued as:

*Up to date and interesting.
It tells us about the war and Iraq.*

As with the Primary School pupils chances for ‘active’ learning were valued:

We get to use our own ideas.

Negative learning experiences in the Secondary School seemed to focus more sharply than in the Primary School with a near universal dislike of Maths, with Spanish not far behind. Disaggregating the components of ‘*it is totale boring*’ suggests that the following features contribute to negative learning experiences (not solely in Maths and Spanish).

The experienced difficulty of subjects is more prominent in the talk of the Secondary School pupils than in that of the Primary School pupils. Various subjects are disliked because:

*It’s a hard subject to learn.
Its to hard to head and you have to ‘yuse’ pencil.
I always get the beat wrong.*

The increased sense of utility noted above has its negative moment with, for example, Maths, Spanish and Modern Studies rejected because:

*Might not use it.
Will never use it.
Just learn about ‘moany’ labour stuff and discrimination.*

Secondary School pupils expressed a more developed personal preference for the content of learning than did Primary School pupils:

*I don’t like anything technical.
I don’t like sums.
Cause I don’t like learning about the past.*

Similarly there was present a more developed sense of time allocation both within school hours and, significantly, between school, home and other activities. Aspects of learning were rejected because:

*Too much homework.
Takes up home time.
Wastes time if you want to do other stuff.*

When asked about learning opportunities which they wished that the school provided Secondary School pupils, as the younger pupils, focused on more opportunities for

⁷ ‘Modies’ refers to Modern Studies.

physical education (for example, football for both boys and girls, boxing, karate), expressive arts (drama and dance) and on particular interests which were thought to be useful for the future:

*Mechanics because I want to be a mechanic when I leave school.
How to play football better because I want to be a footballer when I am older.*

And inevitably:

Sex education because we like it a lot and because we want to be a pornographer star.

Parents had less specifically developed senses of the value of different aspects of the curriculum than did their children. Subjects in the traditional ‘core’, especially languages and science, were valued as was the drugs programme:

... is great – they know all the jargon like ‘social inclusion’.

Parental discontents did not focus on specific subjects but on the pacing and organisation of the curriculum as a whole. The rigid nature of the Primary School curriculum was disliked as:

They spent last August and September revising a curriculum that’s just a wee bit too simple. My son was bored out his skull.

The same parent went on to complain that progress for her child ceased after Easter leaving only half the school year for progression. She noticed a deterioration in his attitude and behaviour before and after the summer holiday.

The apparently arbitrary nature of differences in the Primary School curriculum between schools was resented. One school was seen to focus very significant attention on football ‘because the Head likes football’ which was felt to disadvantage pupils who did not share the same enthusiasm. Similarly one Primary School was held not to teach its pupils maths to the same level, ‘Heinemann 8’, as other schools thus disadvantaging its pupils on transfer to Secondary School. Overall parents felt that there should be more subject choice for pupils combined with a standard core which all schools should deliver.

6.3 Pupil and Parental Perspectives on the Hidden Curriculum

Parental and pupil perspectives on the ‘hidden curriculum’, the implicit, broader teaching and learning which schools deliver, were explored through asking them about what they liked and disliked about school apart from the classroom curriculum and about what they wished that the school did differently.

Primary School children liked school for the opportunity it brought to participate in sports. Some of these were currently gender specific sports (for example, netball) with mixed-gender live football sometimes a problem because:

*When girls tackle you get bruising on your legs..
[Girls] keep in a group and don't let boys in.*

For pupils not inclined to such sports the dominance of football was a problem:

Don't like boys and football.

Participation in sport, valued amongst other things for teamwork, was closely followed in pupil priority by the opportunity school gave for meeting and talking with friends (both old and new).

Two themes dominated the Primary School pupil responses to requests for elaboration of their dislikes of school. School was felt to demand too much pupil time in terms both of school hours and of homework intruding into opportunities to spend time with friends. Secondly, some of the actions of teachers were felt to be inappropriate. One pupil said (in the presence of their teacher):

*Teachers are too 'moany' in the mornings, shout too much
[Cheers and claps from the rest of the class].*

This theme was allied with a dislike of being forced to wear a school uniform and it generated the suggestion that teachers should become pupils for a day in order to find out how it felt. The responses to questioning about the ways in which the Primary School pupils would like to see school change confirmed the priority given to school demanding less of their time, teachers placing themselves in pupil shoes and the possibility of pupil having more room for choice and negotiation within the existing school structure.

Secondary School pupils responses about what they appreciated about school had some similarities with those of their younger colleagues. The importance of social networks was emphasised particularly the opportunity Secondary Schools give for widening networks:

Make new friends different from Primary.

The intrusion of school into other activities was also present in the responses of the Secondary School pupils although this was mediated by the difference in the organisation of the school day:

Time 'flys' cause we are moving about more.

Having different 'subjects' was appreciated as was the availability of subjects not provided in the Primary School. Attitudes to teachers were more positive:

We like that you get more teachers.

*Teachers are good to you.
Some 'funny' teachers because they keep us entertained.*

The positive role of teachers in the social relations of the school was highlighted:

*The way Mr [Headteacher] present to the school.
I like the school because Mr. [Headteacher] does not allow any bullying. If there is any bullying it is stopped.
If anyone fight they will be suspended.
It goes in quick (at the start of the school day).
Because everyone 'weres' uniform.*

The enhanced facilities of the Secondary School were appreciated (*cleaness; healthyness; food is beautiful*) and the lack of alternative to school suggested:

It keeps you busy – if you weren't at school what would you do Mon-Fri?

The dislikes about the hidden curriculum of the Secondary School had continuities with those of the Primary School pupils. The intrusion of school into non-school time was resented:

*Starts too early.
Spend too much time at school.
Interval is too short.
Because after school you want to go out and play with your friends instead of doing homework.*

The appreciation of the school regime noted above was not universally held:

*Uniform too dull; Uniform gets too hot; Uniform because its boring.
You are not allowed chewing gum; You can't drink juice in class.
Not allowed to go to toilet during class.
Too strict; Too many [rules]; Too stupid- like what to wear*

Similarly perceptions of shouting teachers, bullying older pupils and a lack of facilities (especially lockers) contrast with the positive sentiments noted above. Desired changes to the school regime follow from this with priority being given to shorter school hours, better facilities (lockers and in-house MacDonal'd's) and pupils having autonomy and respect:

*Teachers cant shout at us. Not allowed to shout at us for making a mistake.
Make up your own timetable.*

Divisions within the pupil body, and the schools' responses to these, were highlighted by suggestions that:

*Brainy people 'get's' suspended.
Get rid of some 5 years that smoke and drink.*

Parental perspectives on the hidden curriculum contained significant elements concerned with general public perceptions of the school:

*It has a good reputation.
It is excellent, the teachers and the Headteacher.
I've only heard good reports.*

There were continuities with some of the perspectives of the pupils:

*It is strict and well organised – pupils do their work.
The bullying policy – if there's a problem it is quickly sorted out.
At the big school there's no bullying – they've got a buddy system while the smaller school's got some disruptive one's in class.*

Particularly appreciated was the sense that teachers knew and responded to the children as individuals:

*My younger son 'cannae' wait to get there. The teachers know their names – and not just the bad kids.
If you have a problem you can just pick up the phone. You know who to contact.*

For parents of children making the transition to the Secondary School there were anxieties about being split from friends, about being picked on and about the 'crowd' with whom the young person would make new friends.

The role of school in developing personal qualities in children was emphasised:

*They've been feeding his ambition. He's done astronomy, architecture, medicine. He's been on visits to different Universities.
Building on their sense of confidence, more outgoing. More get up and go.
Qualification – they are important but not everything. Need a balance.
Balance is important too – need hobby classes, sports, things not to do with qualification. Music, plays panto.
Need community building.*

The (potential) contribution of the school to the wider community was valued both in itself and for the effect on the school:

*They've started adult classes here at night. That's good. It has a knock on effect of the kids. These days they've got to get a qualification so they need to be pushed.
The building's the biggest in the area, with lots of facilities. They could provide facilities. They could make all the difference.*

The main criticisms which parents had of schools centred on issues of equity and safety:

*Some school, like those in deprived areas, get more money than others. But it should be determined by the schools' catchment area, based on kids' post codes.
There's nothing for girls in sports. No alternative to football ... They need better choices and it shouldn't be down to one Head's opinions and preferences – it's not fair if the Head's a football fanatic.*

... the lack of security which is a problem. Someone walked in and stole a teacher's handbag while there was a class on. Also it's on a public right of way: people can walk right through the playground.

There's a real problem with safety and being heard at [school]: a child was killed on the road last year by the school where there should have been a Lollypop person. We've been asking for one for 12 years now. The last meeting I attended was four years ago 'coz I just don't see the point. We're just not listened to.

6.4 Pupil and Parental Perspectives on the Local Area

The Learning Community initiative, located in the biggest concentration of deprivation in Scotland and having the twin objectives of raising attainments and promoting social inclusion, necessitates a 'community' agenda for school, the current very preliminary nature of which was noted in the Report on Phase 1. In order to explore pupil and parental perspectives on their social context both groups were asked about their 'area': what they liked, what they disliked and what they wished the area had.

Primary School pupils valued (or missed, if not available) parks in which it was safe to play in peace and the presence of friends in the neighbourhood. The proximity of shops and leisure facilities also was rated highly. The enjoyment of the local area was however highly conditional. The fear of gangs and other sources of threat permeated the responses of these pupils. When asked about what they did not like about the area in which they lived some Primary School pupils responded to general agreement:

*Gangs, fighting, junkies, neds and drunks.
Junkies – we are under risk ...because they leave needles.*

One significant source of community tension appears to be conflict between children playing in the street and adult residents who complain about the noise and disruption:

*Older people moaning when you play.
Annoying people in our street.*

A poor quality physical environment also figured significantly in the responses of Primary School pupils:

*Mess, glass, graffiti, dogs and cat mess.
Near a main road and railway line.*

The wish list for these pupils was the inverse of the problems perceived: better leisure facilities, better shops, less 'moany' neighbours, more friends nearby.

Responses from Secondary School pupils about the valued aspects of their areas produced similar responses to their younger peers:

*Got open space, lots of grass you can lie on.
There's a park just down the road but nothings in it..*

There's a football complex just up the road from me but some gangs hang about there.

Next to the Chinese.

Other valued characteristics of areas included:

Its clean and there is not a lot of trouble.

Its quite quiet so we can get to sleep 'esiar'.

Nice people to talk to.

All the children get on way each other.

Devalued aspects of the areas were, for Secondary School pupils, similar to those of the Primary School pupils:

Sometimes there's too much trouble.

Bullying, hitting people.

All the older people moan at you if you play out side their house.

The neighbours shout at you for jumping about mad in the street.

All the bigger ones think they rule because they are a lot older.

Junkies – they try to rob 'jewelry'. Thieving.

There is vandalism everywhere because of the bigger ones with spray paint.

The emphasis in pupil talk on social networks has a potential negative side. Some Secondary School pupils valued activities which others devalued:

Its good you get to have a laugh.

You get a good gang fight.

Divisions (areal, sectarian and racial) between groups in the East End appear to present a significant source of problem:

People from other areas come down to fight all the time.

Old Firm Game at Parkhead there is too much fighting.

I only want to know about my 'religoun'.

We don't like their food or 'acsent'.

The wish list for Secondary School pupils mirrored that of Primary School pupils. For example:

Less drunks, fights and vandals.

More fun activities.

Better games facilities.

No 'peodifiles' and drug addicts.

Vandals die because I hate them.

The sense of risk evident in pupil responses also characterises the responses of parents. Apart from local facilities the main valued characteristic of local areas was that:

Can see where they play

Negative aspects of the environment included:

Can't let the kids out after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Its too dangerous.

There's nothing to do in the area but the Leisure Centre.

Drugs. People under the influence are the problem. Like when they get into the school because the gates are open and take the lunch money off the kids.

No, there's been two murders in the past two months here. A 19-year old was jumped by a 26-year old.

In some places there's nice families but the Council's put other families in who're not. Recently near the Leisure Centre there were about 15 six and seven year olds who were attacking my kids and then my husband. Even though those families have been evicted from the area the kids keep coming back and battering on the windows and throwing stones and running through the Leisure Centre if the doors are not locked.

Chapter 7: Assessing the Impact of New Learning Communities

7.1 Background

The Report of the Phase 1 Evaluation, and this Report, are essentially qualitative in nature focusing on the processes of the pilot Learning Communities, their expansion and the adoption of New Learning Communities as policy by the City Council. No attempt has been made to date to assess the impact of the initiative on pupil attainments and social inclusion on the grounds that such impact can only be assessed in the medium (five years) and long term (ten years). These timeframes are specified in the light of the scheduled roll-out process and in terms of approximating to a child's progression through the Pre-Five, Primary and Secondary School sectors (in the case of the medium term) and a child's career in non-statutory education (in the case of the long term). Given the decision of the City Council to extend New Learning Communities to all educational establishments (see Chapter 10), it is now appropriate to evaluate the capacity of existing Management Information Systems (MIS) and their analytic capacity to perform this task and to offer a preliminary specification of how the impacts of the New Learning Communities may be assessed in the medium term.

These needs were also identified by the May 2002 inspection of Glasgow City Council by HMIE which identified 'Measuring, Monitoring and Evaluating Performance' as the only one out of eleven Quality Indicators which was not either Very Good or Good (HMIE 2002:58). HMIE saw the need for the Education Department *to develop more rigorous and comprehensive approaches* to monitoring and evaluating its own and schools' performance (HMIE 2002:32). Similarly HMIE highlighted the success of the City in promoting and supporting local innovations but *there was the need to monitor and evaluate the success of these initiatives more effectively and to focus attention and resources more clearly on developments which showed success in improving pupil achievements* (HMIE 2002:33). In particular HMIE identified (2002:34) the lack of baseline data and the need *to establish a coherent system for the collection, analysis and reporting of performance information* (2002:36). So far as the Learning Communities initiative was concerned HMIE concurred with the assessment of progress reported in our Phase 1 Report but argued that *despite these positive indications, further evidence was required to show that the planned improvements in attendance and pupil's attainment were being achieved* (2002:46).

In this chapter, the data capacity of the major MIS used by the City's Education Department, SEEMIS, which is also used by the other eleven Councils which formerly constituted Strathclyde Region, is first explored in a preliminary way. Secondly, the use of SEEMIS Vision module by the City in analysing these data to monitor school and pupil performance is assessed. We then turn, thirdly, to the new data requirements implied by the twin aims of the New Learning Communities of improving pupil attainments and promoting social inclusion and to the potential of data linking within the Council to enable a better understanding of the conditions in which these twin aims are best met. Finally, the potential of recent advances in statistical techniques which enable a more comprehensive understanding of pupil progress and school effectiveness than was previously available is examined.

7.2 The SEEMIS Database

The recently upgraded SEEMIS database contains much of the data necessary for the evaluation of the success of New Learning Communities in raising pupil attainments. There is no 'code book' or 'data map' available and the following has been derived from the Training Manuals provided by the SEEMIS Group and from meetings with staff of the SEEMIS Group and of the City Council's Education Department. We are very grateful for the helpful discussions on which this preliminary analysis is based.

Records held at the level of individual pupils allow the progress of each pupil to be tracked through the 5-14 Levels. SQA data are downloaded each August. These data may be aggregated to various types of groupings within the school (e.g. Registration Group, Class), to schools or groups of schools and to the City as a whole. The structure of the SQA data means that it difficult to manipulate and interpret in SEEMIS.

In addition to these attainment data the database contains individual 'disciplinary' records in terms of attendance, different types of absence, disruptions caused and exclusions. These data be aggregated to the different levels noted above.

At the school level data are available through the database of the destinations of leavers from secondary schools in terms of entering further and higher education, training or employment. It is currently unclear if these data could be obtained at the individual pupil level.

If such attainment, disciplinary and destination data are treated as dependent variable then the database contains a series of potential independent variables which might explain different patterns in the dependent variables. Characteristics of individual pupils in terms such as their gender, their place in the family birth order, their first and other languages, their religion and their ethnic origin are recorded as are medical conditions and any Record of Needs.

Indicators of the socio-economic conditions of the family are available in terms of the receipt of free school meals or of bursaries. Indicators of the socio-economic conditions of each pupil's residential area may be accessed through the address/postcode. This can indicate whether the residence is in an Area of Priority Treatment and may be used to access the Ward level data of the Scottish Indices of Deprivation outlined in Chapter 1. Currently however there is some concern about the coverage and the reliability of the postcode data in SEEMIS.

In a city where each child has a 40% chance of having a Placing Request lodged during their time in school data on such pupil careers are important. SEEMIS allows seven types of Placing Request to be explored but it can only provide details of currently contiguous schools rather than the pupil's whole history of placements.

7.3 Current Data Analysis using SEEMIS Vision

Currently school progress is monitored quantitatively through the SEEMIS Vision module which gives the Directorate access to definable aggregations of the raw individual level data.

Primary Schools, for example, are monitored by cross-tabulating P1 to P7 classes with the 5-14 Levels in Reading, Writing and Maths. Achievement is specified by the age/stage for each Level such that there is diagonal from achieving Level A in P3 to Level D in P7. Pupils at or above the diagonal have achieved expected levels, below the diagonal they have not. Such tables may be produced, for example, for individual schools, for schools in specific areas or for the whole City. Single years may be analysed as may be trends over years. Male and female pupils may be analysed separately.

Secondary Schools, in S1 and S2, are similarly monitored by the percentage of pupils attaining the expected Level for their age in Reading, Writing and Maths. Performance in Standard Grades are monitored by three Scottish Executive performance indicators (5+ Standard Grades at 1 or 2, 5+ at 1-4, 5+ at 1-6). Comparisons are made between the individual school, the Glasgow average and the national average. Similarly at Highers, each school is monitored in terms of 3+ Highers at A-C and 5+ Highers at A-C against the Glasgow and the national averages (see Chapter 9).

Following the City's Raising Standards – Setting Targets initiative school improvement is fostered through the use of SEEMIS Vision by establishing Targets (on a three year rolling basis) for each school. Targets are set on each of the measures, and on attendance, in the context of such Targets for the City as a whole. As the HMIE Report notes (2002:51), Glasgow as a city has no comparators in terms of socio-economic indicators and this means that the establishment of Targets is more than usually difficult.

In order to begin to control for the effects of socio-economic circumstances SEEMIS Vision is used to compare the performance of individual schools in terms of achieving the 5-14 Levels and attendance with ten schools with similar Free Meal Entitlements. Each school can thus be compared in terms of progress to Targets with 'similar' schools.

7.4 Data Requirements for the Evaluation of New Learning Communities

As we noted in our Phase 1 report the Learning Communities initiative is bold, suitable to the scale of the educational challenges facing the City. If progress in improving attainments and promoting social inclusion is to be monitored, understood and fostered then more wide-ranging datasets will be necessary than that which is currently available in SEEMIS. This is not a criticism of the existing software or staff but a recognition of the tasks facing the City.

Currently the attainment data which SEEMIS records are those of the 5-14 and the SQA systems. These data are important as they record the attainments of Glasgow pupils in the dominant public 'currency' of credentials and these are clearly important to the regeneration of the city. Such attainment data are however not sufficient to assess the progress of the New Learning Communities with their wide brief.

At the level of the city, the predominant use of 5-14 assessments must be questioned as there is little control on the reliability of the assessments made by staff in the 203 Primary and 29 Secondary schools. If the relative performance of schools is to be assessed then some more reliable measures of performance across the city are necessary. Given the city's serious socio-economic and educational position the sole focus on reading, writing and maths must be questioned. Complementary and alternative curriculum outcomes across the city need to be considered and the assessment of progress in social relations and personal development in schools needs to appear on the agenda. Similarly the sole focus on SQA outcomes for the upper secondary school must be questioned. Complementary and alternative curriculum outcomes, and measures of personal and social progress need to be considered for the assessment of school improvement.

Given the City justifiably praised emphasis on local innovation, of which the Learning Communities initiative is but one example, there is a need for systems of indicator development at the level of New Learning Communities and individual schools within such communities. Currently the Development Planning process for both New Learning Communities and for individual schools encourage innovation and self assessment but only rarely does this result in outcomes which may rigorously be measured and the roots of success (or the failure which must sometimes be expected if innovation is to be bold). There is a need for a mechanism by which such local indicators may be negotiated, operationalized and incorporated into routine monitoring of performance.

Combining the New Community Schools initiative with that of the Learning Communities (see Chapter 10) has major implications for the assessment of progress of individual pupils. An 'essential structure' for the New Community Schools are Personal Learning Plans by which each pupil would be assessed and *a programme of development agreed with, and to be supported by parents, including targets for attainment* (Scottish Office 1998b:11). If the 'ownership' of such Plans is to rest significantly with pupils and parents then indicators appropriate to their aspirations need to be developed. While some of these may already be captured by existing attainment data the analysis of pupil and parental views in Chapter 6 suggests that there are whole domains of indicators which would be needed. As with Learning Community and school level indicators there needs to be systems by which individual progress indicators may be negotiated, operationalised and embedded into monitoring processes.

The implications of merging the New Community School agenda with that of the Learning Communities are wider than Personal Learning Plans. The objective of promoting social inclusion raises serious issues of measurement and monitoring. Currently the national evaluation of the pilot phases of New Community Schools by

the Institute of Education, University of London uses a range of indicators specified in the original tender document. In the timescale of launching the pilots phases and their evaluation the indicators were largely sought in existing administrative datasets and in self reporting by the New Community Schools (Sammons et al, 2001 and 2002). As the New Community Schools agenda is rolled out across the city in the form of New Learning Communities there is a need to develop more reliable and valid indicators of social inclusion than it was possible to use for the initial evaluative studies. What the City Council means by social inclusion and thus how it may be operationalized and monitored presents a major intellectual and political challenge for the New Learning Community initiative.

Finally, in terms of the requirement for new data adequate to the demands of monitoring and evaluating the progress of the roll-out, there is a need for better individual and ecological data about the composition of pupil cohorts. Establishing reliable addresses and postcodes for pupils would enable access to major ecological datasets such as the Scottish Indices of Deprivation (and possibly their constitutive indicators) or the 2001 Census. The possibility of linking into other datasets held by the City Council would also be enabled by accurate address and postcode information. Currently recorded knowledge of individual pupil circumstances is relatively limited with Free Meal Entitlement as the main indicators. While important this has significant limitations as take up rates may vary between areas and taking up the entitlement may conceal very different home circumstances. The possibility of negotiating the collection and recording of better data about home circumstances should be considered.

7.5 Data Analytic Requirements for the Evaluation of New Learning Communities

Currently SEEMIS Vision provides a flexible facility for describing the differences on available measures of the performance of different schools and, through the Free Meal Entitlement comparisons, it seeks to control for the circumstances of the school. This suffers from two major statistical shortcomings. There is no way of telling whether the apparent difference between two schools, or between the scores of the same school in different years, are systematic, structural differences in effectiveness or whether they are to be expected variations around a consistent performance. Current data display considerable instability in many measures which make descriptive conclusions suspect. Secondly the descriptive use of SEEMIS Vision does not enable understandings of what the conditions for progress, or lack thereof, are. What the major factors in enhancing or inhibiting pupil progress can not be determined with current analytic capacity nor can the reasons why schools with similar circumstances may perform differently.

Research on 'school effectiveness', significantly centred of the educational problems of London, has, over the past twenty years, developed and utilised techniques for assessing the 'value added' at the level of the school and for exploring the conditions which are associated with this (Mortimore 1998; Sammons 1999). Two major developments in statistical techniques have enabled this type of research: logistic regression analysis and multi-level modelling. The use of these in context of

Glasgow's New Learning Communities would enable both a systematic understanding of progress towards the objectives of raising attainments and of promoting social inclusion and of 'what works' in achieving these objectives.

Logistic regression is a special case of the general linear (regression) model which is applicable to the 'low' level (non-parametric) data which is most common in education (for example, Pupil A is a girl, has Free Meal Entitlement, is on a Placing Request, is in a school using a particular reading scheme and has achieved Level C in Reading at the expected time). The model allows the researcher to calculate the relative chances of pupils in different circumstances (for example, a girl as above but using a different reading scheme) of achieving a particular, given outcome and thus the salience of these circumstances and how positive effects be enhanced, negative effects be diminished. Such models could be produced for the wide range of outcomes necessitated by the twin objectives of raising attainments and promoting social inclusion and would identify the factors on which improvement policy should focus.

Multi-Level Models have been developed to address the problem of the hierarchical clustering of data. The progress of different pupils in schools with different pedagogies which draw from areas with different socio-economic circumstances is a classic example of such hierarchically structured data where each 'level' (pupil characteristics; school characteristics; area characteristics) may have its own effects and interactions with other levels. Using such models has shown that 'obvious' differences in school performance (such as those produced by SEEMIS Vision) may disappear and schools which appear to be similar may, in fact, be performing differently. Using such models on the New Learning Communities would enable the City to establish a reliable picture of the relative progress of schools and the contribution of the reorganisation to this.

Chapter 8: Discussion of the Key Issues

8.1 Introduction

It is important to begin this chapter by referring to the policy context of the Learning Community initiative in Glasgow. It began as a pilot scheme in 1999 with two Learning Communities and expanded to six in 2000. It was hoped at the outset that the experience of this pilot phase could help determine future Council policy with regard to the position of all its educational establishments in due course. This policy was articulated in the Spring of 2002 in a paper to the Children's Services Committee of Glasgow City Council (GCC, 2002) following the report on Phase 1 of the evaluation by the University of Glasgow. In this report (Baron et al, 2001) a number of positive outcomes of the initiative in its first two years of existence were identified. These were:

- *The boldness of the initiative is widely welcomed. The Education Department of the City of Glasgow is taking action on a scale appropriate to the nature of the problem, that is, entrenched under-achievement in its schools and community cultures not supportive of learning. The initiative is strategic, radical and challenging and has promise in the longer term to deliver significant improvements.*
- *The pilot 'experiment', which involves 21% of the City's educational establishments, provides a strong basis for making appropriate decisions on the way forward for the initiative in relation to the schools in the City.*
- *Headteachers of the primary and secondary schools involved in the learning communities have systematically engaged with the initiative and are now in a position to make major strides forward.*
- *Significant progress has been made to promote greater consistency and co-ordination in specific areas of the curriculum.*
- *Joint staff development and productive collaboration is being achieved through priority working groups and joint curriculum-related initiatives.*
- *The initiative has provided a mechanism to promote a greater sense of collective ownership and responsibility amongst headteachers for the education of children at the local level.*
- *Collective Development Planning is beginning to emerge.*

(Baron et al, 2001, p 105)

The evaluators concluded:

This Report provides an evaluation of the first two years of the Learning Community initiative and represents an encouraging endorsement of the Authority's policy. Establishing an effective formal mechanism whereby schools are required to collaborate is a challenging task given the long cultural tradition of schools being separate institutions. This is not to say that more could not have been done in the time or that more does not need to

be done if the initiative is to be successful. There are urgent and difficult matters to be addressed which the Report has highlighted. It must also be recognised that ultimate success will take time - perhaps longer than might be expected. If progress over the first two years continues to be built on, we have little reason to doubt that, in say ten years, educational achievement and the culture of learning in Glasgow will be significantly enhanced.

(Baron et al, 2001, p 106)

Whilst generally welcoming the progress made with the initiative in its first two years, the evaluators clearly identified the need for a long-term perspective if the ultimate goal of raising achievement in Glasgow's schools was to be realised. But they also urged a more proactive engagement with the difficult issues which emerged during the first two years. The following sections attempt to summarise the main developments in the Learning Communities during 2002.

8.2 Toward the Success Criteria

There is evidence of continuing progress in a number of key areas in each of the four Learning Communities. The general ethos of the initiative has been consolidated. Most progress appears to have been made in relation to curriculum development, the sharing of resources across the Learning Communities and greater clarification in the management roles of the senior personnel in each Learning Community. However, there is still a need to foster further progress in relation to inter-agency work in general and the work of the Child Support Team in particular. There was also some indication that pre-five establishments were becoming more integrated into Learning Communities. However, for a small number of these establishments additional attention will be required if they are to become full partners in the initiative.

8.3 Curriculum innovation

In terms of curriculum innovation, the joint working which takes place at the management level of the LC, especially between the primary and secondary sectors, is among the most successful aspects of the initiatives in the case study schools. Most members of SMTs who were interviewed spoke positively about the experience of being involved in this new arrangement for decision making within the cluster of schools. Many reported the increased sense of purpose in curriculum development which had resulted from this mechanism.

It seems that the resourcing which follows from this kind of joint discussion and curriculum planning is an important catalyst in ensuring commonality of approach across the primary schools within Learning Communities, which in turn has implications for continuity and progression.

The involvement of practitioners seems to be helpful in ensuring commitment across a range of schools. The commissioning of teachers to develop and produce materials, their involvement in piloting and evaluating materials, encouraged a sense of ownership, which may have long term benefits in terms of lasting curriculum change.

One of the biggest barriers found in the case studies to consistency in delivery and pace of 5-14 curriculum is the apparent lack of connection between the work on the ground and the decision making process. The gap appears to be the virtual non-involvement of Principal Teachers and other key players.

It is worth considering the value of taking the long term view of development work and recognising the shortcomings of only valuing that which can be easily and quickly measured. The laying of sound and solid foundations for long term change may be equally or more valuable in terms of impact on children's learning.

Although some staff did point to positive features of assessment practices planned for the future, the overall impression was of a lack of consistency in the sharing of assessment information and the use of that information to plan children's learning. Despite very good progress in some curricular areas, in both sectors and considerable improvements in commonality of approach across primary schools, continuity in learning is seriously compromised by this structural omission.

8.4 ICT

The authority's ICT infrastructure appears sufficient to meet the administrative and management needs of Learning Communities. Individual establishments, within and across Learning Communities, have little difficulty in communicating with one another and with headquarters.

Commendable steps have been taken by some Learning Communities to develop local information systems to support management decision-making (including systems to 'track' pupils). At present this process appears to be overly reliant upon the individual expertise of the Principal or Bursar.

In general, the promise of Learning Community-driven ICT usage to support learning and teaching has yet to be realised. Factors outwith the Learning Communities, notably in conjunction with the network, training and software implementation, are identified for this relatively slow start. Others believe that basic ICT training and the NOF training, as a related factor, have not sufficiently developed the competence and confidence of staff to encourage open inter-institutional co-operation.

Application of ICT skills to curriculum delivery has been similarly inhibited, and not helped by the lack of clear central authority guidance. There were some positive examples of implementing Learning Community ICT policies, but not yet across the board.

To date development efforts have focused primarily on the staffs of the individual establishments within Learning Communities. Accordingly, the involvement of the wider community and other agencies has yet to be focused on.

There is evidence, based on how ICT is being used in the Learning Communities, of moves towards streamlining administration, but not yet in releasing time for teaching or significantly enhancing the curriculum.

8.6 Pupil and Parent perspectives

As emphasised in Chapter 2 this exploration of pupil and parental perspectives is preliminary and does not seek to provide the basis for generalisation about specific substantive matters. Subjects, for example, are both liked and disliked; uniform is both valued and devalued; hanging about and having a laugh is both fun and oppressive of others; parents are both informed and kept at a distance etc. What this study does reveal, with a degree of consistency which has surprised us, are the main issues which are at stake in seeking to promote higher levels of attainment and social inclusion in the context of deep and multiple deprivation. It is on these, an agenda for starting to reformulate the relationships between pupils, teachers, parents, schools and communities, that we focus by way of conclusion.

In seeking to raise attainments and promote social inclusion through schools perhaps the central challenge facing the New Learning Communities is to foster greater engagement of young people with the education system. In our conversation with pupils and parents there was little evidence of hostility to the idea of education but substantial evidence of a rejection of aspects of the current organisation and management of schools. The major issues at stake are:

Active learning: There was a clear sense in the responses of pupils that they valued learning contexts in which they were active. Physical education and expressive arts were consistently appreciated while, in the classroom based curriculum, involvement in, for example, experiments and developing their own ideas were similarly valued.

Pupil respect: Pupils displayed a strong sense that the way in which they were treated by some teachers was sometimes inappropriate and unjust. This did not appear as a rejection of 'school rules' as such (indeed order in the school was appreciated) but more in terms of the daily round of discipline being arbitrary and lacking in respect for the pupils.

Negotiated curriculum: Parental and pupil talk suggested that the schools were seen as significantly curriculum centred rather than child centred with problems of pacing, differentiation, pupil choice and connection with the realities of life in the East End.

Social Networks: The centrality of social networks to the lives of pupils came through extremely strongly. Provision of learning opportunities by the school appears to be powerfully mediated by their impact on pupil social networks and, with a curriculum centred organisation, little explicit attention seems to be paid to the educational potential of such networks. These necessarily entail problems of conflict and social dysfunction.

Dialogue with parents and the wider community: The parents who responded to the invitation to speak with us displayed a high level of commitment to their children and their education in terms both of credentials and personal characteristics. The opportunity for schools to have more extensive dialogues with parents about how these might be fostered was suggested. A strong theme in the responses of pupils and parents was the dominant sense of ever present risks in living in the East End (from which schools appear to be a relative enclave). Dialogues on how such risks might be minimised and negotiated, and how the causes of these risks might be removed, would address a central cultural experience of the communities of the schools.

Chapter 9: Conclusions and Recommendations

As in the first evaluation report the conclusions have been categorised into two groups - the identified positive effects of the initiative during 2002 which build on those identified in the first report and those areas either not yet taken forward or requiring further discussion.

Positive outcomes to date:

- the advances in curriculum innovation at the local level has been the main hallmark of the initiative in 2002. A sense of ownership in the Learning Communities coupled with a recognition of the value of networking has generated a will to invest ideas and resources to the benefit of children's schooling in each Learning Community.
- a greater collaboration across sectors has emerged within each Learning Community in terms of joint decision-making in the deployment of resources. More staff have become identified with the initiative and feelings of suspicion and threat have significantly diminished.
- a significant effort has been made in clarifying the roles of senior staff in each Learning Community thus helping to improve the efficiency in decision-making and administration.
- tentative steps have been taken towards addressing the central issue of social inclusion through the establishment of Child Support Teams.
- significant progress has been made in the deployment of ICT for enhancing the efficiency of administration in each Learning Community.

Points for Action

- It was right and proper during the pilot phases of the Learning Community initiative (1999-2003) that each Learning Community be given freedom to find its own way forward. A new steer, such as that articulated in the Council's Children's Services paper in 2002, is essential for the future success of the initiative. Such a steer should be supported by clear, overt and sustained commitment by the Council to the twin aims of the initiative, that is, raising achievement and enhancing social inclusion.
- Within the Learning Communities themselves, further consideration and action is required to facilitate cross-sector learning and teaching. In particular, Principal Teachers in the Secondary Schools might be given more opportunities to be involved in the work of the Learning Community Primary Schools. An interactive working relationship requires to be established between Primary School Headteachers and Principal Teachers in the Secondary Schools if significant pedagogic advances are to be made. Such a relationship would facilitate the cross-sectoral deployment of staff.

- Also, at the pedagogic level, greater attempts should be made to use consistent assessment information in planning children's learning experiences, particularly at the points of transition from one stage to the next.
- As mentioned in the first report, the initiative has not yet substantially addressed the relationships between school, pupils, parents and community. Recognition needs to be given to parents and community interests as 'stakeholders' in the educative process such as is witnessed in the Networked Learning Communities in the Educational Action Zones in England.
- A new initiative needs to be taken in the use of ICT. Whilst ICT is now being deployed to enhance administration in each Learning Community, the opportunity to extend this to learning and teaching in Learning Communities in a co-ordinated way must be seized. Co-ordination of ICT with curriculum-based activities is crucial.
- In the Learning Community initiative to date there has been variation in the involvement of other agencies. Such involvement, where it is in evidence, has depended on personal contacts and good will rather than on putting in place appropriate structural arrangements to sustain collaboration. New relationships with other agencies should now be developed involving health, social work, careers, police, Children's Panels and community education. Such "integration of services" as outlined in the report *For Scotland's Children* (SEED, 2001) is an essential step in the pursuit of greater social inclusion.

This Report, as did its predecessor, provides an encouraging endorsement of the Authority's policy for raising achievement and enhancing social inclusion in the City of Glasgow. Whilst it is still premature to expect movement in 'output' factors such as systematic and consistent changes in examination results, the tentative early signs are encouraging. Examination results over the period 2000-2002 for each of the six Learning Communities set against the averages for Glasgow and Scotland as a whole are given in Appendix 1. Achievement in Glasgow's Learning Community schools at Level 3 of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) hovers about the Glasgow average and is just below the national average. However, for higher levels in the SCQF, Learning Community schools are achieving about half the national average.

Inspecting Appendix I for consistent trends in achievement levels, the only Learning Community to be entirely consistent in improving its examination results over the period 2000 to 2002 is St. Mungo's. As suggested in Chapter 7, it is premature to indicate with any confidence whether this trend is attributable to the Learning Community initiative. It would also be dangerous to conclude that little progress is being made in the other Learning Communities. There are promising signs that might suggest the initiative will hold out hope that, in the years to come, the cycle of under-achievement in Glasgow will be broken. But it will require the dedication and

sustained commitment of all the stakeholders - central government, local government, service agencies, teachers, pupils, parents and community leaders.

Chapter 10: The Way Ahead

As stated at the beginning of Chapter 1, the Learning Community initiative was regarded as a pilot scheme until such time as evidence emerged that indicated either that the initiative was a fruitless endeavour or that it was a potentially promising innovation that could, in time, impact on the culture of learning in the city of Glasgow.

The first evaluation report (Baron et al, 2001) clearly supported the latter position. The evaluators concluded that:

If progress over the first two years continues to be built on, we have little reason to doubt that, in say ten years time, educational achievement and the culture of learning in Glasgow will be significantly enhanced.

(Baron et al, 2001, p 106)

But the Learning Community initiative was not the only major initiative targeted at raising achievement in Scotland. Significant national developments were taking place in the establishment of New Community Schools in Scotland. The Scottish Executive Education Department adopted the New Community School (NCS) initiative first put forward by the Secretary of State for Scotland, Donald Dewar in 1998 (SO, 1998). In Glasgow, two pilot new community schools were established - Lochend (Easterhouse) and Drumchapel, both sited in disadvantaged outer-city housing estates.

Through the New Community Schools we will make a radical attack on this vicious cycle of underachievement. New Community Schools will embody the fundamental principal that the potential of all children can be realised only by addressing their needs in the round - and that this requires an integrated approach by all those involved.

(Scottish Office, 1998, p 1)

In many respects the New Community School initiative took on board the need for inter-agency collaboration in dealing with the negative aspects of life in Easterhouse and Drumchapel. Such a perspective was much less evident in Glasgow's Learning Community initiative, the latter being more active in curriculum innovation and shared management processes between schools and pre-five establishments. Nevertheless, the drive from central government in Scotland was for greater integrated delivery of services for children and families (SE, 2002)⁸.

This drive for expansion of the NCS programme beyond the pilot phase was backed by additional funding from SEED for a period of five years.

It seemed not unreasonable therefore, that Glasgow City Council should attempt to integrate the best of the New Community School initiative with that of its own Learning Community initiative. In the paper to the Children's Services Committee in 2002, the Director of Education stated:

⁸ The Integrated Services Unit at Lochend NCS has been subject to systematic evaluation by the same team that evaluated GCC's Learning Community initiative. (Wilkinson et al, 2002)

The interim evaluation (of the Learning Community initiative) has been positive, and it is now proposed that the expansion of the Learning Communities initiative be used as the vehicle for the roll-out of New Community Schools.

(GCC, 2002a, p 2)

The Council endorsed the proposal that the New Community Schools and the Learning Communities initiative should jointly provide a key vehicle for integrating services for children and families.

Subject to the allocation of additional set up funding by the Executive in years 2003 - 2005, it is proposed that the learning community initiative now be rolled out across the city over a 4/5 year period as outlined in the letter from the Scottish Executive.

(GCC, 2002a, p 3)

It was agreed by the Council that all its 29 secondary schools participate in the roll-out of the New Community Schools as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Phase 1 | - Eastbank, St. Andrew's, St. Mungo's, Smithycroft, Lochend |
| Phase 2 | - All Saints, Castlemilk, St. Margaret Mary's |
| Phase 3 | - Springburn, St. Roch's, St. Paul's |
| Phase 4 ⁹ | - Lourdes, Bellahouston, Penilee, Shawlands, Kings Park, Hillpark, Holyrood, Bannerman, Govan |
| Phase 5 ¹⁰ | - Drumchapel, St. Thomas Aquinas, Knightswood, Hillhead, Hyndland, John Paul, Notre Dame, Cleveden |

The Council also agreed that the schools involved in Phases 1 to 3 should collaborate between clusters and share good practice i.e. 'clusters of clusters', thus facilitating dialogue between the denominationally based clusters e.g. St. Andrew's and the non-denominationally based clusters e.g. Smithycroft.

In each New Learning Community cluster, it was proposed that the following arrangements be put in place:

- *A management group (or sub group) be established for each learning community/cluster to focus on inclusion and joint working. The group will include representatives of the key partners in delivering a more integrated approach to supporting children - education, health and social work and other relevant partners, including Glasgow Alliance, Careers Scotland and Colleges of Further Education. (A separate group will be established to focus on raising attainment and will have, as members of the team, advisers from the educational management service).*
- *Each learning community or cluster will draw up a plan of action. In learning communities the responsibility for developing the plan will lie with the learning community principal in conjunction with heads of establishment. In schools not yet established as learning communities*

⁹ Subject to availability of funding.

the secondary headteacher will produce the plan of action in consultation with heads of establishment within the cluster. The plans will require to include targets and strategies, resource requirements and success criteria. A general format is included as appendix 2.

- *For those schools which currently receive action plan funding, the plans should indicate how current activities contributing to the core concept of the new community school can be sustained while there is a widening of appropriate support and involvement to all sectors over a period of 2 years. Plans will incorporate the implementation of the health promoting school/community scheme.*
- *As part of the plan of action each learning community will establish a child and family support team to take operational responsibility for delivering a more integrated approach to supporting children and young people. The child and family support team will include representatives from Pre Five, Primary and SEN establishments (where appropriate), from the Guidance team of the secondary school and from psychological services. Network support teachers will form part of the team. Social Work and Health Board representation will also be included. There will be opportunities for therapeutic intervention in addition to currently available supports. The team will be managed by the assistant of deputy head of the secondary school who has responsibility for pupil support.*
- *Another essential element will be the inclusion of the Health Promoting School initiative, most likely through the Glasgow Healthy Schools Incentive and Reward Scheme. In association with this it is expected that health promotion will include various sports initiatives.*
- *An attendance council for each learning community will also be established.*

(GCC, 2002a, p 5)

A key feature of the management arrangements for the New Learning Communities was the establishment of two new groups in each Learning Community - a **social inclusion** group and a **raising achievement** group, both under the overall leadership of the Learning Community Principal.

Undoubtedly this is a bold step forward and goes some considerable way to address some of the concerns raised in the first evaluation report.

Bibliography

- Baron, S. R., Hall, S., McCreath, D., Roebuck, M., & Wilkinson, J. E. (2001) **The Learning Community Initiative in Glasgow**, Glasgow: Department of Educational Studies, University of Glasgow.
- Carter, K. (2002) Leadership in Urban and Challenging Contexts investigating EA2 policy in practice, **School Leadership & Management**, 22 (1), pp 41-59.
- DfEE (1998) **£75 million boosts radical education action zones and raises standards**, London: DfEE, Press release.
- Dowling, J. and Gooday, M. (2000) **Supporting Effective School Clusters**, Paper presented to the European Conference on Educational Research, Edinburgh, September 2000.
- Glasgow City Council (2002a) **Integrated Services: the Roll-out of New Community Schools**, Glasgow: Glasgow City Council, Children's Services Sub-Committee.
- Glasgow City Council (2002b) **ICT in Primary Schools Update**. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council, Educational Services (Standards and Quality) Sub-Committee, 23 April 2002, Paper 2304IT4A
- Glasgow City Council (2002c) **ICT in Secondary Schools Update**. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council, Educational Services (Standards and Quality) Sub-Committee, 23 April 2002, Paper 2304IT4B
- Glasgow City Council (2002d) **ICT Update**. Glasgow: Glasgow City Council, Educational Services Committee, December 2002, Paper 1330IT11
- Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HMIE) (2002) **Into the Classroom of Tomorrow** (Interim Report on the Implementation of the New Opportunities Fund ICT Training): Edinburgh: HMIE, June 2002
- Mortimore, P. (1998) **The Road to Improvement: Reflections on school effectiveness**, Abingdon: Swets and Zeitlinger
- Noble, M. et al (2003) **Scottish Indices of Deprivation 2003** Oxford: Department of Social Policy & Social Work, University of Oxford.
- Sammons, P. (1999), **School Effectiveness: Coming of age in the twenty-first century**, Abingdon: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Sammons, P., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Power, S., Campbell, C., Delemare, J. and Whitty, G. (2001) **New Community Schools in Scotland: National evaluation strategy, the development of baseline indicators and early**

progress, Paper to the Scottish Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Dundee, 28 September 2001.

Sammons, P., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Power, S., Campbell, C., Delemare, J. and Whitty, G. (2002) National Evaluation of the New Community Schools in Scotland: Phase 1 1999-2002; Interim Findings and Emerging Issues for Policy and Practice, **Interchange** 76, Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.

Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1999) **Budget Boost of £39 Million for Information Technology in Scottish Education**.
Edinburgh: The Scottish Office, News Release 0602/19, 19 March 1999.

Scottish Executive (2002) **For Scotland's Children**,
Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

The Scottish Office (1998) **New Community Schools Prospectus**,
Edinburgh: The Scottish Office.

Turok, I., Bailey, N. and 13 others (2003) **Twin Track Cities? Linking prosperity and cohesion in Glasgow and Edinburgh**,
Glasgow: Department of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Wilkinson, J. E., Baron, S. R., Schad, D. P., (2002) **The Integrated Services Unit at Lochend New Community High School Easterhouse, Glasgow**.
Glasgow : Department of Educational Studies, University of Glasgow.

© Department of Educational Studies, University of Glasgow
ISBN 085261 773 9