Education Endowment Foundation

PROJECT TITLE	School Partnership Programme
DEVELOPER	The Education Development Trust
EVALUATOR	UCL Institute of Education
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S)	Jake Anders (Impact Evaluation), Louise Stoll (Implementation and Process Evaluation)
PROTOCOL AUTHOR(S)	Jake Anders, John Jerrim, Louise Stoll, Toby Greany, David Godfrey
STUDY DESIGN	School-level matched difference in differences
AGE RANGE	10-11
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	437
NUMBER OF PUPILS	N/A
PRIMARY OUTCOME	KS2 SATS maths performance

Protocol version history

VERSION	DATE	REASON FOR REVISION
1.0 [*original*]	21/05/2018	

Table of contents

Intervention

The Education Development Trust (EDT)'s School Partnership Programme (SPP) is a structured approach to cluster-based school collaboration, through the provision of a coherent and consistent approach to peer review that aims to drive improvement across all schools involved in the cluster. The programme aims to develop a culture of partnership working through school self-evaluation, peer review and school-to-school support.

SPP is a peer review model that is intended to build capacity and capability across clusters so they can gradually take more responsibility for their own development and maturity, and lead their own improvement. Over time, local areas will own the SPP model, and continue to develop it so it has impact locally. SPP provides frameworks and tools, training and professional support, and is designed to incorporate and build on, not side line, schools' existing best practice.

Significance

The need for lateral school-to school partnerships has become apparent in the face of evidence that neither top-down centrally imposed change, nor pure competition can achieve sustained improvement across school systems (Burns and Koster, 2016). The aim, rather, has been to 'unleash greatness' by asking school system leaders to work together in ways which transfer knowledge, expertise and capacity within and between schools, so that all schools improve and all children achieve their potential (DfE, 2010).

This has implications for accountability, with the drive for a 'self-improving school system' leading to an increase in engagement in peer evaluation to promote self-accountability (Greany and Higham, 2018). This is seen as a key step towards schools self-regulation in which schools take greater ownership of their quality assurance, not only through self-evaluation but through exposing their work to the scrutiny and perceptions of trusted peers (Matthews and Ehren, 2017). This accords with the outcomes of an international comprehensive survey of assessment and evaluation in 28 countries by the OECD (2013). In finding little evidence of peer review, the OECD report's authors identified developing school evaluation capacity as a priority, proposing that school leadership teams collaborate to identify common challenges and devise common approaches to peer evaluation.

Methods

Research questions

The primary objective of this evaluation is to estimate the effect of participating in the EDT School Partnerships Programme (SPP) for two years on pupils' attainment.

In addition, the impact evaluation will seek to answer the following question:
1. Does participating in EDT SPP have an effect on the attainment of young people ever identified as eligible for free school meals (FSM)?

The implementation and process evaluation will seek the answer the following questions
2. In what ways does the SPP influence the capability, culture and practice of partnerships, leadership and teachers in involved schools?
3. In what ways do the elements in the School Partnership Programme theory of change work in achieving impact at the level of pupil attainment in KS2 numeracy and literacy (over the period of the trial or beyond)?

4. What factors influence schools' and clusters' ability to engage in, participate fully in and successfully implement and sustain the processes involved to achieve their desired outcomes? What distinguishes schools and clusters that are more or less successful?

Design

This evaluation has been designed as an embedded mixed methods evaluation, incorporating a school-level matched comparison difference in differences impact evaluation, with an Implementation and Process Evaluation (IPE).

This approach to the impact evaluation has been chosen because a randomised controlled trial would not have been feasible with this programme, partly due to the scale required (because of the grouping of schools into clusters) and because of the difficulty of forming schools into clusters while expecting them not to cooperate in the case that they are allocated to a control group.

Participants

Target recruitment was 50 clusters of English state-funded primary schools to be recruited with an approximate cluster size of 6, making 300 schools in total, with the proviso that if cluster size is smaller than expected additional recruitment would be undertaken to bring the number of schools recruited up to 300. In the event, the project team (EDT) successfully recruited far more schools than anticipated, providing a sample of 437 English state-funded primary schools in 85 clusters (average cluster size of just over 5). All recruited schools will receive the intervention, while statistical matching methods will be used to identify the counterfactual group.

In order to be considered, schools will have to agree to cooperate with the project and evaluation teams during the trial (further details of these requirements are outlined in the School Partnerships Programme Agreement, between EDT and each partnership, a template for which is included with this document in Appendix A).

The project team will advertise the trial and also approach schools through their existing networks. Where possible it will aim to recruit schools that have larger populations of individuals receiving FSM.

Impact evaluation

Outcome measures

The primary outcome of interest is school average performance in KS2 maths tests (mat_average). More specifically, given that this is a difference in differences design, the outcome will be the difference in differences between treatment and matched comparison schools in pre- and post-treatment years.

The secondary outcome of interest is school average performance in KS2 reading tests (read_average). The same specifics apply as for the primary outcome above.

Additional secondary outcomes will be the outcomes above for the FSM sub-groups within schools. These will be recovered using school-level variables available for this purpose (mat_average_fsm6cla1a and read_average_fsm6cla1a).

Matching
For clarity, matching will be carried out on the basis of a 1:1 nearest neighbour propensity score matching without replacement, including exact matching on key characteristics (likely to include school type and government office region), application of a caliper[1] on the propensity score matching, and imposition of common support. Since clusters are observed in the treatment group but not in the pool of potential matched comparators, it is necessary to match at school-, rather than cluster-, level; the importance of the clustering of treatment schools will be recognised in the analysis. The matching exercise will be carried out following pseudo-randomisation, with the final treated and matched samples considered fixed at this point, before any outcomes data are available.

Characteristics that will be assessed for inclusion in matching (including interactions and higher order polynomials of these terms) will be:
- Number of pupils
- Attainment in school measured by KS2 average points score in each previous year 2010-15
- Prior attainment of intake measured by KS1 average points score in each previous year 2010-15
- School type (academy vs. other)
- Ofsted rating
- IDACI quintile
- Geographical location (longitude, latitude)
- Local authority area
- Government office region

The identification of pseudo-clusters among untreated schools based primarily on geographic characteristics, to which treated schools could be matched, was explored but rejected. We made this decision as it resulted in worse balance of school-level characteristics between the treatment and matched comparison groups in a pilot exercise. Instead, geographic characteristics (e.g. latitude, longitude, government office region, IDACI quintile) will be included as part of the matching process itself.

Difference in differences
While matching attempts to ensure that the treated and comparison group are comparable on the basis of observable characteristics, there is still the potential for confounding due to unobservable differences between the treated and matched comparison schools. We take a difference in differences approach to deal with remaining time-invariant unobservable characteristics. This means that our impact estimate makes the assumption of common trends i.e. that in the absence of the treatment the change in our outcomes of interest between the pre- and post-treatment period would have been the same between our treatment and our matched comparison schools (Anders et al. 2017, ch. 4). We have aimed to improve the plausibility of this assumption by using previous years' average attainment as part of our matching.

---

[1] We will explore the quality of fit of differing widths for our preferred strategy but plan to start this search with a caliper of 0.2 of the standard deviation of the logit of the propensity score (as recommended by Austin, 2011). Note that we will explore the robustness to varying this caliper, as discussed below.

We will compare the differences in outcomes between treated and matched comparison schools in 2017/18 (pre-treatment) with the difference in outcomes between treated and matched comparison schools in 2019/20 (post-treatment) – two years after the intervention began.

Sample size calculations

We conduct our sample size calculation for the KS2 maths outcome, since this is the primary outcome. Sample size calculations were based on an estimated Minimum Detectable Effect Size (MDES) of 0.20 and the following assumptions: power of 0.8 for a two-tailed 0.05 significance test, treatment assignment at cluster-level, an intra-cluster correlation of 0.10[2] and 6 schools within each cluster.

In conducting this calculation, we assume that 0.40 of post-test variance at school- and 0.70 at cluster-level is explained by the pre-test and lagged performance (in the setting of a difference in differences this is based on variation explained by lagged performance in the outcome variable and, in this case, performance a KS1 "pre-test"). The pre-test/post-test correlation assumptions are based on estimates derived from a database of schools previously treated by EDT.[3]

These requirements suggest a requirement of approximately 300 treated schools with the final average cluster size not exceeding 6 (as this would reduce the power). Based on discussions with the project team and EEF at project set-up, this was set as the recruitment target.

Since we are using school-level variables, the power calculation for average performance of FSM pupils is no different to that for the overall outcome.[4]

Analysis plan

We will estimate the effect of the intervention using a linear model on school-level data from the pre- and post-treatment periods (as defined above). Raw outcome variables from the NPD, as described in the outcome measures section above, will be used in all models. Cluster-level clustered standard errors will be calculated in order to take into account the potential dependence of the results among school clusters; schools in the matched comparison group will be treated as independent from one another for the purposes of calculating standard errors.

The model will include a treatment indicator, a post-treatment period indicator, an interaction term between the treatment indicator and the post-treatment period indicator, and school average performance at Key Stage 1 (tks1average, or an updated version of this) as an

---

[2] It is difficult to choose an ICC value in this setting given that little evidence exists for intra-cluster correlations at school-cluster (rather than within school) level. As a result, we choose 0.10 as being at the lower level of within school ICCs found by EEF in previous trials, based on an assumption that within-cluster variance is likely to be higher than within-school variance.

[3] Specifically, we ran a school-level model of average points score in 2014 on average points score for the same cohort at KS1 and average points score in 2013 in the same school, allowing for cluster-level variance components. This estimated within-cluster variance explained at 0.42 and between-cluster variance explained at 0.70.

[4] We note the risk of figures among the FSM sample being suppressed in schools where there are 3 or fewer pupils who are eligible for FSM.

additional way to reduce bias in the estimator (Imbens & Rubin, 2015, ch.18). The model will be specified as follow:

$$mat\_average_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Treat_i + \beta_2 Post_t + \beta_3 Treat_i * Post_t + tks1average_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

As this will be estimated on the treatment sample defined at the pseudo-randomisation date, the coefficient on the interaction term (β_3) will recover the Intention to Treat (ITT) Average Treatment on the Treated (ATT) estimate of impact.

We will calculate Hedge's g effect size by dividing this coefficient by an estimate of the unconditional pooled total variance of the outcome variable and applying the appropriate correction factor. 95% confidence intervals will be estimated by inputting the upper and lower confidence limits of the coefficient from the regression model into the effect size formula.

An estimate of the intra-cluster correlation of the outcome measure will be extracted by estimating a variance components model for this purpose.

As noted above, the regression model will include a pre-test variable in order to improve the precision of the estimates.

We will estimate the impact on average performance of FSMever pupils using a separate model using the relevant outcome variable from the NPD. This will be carried out for both maths and English performance.

We will estimate treatment effects for compliers (both "minimal" and "optimal") at both school-level and cluster-level using a sub-group analysis defined by a school-level and cluster-level measures of compliance with the intervention (the cluster-level measure is based on an aggregation of the school-level measure). The definition of these fidelity measures is discussed as part of the Implementation and Process Evaluation Stage 4 below.

Robustness checks
We believe that a battery of robustness checks of both the matching and the difference in difference elements of the design are vital to establish the credibility of the estimates. These are likely to include:

Matching
- Selection of two nearest neighbours;
- Varying the caliper width (including half and double of the caliper selected for our preferred approach);
- Exclusion of items from the matching equation;
- Removal of exact matching characteristics;
- Removal of imposition of common support;
- Use of kernel matching as an alternative to nearest neighbour matching.

We will explore the balance of baseline characteristics in the matched models these produce in order to select 5 well-matched alternative specifications to use as the core robustness check models for impact estimation.

Difference in differences
- Use of two years prior to implantation as baseline (rather than one year prior to implementation);

- Specification of the estimation model as a fixed effects estimation rather than difference in differences.

Implementation and process evaluation methods

The purpose of the process evaluation is to establish fidelity and to assess the factors which affect impact from the different phases of the SPP on the stakeholders within the project, and which may explain the findings of the quantitative evaluation. We will also look for evidence of wider issues which may need to be considered in any further roll out of this programme and other whole school-level interventions. The process evaluation will involve the following:

- UCL IOE attendance at EDT training events
- Baseline and final interview surveys of 437 head teachers in intervention schools
- UCL IOE interviews of school leaders and teachers in all schools in 2 clusters
- UCL IOE attendance at localised cluster pre-review training, reviews, and follow up (3 schools)
- UCL IOE interviews of school leaders and teachers at 8 matched schools
- Interview surveys of 437 matched school head teachers

Stage 1 (approx. May/July 2018):

Baseline telephone Interview surveys
To gather data from all treatment schools, we propose that telephone baseline (followed by final surveys in the last stage) of intervention schools be carried out. This would include information on "business as usual" and differences between "business as usual" and the intervention and gain a wider view of fidelity and/or impact as measured qualitatively.

Stakeholder Interviews
We will carry out individual telephone interviews with a number of key stakeholders as agreed with the delivery partners to explore intentions around the nature and reach of activity, programme differentiation.

Stage 2 (approx. starting date March 2018 and various dates depending on training arrangements – also ongoing throughout two years)

Observing EDT peer review training events
Members of our team with expertise and knowledge of leadership development and peer review will lead the observations and fieldwork. The IPE team will attend and observe all types of training sessions delivered by the training provider, as well as reviewing the materials used.

A sample of EDT and partnership training will be observed, including:

1. Training of reviewers – Senior Leaders and Improvement champion training (Year 1 - Spring 2018; Autumn 2018; Year 2 – Autumn 2019).
2. Baseline, interim and summative impact workshops led by EDT (Year 1 - Spring 2018, Autumn 2018, Summer 2019; Year 2 – Autumn 2019, Spring 2020; Summer 2020).
3. Further training for middle leaders and governors to start Year 2 cycle (Autumn 2019)

Ongoing desk review of related SPP materials (Summer 2018 – Summer 2020)
Working closely with the delivery partners (EDT), we will aim to draw on data collected by them and school-level data where possible. For example, we will seek permission from all participating schools to be given access to their self-evaluation and peer-review framework and tools, online audit tools and school level documentation.

Stage 3: Detailed case studies of the intervention and matched comparison groups (Autumn 2018 and Autumn 2019).

Case studies from intervention group
We will follow two case study clusters and their intervention schools (5 schools per cluster) over the two years of the intervention. Initial data on school and cluster characteristics gathered as part of the quantitative evaluation will be used to inform selection of this sample. The clusters will be located in different contexts and at different stages of development to explore potential developmental changes. We will conduct one visit per year per school to interview people (a minimum of 3 per school e.g. head teacher, involved senior or middle leader, Improvement Champion and another teacher), using instruments based on the logic model. We will also carry out interviews at impact workshops to monitor the peer-review process: their own review at their school, their attendance at a local peer review, follow-up school-to-school support or other relevant cluster activity (*dates as above*). Schools in these case study schools will also share with us documentation used in their peer review activities. To further inform the case studies, a sample of reviews will be observed, including:
1. Pre-conversations (Year 1 – Summer 2018; Year 2 – Summer 2019)
2. Review visit (Year 1 – Summer 2018; Year 2 – Summer 2019)
3. Follow-up improvement workshop (Year 1 – Summer 2018; Year 2 – Summer 2019)

Case studies from matched comparison clusters
We will follow two case study clusters of matched schools (4 schools per cluster) over the two years, also using information on school and cluster characteristics gathered for the quantitative evaluation. We will also conduct face-to-face interviews with head teachers and senior leaders in two matched clusters of schools to probe any similar interventions in which they might be involved, focusing on similarities and differences in the process, engagement of teachers and wider impact on pupils. This will help us understand how 'standard' school practices in the areas of self-evaluation, peer review and school to school support compare with the SPP model.

Stage 4 (Summer 2020):

Final telephone interview surveys of intervention schools and telephone interviews of matched comparison schools
The final telephone surveys in the last stage of intervention schools would include information on fidelity, dosage, quality, reach, responsiveness, programme differentiation, adaptation. Some Likert scale responses which would be included in the baseline survey would compare distance travelled in terms of levels of trust, openness, support and challenge.

In addition, we would provide descriptions of non-compliant, partially-compliant and compliant schools, based on objective data recorded centrally by EDT (see table below). This would allow for sub-group analysis in the impact evaluation looking at how effects vary

by compliance. Using only EDT data has the advantage of not having to factor-in non-completion of surveys into our judgements about compliance. We would also overcome issues with self-reporting of issues to do with responsiveness, reach, programme differentiation, etc.

However, separately to the impact evaluation, we will also conduct further analysis as part of our IPE, based on additional data from our survey on other aspects of (self-reported) fidelity to the SPP.

School-level compliance categories and criteria for School Partnership Programme

Categories	Attendance to training/workshops	Review visits
Non-compliant schools	No attendance/dropped out	No review visits/dropped out
Minimally compliant schools	Attendance to less than 75% of training sessions/workshops	Has hosted 1 peer review visit across programme
Fully compliant schools	Attendance to 75% or more of training sessions/workshops	Has hosted 2 review visits across programme
Source of data	EDT database	EDT database

In order to be categorised as minimally or fully compliant both "Attendance to training/workshops" and "Review visits" criteria must be met.

Cluster-level compliance categories and criteria for School Partnership Programme

Cluster-level compliance categories are based on aggregation of school-level compliance of all schools within a cluster. This aggregation is carried out as follows:

Minimally compliant: A minimally compliant cluster contains no non-compliant schools and at least one fully compliant school.

Fully compliant: A fully compliant cluster contains a maximum of one school that is partially compliant and the rest are fully compliant.

All clusters that fail to meet either of these criteria will be considered to be **Non-compliant**.

Telephone surveys of matched comparison schools
We would also carry out equivalent telephone surveys of the matched schools, in order to compare business as usual in these schools with the intervention groups.

Costs
An estimate of the per-pupil cost of the intervention will be calculated by the evaluation team. This estimate will focus on cost from the perspective of a participating school and will be based on the marginal financial costs of the intervention.

The cost estimates will make use of information from the project team (particularly with regard to the actual cost of delivering the intervention, e.g. the cost of providing the training),

as well as that collected directly by the evaluation team. Information on costs, especially any hidden costs or resource implications, will be explored through the process evaluation as part of the interviews with teachers and school visits. The purpose of collecting such data in the process evaluation would be to identify the main areas of expenditure required by the project. This process will also help to establish whether it may be appropriate to include any questions on costs/resource use in the survey. This will need to strike a balance between collecting sufficient cost information and not damaging response rates; it will also need to take account of whether a teacher is well placed to provide accurate information on particular types of costs.

Costs in terms of time, such as the amount of time for which schools need to arrange supply cover for teachers to attend training, will be reported separately from the financial costs. Any costs in terms of prerequisites will also be considered.
An estimate of cost per pupil per year will also be calculated based on the trial period, as once trained, teachers would also be able to deliver the programme in subsequent years. Any costs associated purely with the trial will be excluded.

Ethics and registration
Ethical approval has been sought following UCL Institute of Education staff ethics approval procedure. It was approved on 20 March 2018.

This protocol is has been registered at www.controlled-trials.com, and the assigned International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial Number (ISRCTN) is ISRCTN20687346.

Personnel
Project team
Jenni Rolls, John Cronin, Maggie Farrar (SPP)

Evaluation team
Jake Anders, John Jerrim, Louise Stoll, David Godfrey, Toby Greany (UCL)

The teams will have the following roles within the evaluation:

Design of the trial
- Sample size calculation – Evaluation team
- Refinement of matching approach – Evaluation team
Delivery of the intervention
- Recruitment of schools – Project team
- Delivery of intervention – Project team
Measurement of outcomes
- Collection of outcomes data from administrative sources – Evaluation team
Impact analysis – Evaluation team
Qualitative analysis – Evaluation team

Risks
The data security policy of UCL is available at
https://www.ucl.ac.uk/informationsecurity/policy/public-policy/information-security-policy.pdf.

Some of the key risks are summarised in the table below:

Issue/risk	Risk level	Action to address issue/reduce risk
Dropout / non-compliance of settings	Medium	We want to avoid attrition of schools from the project as much as possible. We plan to minimise attrition by ensuring that schools that sign up are committed (by asking them to sign a Memorandum of Understanding). Keeping them informed of progress and providing reminders of next steps will be important for retention. The project team should also monitor changes in key personnel to ensure ongoing commitment. Minimising the data collection burden on schools will also be important for retention. We will also randomise only after schools have followed consent collection procedures, provided the necessary student data.
Difficulty recruiting schools	Low to medium	We are confident that the project team will convey the importance of the evaluation to settings and the value to them of taking part. To understand whether recruited settings are atypical in some way (which would affect external validity), we ask that the project team keep records of settings approached and, where possible, of reasons for not participating.
Missing outcome data	Low	We are confident that we should be able to recover estimated outcomes for all treated schools
Poor balance between treatment and matched comparison group	Medium	We have a large pool of donor schools which should mean it is possible to get a well-balanced matched comparison group. Furthermore, we do not rely solely on balance on observables to justify the credibility of our treatment estimates.
Treatment variation	Medium	We view this not so much as a risk but as the reality of implementing such an intervention. The impact estimates (Intention to Treat) therefore relate more to the type of treatment likely to prevail in practice rather than the type of impact that could be seen were it possible to achieve laboratory-type conditions. Nevertheless, understanding treatment variation is important and will be a key focus of the process study.
Unexpected absence or loss of team members	Low	The team will substitute for each other during any short-term absence. In the event of longer periods of unplanned absence or departure, we will recruit replacements. UCL have other experts in evaluation and education who could substitute for members of the team, should this be necessary.

Timeline

Date	Activity
October 2017 – February 2018	Recruitment (Project team)
October 2017 – February 2018	Pre-Randomisation Data Collection (Project team)
March 2018	Pseudo-randomisation date (Evaluation team)
September 2018 – July 2020	Intervention in Schools (Project team)
March 2018 – July 2020	Implementation and Process Evaluation Fieldwork (Evaluation team)
October 2020	Collection of NPD outcomes data (Evaluation team)
September – December 2020	Impact Analysis and Report Writing (Evaluation team)

References

Anders, J., Brown, C., Ehren, M., Greany, T., Nelson, R., Heal, J., Groot, A., Sanders, M., & Allen, R. (2017) Evaluation of Complex Whole-School Interventions: Methodological and Practical Considerations. Report to the Education Endowment Foundation.

Austin, P. C. (2011). Optimal caliper widths for propensity-score matching when estimating differences in means and differences in proportions in observational studies. Pharm Stat, 10(2), 150-161. doi:10.1002/pst.433

Burns, T. and Köster F. (eds.) (2016), *Governing Education in a Complex World*, Educational Research and Innovation, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DfE (2010), *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper*, Cm 7980, Department for Education, London.

Greany, T., and Higham, R., (2018) *Hierarchy, Markets, Networks and Leadership: analysing the 'self-improving school-led system' agenda in England*. IOE Press: London.

Matthews, P, and Ehren, M, (2017) 'Accountability and Improvement in Self-improving School Systems'. In Greany T, and Earley P, (Eds) School Leadership and Education System Reform, Bloomsbury: London.

OECD (2013), Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment. PISA, Paris: OECD.

Appendix A: Schools Partnership Programme Agreement

Agreement between:

Education Development Trust of [Highbridge House, 16-18 Duke Street, Reading, RG1 4RU] "Education Development Trust"

and {insert name of partnership}"Partnership"

This agreement is for the period: 1st January 2018 to 30th August 2020 ("The Initial Period")

- The Partnership has the right to terminate this agreement at the end of the Initial Period by giving 3 months' notice. Such notice must be signed by an appropriate representative of the Partnership.

Operational expectations of each party:

Partnership:

1. The Partnership will ensure that it is represented at all relevant meetings and events unless there is an unavoidable reason to prevent this.
2. The Partnership will nominate a Partnership lead. This individual will hold the post for duration of the contract (unless the post is delegated to another representation of the cluster) and will be responsible for:
   a) providing leadership to the Partnership, ensuring that Partnership members work effectively together and that all members participate in all aspects of the SPP, including Self-Review, Peer Review, School-to-School Support and developing an Action Plan
   b) being the key point of contact between the partnership and Education Development Trust, providing information and data to Education Development Trust as requested;
   c) agreeing to participate in evaluation activities, with other members of the partnership e.g. Improvement Champions, with the independent evaluation team at UCL Institute of Education, including interviews.
3. All members of the Partnership will agree to share and be transparent on data, in accordance with the Data Sharing Agreement with other members of their Partnership, Education Development Trust, and the independent evaluation team at UCL Institute of Education;
4. The Partnership will maintain confidentiality: any information, data or documents received by any member of the Partnership will not be shared with any third party, or used outside of the SPP and the independent evaluation team at UCL Institute of Education, without the consent of the disclosing party;
5. In order to support system improvement, the Partnership will share the outcomes their peer reviews with the rest of their partnership, Education Development Trust and the independent evaluation team at UCL Institute of Education. Parties will not share these outcomes without the permission of the school and reviewers concerned and will use them only for the purposes of the SPP and the independent evaluation by UCL Institute of Education;
6. In order to support governors' accountability, all members of the Partnership agree to ensure that the governing body of each school is kept fully informed of their Partnership work and receives relevant feedback following peer reviews. Individual partnerships will be expected to discuss and agree the governance arrangements for their Partnership;
7. The Partnership will develop their own Memorandum of Understanding to encapsulate their partnership approach but also to ensure that clear lines of accountability are agreed.

8. If any concerns about a school come to light following a peer review, such as evidence of illegal activity or safeguarding concerns, the Partnership will ensure that the appropriate body is informed;

9. The Partnership will undertake to appoint the appropriate personnel, including Improvement Champions prior to initial training.

10. Partnership members will pay Education Development Trust the agreed financial contribution for involvement in the project.

Education Development Trust:

1. Education Development Trust will assign the Partnership a named Education Development Trust contact who be their key point of contact for the project.

2. Education Development Trust will retain ownership of all intellectual property in materials created or used by Education Development Trust and/or a Partnership for the purposes of the SPP. Education Development Trust will allow all Partnerships to use all materials for the sole purpose of the SPP only while they are affiliated to the programme;

3. Education Development Trust will maintain confidentiality: any information, data or documents received by Education Development Trust will not be shared with any third party, or used outside of the SPP and the independent evaluation team at UCL Institute of Education, without the consent of the disclosing party;

4. Education Development Trust will ensure that it keeps partnerships informed of its research programme and international opportunities, insofar as the same are relevant and appropriate to the Partnership or the SPP.

General legal terms

1. Nothing in this agreement is intended to create or shall constitute or be deemed to constitute a legal partnership or joint venture between the parties.

2. This agreement is not intended to confer any rights upon any third parties or persons not a party to it.

3. This agreement shall form the entire understanding between Education Development Trust and the Partnership and may only be amended by written agreement of either party.

4. This agreement shall be governed by the laws of England and Wales.

Data Sharing

Effective partnerships will work collaboratively in a mutually challenging and supportive way in order to bring about system-wide improvement. To be truly effective, partnerships will benefit from sharing their data in an open and transparent way, allowing data to be used effectively to underpin the work of peer review teams. In order to achieve this, members are asked to sign a data sharing agreement.

Permission to share data

I agree to share school and subject level data with the schools indicated below on the terms outlined by the Partnership below:

The Partnership recognises that the practice of data sharing must comply with all confidentiality, data protection, intellectual property and safeguarding regulations of the schools and contained within legislation.

The Partnership understands that any data shared should not contain any pupil information, must be treated confidentially and used to support collaborative work and the sharing of best practice by schools within the group.

Where data is shared with Education Development Trust, the terms of this agreement will be upheld by Education Development Trust.

SPP EEF trial Phase 1 programme training and support (March 2018 - July 2019)

Peer review & improvement champion training x 1 event - for heads, deputies and nominated improvement champions (improvement champions are a shared capacity across the cluster – up to 2 places per school for Senior Leaders (i.e. the Headteacher, Deputy etc) who will be undertaking the peer reviews. A further 3 places across the cluster for the role of the improvement champion will also be allocated.

Improvement Champion (IC) training day 2 – for nominated improvement Champions (those identified above)

Impact / review workshops x 3 over the year - to establish and monitor impact through baseline / interim & summative improvement conversations with SPP Associate.

Access to all tools; SPP handbook / improvement framework etc.

SPP EEF trial Phase 2 programme and support (September 2019 – July 2020)

Peer Review Training for middle leaders / beyond x 1 event – 2 places per school

Collaborative leadership training for senior leaders x 1 event – 2 places per school

Impact / review workshops x 3 throughout the year - to establish and monitor impact through baseline / interim & summative improvement conversations with SPP Associate.

Throughout the duration of the programme, clusters will have full affiliation to Education Development Trust (including access to events, termly newsletters)

Costs of the programme

The total cost of the programme is £1300 +VAT per primary school participating.

The cost for other phases of schools is £2600+VAT.

The Partnership lead will coordinate the payment from each school, although each school can make their payment directly to Education Development Trust.

Full payment must be made 30 days after being invoiced by Education Development Trust

Partnership details

Please confirm details the name of your 'Partnership Lead' and the names of the 3 'Improvement Champions' you have nominated for your cluster.

Name or Partnership Lead	• Name 1 / email address
Names of Peer Reviewers (x 2 per school)	• School 1 – names / email address • School 2 – names / email address • School 3 – names / email address • School 4 – names / email address • School 5 – names / email address • School 6 – names / email address • School 7 – names / email address
Names of Improvement Champions (x 3 per cluster)	• Name 1 / email address • Name 2 / email address • Name 3 / email address

Signed on behalf of each school in the Partnership below:

	Name of school and address	LA establishment number	Name of headteacher	Headteacher email address	Amount paid to Education Development Trust by school	Name and email for contact to be invoiced	Signed an (please i scanned ve your sign unfortuna are una accept 't signatu
1							
2							

3							
4							
5							
6							
7							

Add more rows if required.

Signed on behalf of Education Development Trust:

Dated: