



Education Board

Date: THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 2020

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Henry Colthurst (Chairman)
Ann Holmes (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Alderman Sir Peter Estlin
Caroline Haines
Alderman Nicholas Lyons
Benjamin Murphy
The Rt Hon. the Lord Mayor, Alderman William Russell
Ruby Sayed
Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Rachel Bower (Co-Opted)
Tim Campbell (Co-Opted)
Deborah Knight (Co-Opted)
Veronica Wadley (Co-Opted)

Enquiries: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio video recording.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda (10.00 am)

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **PUBLIC MINUTES**
To agree the public minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2020.
For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)
4. **PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 5 - 8)
5. **GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 9 - 10)
6. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 11 - 12)

Culture and Creative Learning (10.10 am)

7. **CULTURE MILE LEARNING UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 13 - 14)
8. **REVIEW OF FUNDING TO THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL TRUST AND THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA FOR SCHOLARSHIPS**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Decision
(Pages 15 - 16)

Education (10.30 am)

9. **ANNUAL PARTNERSHIPS REPORT**
Report of the Town Clerk.
- For Information**
(Pages 17 - 18)
10. **SUMMER ENRICHMENT PILOT 2019 EVALUATION REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**
(Pages 19 - 24)
11. **CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST, ACADEMIES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME - UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- NB – this report has one Non-Public Appendix which can be found at item 24 on the Agenda.*
- For Information**
(Pages 25 - 28)
12. **CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST - EXPANSION BY THE TRANSFER OF THE TWO CO-SPONSORED ACADEMY TRUSTS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- NB – this report has two Non-Public Appendices which can be found at item 25 on the Agenda.*
- For Decision**
(Pages 29 - 34)
13. **VALIDATED 2018/2019 RESULTS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Decision**
(Pages 35 - 36)
14. **EDUCATION BUDGET UPDATE 2019/20**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**
(Pages 37 - 40)
15. **MUSIC EDUCATION CALL FOR EVIDENCE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
- For Information**
(Pages 41 - 72)

16. **EDUCATION ACTIVITIES UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information
(Pages 73 - 76)

Skills (11.00 am)

17. **APPRENTICESHIP LEVY POLICY UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information
(Pages 77 - 80)

18. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

19. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

20. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda (11.10 am)

21. **NOTE OF INQUORATE MEETING**
To receive the note of the inquorate meeting held on 16 January 2020.

For Information
(Pages 81 - 86)

22. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 87 - 88)

23. **EXCLUSIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL AND NATIONAL COMPARISONS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information
(Pages 89 - 94)

24. **NON- PUBLIC APPENDIX: CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST, ACADEMIES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME - UPDATE**
Non-Public Appendix to item 11 on the Public Agenda.

For Information

25. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDICES: CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST -
EXPANSION BY THE TRANSFER OF THE TWO CO-SPONSORED ACADEMY
TRUSTS**

Non-Public Appendices to item 12 on the Public Agenda.

For Decision

26. **NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE
BOARD**

27. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND
WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE
PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

EDUCATION BOARD

Thursday, 16 January 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Education Board held at Committee Room - 2nd Floor
West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 16 January 2020 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Henry Colthurst (Chairman)
Ann Holmes (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Rachel Bower
Tim Campbell
Deborah Knight

In Attendance

Officers:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Polly Dunn | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Chandni Tanna | - Town Clerks Department |
| Mark Jarvis | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Anne Bamford | - Community & Children's Services |
| Daniel McGrady | - Community & Children's Services |
| Chris Oldham | - Community & Children's Services |
| Gerald Mehrtens | - Community & Children's Services |
| Anne Pietsch | - Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley, Alderman Sir Peter Estlin, Caroline Haines, Alderman Nicholas Lyons, The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor, Alderman William Russell, Ruby Sayed.

The Chairman noted the disappointing lack of attendance and was encouraged to write to the Education Board membership in that regard.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Henry Colthurst noted his trusteeship of Governors for Schools in respect of item 12 on the agenda.

3. PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 14 November 2019 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding the Education Board's Public Outstanding actions. The following matters were raised:

- 8/2019/P – this action was due to be presented to the Board under item 12 of the agenda
- 9/2019/P and 10/2019/P – both actions would be reported to the March 2020 meeting.
- 15/2019/P – The matter was closed on the understanding that advice on the Education Board’s specific involvement with the City of London Corporation’s Sports Strategy would be provided at a later stage.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

5. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding the Education Board’s annual review of its terms of reference.

Members considered the recommendation of the Policy & Resources Committee and further advice from the Comptroller & City Solicitor’s representative. It was agreed that paragraph 4 (j) be amended as follows: “assist with promotion of skills training and education-business link activities, in line with the City of London Corporation’s Skills Strategy.”

RESOLVED, that

- The terms of reference of the Board be and approved for submission to both the Policy & Resources Committee, as set out in Appendix 1, with an amendment to paragraph 4 (j);
- Any further changes required in the lead up to the Court’s appointment of Committees, be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman; and
- The frequency of meetings remains at six per calendar year, noting that one of these meetings may be converted to an informal away day.

6. **GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS UPDATE**

Members considered a report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services regarding an update on Governor Appointments at the City of London Family of Schools.

Members discussed the implementation of their recommendation that all governor appointments within the Family of Schools should align with the academic year. It was felt that the same parameters ought to be set for appointments to the Academies Trust Board, however Members were advised that this process would require further approvals.

This recommendation to appoint governors in line with the academic year was approved by COLAT at their Trust Board meeting in December 2019 along with a number of other governance recommendations proposed by the Education Board at its meeting in July 2019. The only recommendation that was not

agreed, related to the imposition of a minimum of two, and a maximum of four, Common Councillor governors on each Governing Body.

It was noted that the Boards of Governors of the City's independent schools had, for their co-opted governors, adopted the recommendation to align terms of appointment to the academic year.

RESOLVED that:

- the appointment of Caroline Haines as Chair of Governors to the Local Governing Body of Newham Collegiate Sixth Form, City of London Academy (NCS), be noted;
- the appointments of Anna Foreshaw, Andriea Vamadevan and Catherine Danner to the Local Governing Body of NCS for four-year terms, be noted;
- the appointment of Sarah Matthias, Naureen Bhatti and Neela Moorghen to the Local Governing Body of City of London Primary Academy Islington (CoLPAI) for four-year terms, be noted;
- the resignation of Ann Holmes as Chair of the CoLPAI Governing Body, be noted;
- the appointment of Shireen Fraser to the Local Governing Body of City of London Academy Highgate Hill (CoLAHH) for a four-year term, be noted;
- the reappointment of Andrew McMurtrie be noted as a Trustee of City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) for a four-year term commencing 14 January 2020 following his nomination by the Policy & Resources Committee;
- the reappointment of Lucas Green be noted as a Co-opted Trustee of CoLAT for a four-year term commencing on 27 January 2020 following approval by the CoLAT Board; and
- Delegated authority be granted to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to establish and seek the necessary approvals from Policy & Resources and the Court of Common Council, to ensure that CoLAT Board appointments are made in line with the academic year.

7. EDUCATION ACTIVITIES UPDATE

Members received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding an update on the City of London Corporation's Education Activities.

Following a question, it was confirmed that the newly established Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) Forum was attended by colleagues from each of the City's Family of Schools, including the independent schools.

Members briefly discussed the benefits of sharing learning with livery companies with educational responsibilities, particularly in relation to safeguarding. Given the infancy of the DSL Forum, it was agreed not to invite such external participation until a culture of sharing was fully developed. Other methods of shared learning were also being explored.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

8. **EDUCATION BOARD BUDGET UPDATE FOR 2019/20 FINANCIAL YEAR**

Members received a joint report of the Chamberlain and the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding an update on the Education Board's Budget for the 2019/20 financial year.

RESOLVED, that the report, including spend to date, be noted.

9. **CITY OF LONDON SCHOOLS' CONFERENCE 2019 EVALUATION REPORT**

Members received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the City of London Schools' Conference 2019.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

10.31 – Deputy Philip Woodhouse left the meeting. The Town Clerk announced that the Board was no longer quorate, and the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes under Standing Order 36 (3).

10.41 – The meeting was declared inquorate. Members present agreed to hold an informal meeting to consider the remaining items on the agenda.

The meeting ended at 10.41 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Education Board – Public Outstanding Actions

| Action Number | Date | Action | Officer responsible | Progress Update |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 6/2019/P | 10 January 2019 | Produce a full evaluation report on the Summer Enrichment Programme. | Head of Strategy | Report to March 2020 Board |
| 1/2020/P | 16 January 2020 | Necessary approvals be sought from Policy & Resources and the Court of Common Council, to ensure that CoLAT Board appointments are made in line with the academic year. | Town Clerk/C&CS | Update due at March 2020 Board |

Education Board – Public Completed Actions

| Action Number | Action | Date Completed |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 15/2018/P | Education, Skills, Culture and Creative Learning Strategy to be submitted to Court of Common Council. | 23 May 2019 |
| 1/2019/P | Draft and include wording for revised terms of reference (as agreed) to go to Policy & Resources Committee for approval. | 18 July 2019 |
| 2/2019/P | Invite the following individuals to the Governance Review Item at the March 2019 Away Day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chairmen of the City of London Corporation's three independent schools Chairman of the City of London Academies Trust Board | 23 May 2019 |
| 4/2019/P | A "save the date" notification go to all Members for June 2019 Careers Festival | 23 May 2019 |
| 5/2019/P | Appropriate livery representatives should be invited to an Education Briefing regarding the best practice and learnings following significant progress made by disadvantaged pupils at City sponsored Academies. | 18 July 2019 |
| 7/2019/P | Request that the Planning and Transportation Committee reschedule their meeting on 17 June 2019 so to not clash with preparation works for the C4 Festival | 23 May 2019 |
| 14/2018/P | Guildhall School Scholarship Outcome Report to be submitted to Education Board | 18 July 2019 |
| 3/2019/P | Draft a note on the in-principle invitees to Education Board funded events for approval. | 18 July 2019 |
| 7/2019/P | A report from Culture Mile Learning on delivery of several outcomes in the Cultural and Creative Learning Strategy, including some of the recommendations within the report, would be brought to the Board at its July 2019 meeting. | 18 July 2019 |
| 8/2019/P | Governors for Schools would be conducting surveys of governors who access the resources to evaluate their impact and would be producing a final evaluation report in October 2019. | 16 January 2020 |
| 9/2019/P | Three City Independent School Boards be invited to consider commissioning their annual Partnership reports in March of each year. | 5 March 2020 |
| 10/2019/P | GSMD be invited to submit a similar "partnerships" report as those submitted to the Board by the City's Independent Schools. | 5 March 2020 |
| 11/2019/P | Schools be encouraged to approach their contractors (catering, cleaning etc) to request details of those contractors' BREXIT contingency plans | 16 January 2020 |
| 12/2019/P | Detail on the number of Livery Schools that were involved in the London Careers Festival 2019 to be circulated to the Board. | Withdrawn |
| 13/2019/P | Two page summary evaluation report of the 2019 London Careers Festival, including media summary, to be sent to the Court of Common Council | Completed |
| 14/2019/P | Copy of Culture Mile presentation to be circulated | Completed |

Education Board – Public Completed Actions

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------------|
| 15/2019/P | Corporate Strategy and Education Unit to work together on how education and learning may be better represented within the COL draft Sports Strategy | 16 January 2020 |
|-----------|---|-----------------|

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Governor Appointments Update | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Daniel McGrady, Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills) | |

Summary

This report asks Members to note that there have been no new governor appointments to governing bodies in the Family of Schools. The current governing body membership of the City Family of Schools is attached in **Appendix 1**.

Recommendations

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Governor appointments

1. There are no new governor appointments to governing bodies in the Family of Schools.

Upcoming vacancies on governing bodies

2. Members are asked to note that several governors on the Local Governing Bodies (LGBs) of schools which joined City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) in September 2017 are on terms expiring in August 2020. This is the case for: City of London Primary Academy Islington (four governors); City of London Academy Shoreditch Park (seven governors); City of London Academy Highgate Hill (seven governors); and City of London Academy Highbury Grove (nine governors).
3. The CEO of CoLAT, Headteachers and the Chairs of Governors for each LGB have been engaged to ensure that due regard is given to succession planning. In the first instance, Chairs of Governors should ask the affected governors if they wish to extend their terms of office. This should be appropriately staggered to ensure that the terms end on successive years to ensure that the same level of upcoming vacancies is not postponed to another year.
4. The role of the Education Board in regard to a vacancy on a CoLAT LGB is to be consulted and to nominate suitable candidates. Members of the Education Board will therefore be contacted should vacancies be confirmed and will be asked to nominate suitable candidates with regards to the skill requirements of the LGB.
5. To support CoLAT in the event of vacancies, the Education Strategy Unit are currently working closely with the City Corporation's Corporate Volunteering Team to advertise being a governor to City Corporation employees (including in departments such as Guildhall School of Music and Drama and City of London Police) and to Members. Governors for Schools will also be contacted to support filling vacancies should they arise.

Family of Schools Governance Review Update

6. At the Education Board meeting on 18 July 2019, Members endorsed a series of recommendations from the Education Board to the relevant decision-making committees of the Family of Schools in regard to their governance arrangements. The recommendations were based on ensuring compliance, aligning with best practice, and simplifying the governance structures.
7. At their meeting on 12 December 2019, the CoLAT Board of Trustees discussed the recommendations relating to CoLAT LGBs and approved the implementation of the following recommendations:
 - Establish a formal process for consulting the sponsor on nominations to LGB vacancies.
 - Establish a regular cycle for annual governance reviews (e.g. schemes of delegation a terms of reference), skills reviews and reporting to sponsors.
 - Formalise support from sponsor(s) in ensuring good governance and continuing alignment of education objectives - invite the City Corporation's Strategic Director for Education, Culture and Skills and/or the Lead Policy Officer to attend the Trust Board meetings for relevant items.
 - CoLAT Board of Trustees requested a reciprocal arrangement with the Education Board.
 - Adopt a guideline template of no more than 12 individuals on their governing body selected based on required skills.
 - Adopt terms of office which run for a four-year term coinciding with the academic year (beginning in August/September and ending in July/August) up to a max of two four-year terms.
8. The CoLAT Board of Trustees did not approve the recommendation to appoint a minimum of two elected Members of the Court of Common Council (CCC) to each LGB. The Board of Trustees felt that this could be encouraged and enacted through appointment processes but should not be written into the Terms of Reference as it could lead to vacancies on LGBs if no CCC Members wish to serve.
9. The Education Strategy Unit have agreed with CoLAT that they will work to the Governance Review and Succession Cycle included in **Appendix 2** which enacts these recommendations.

Governing body membership across the Family of Schools

10. An updated list of governing body membership across the Family of Schools is included in **Appendix 1**. At the request of the Chair of the Education Board, the appointments for each governing body are organised by term-end date to support succession planning.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Governing body membership of the Family of Schools.

Appendix 2 – CoLAT Governance Review and Appointments Cycle.

Background papers

Education Board 18 July 2019 - Governance Review Recommendations (Non-Public)

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture & Skills)

T:020 7332 1864 E: Daniel.McGrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Committee(s): Education Board | Date(s): 5 March 2020 |
| Subject: Action Taken Between Meetings | Public |
| Report of: The Town Clerk | For Information |
| Report author: Polly Dunn, Senior Committee and Member Services Officer | |

Summary

This report advises Members of action taken by the Town Clerk since the January 2020 meeting of the Board, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order No. 41(a) and (b). It also provides a brief update on a matter regarding the Education Charity Sub Committee.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Part way through the Education Board meeting held on 16 January 2020, the Board became inquorate. Accordingly, the following decisions scheduled on the agenda were considered under the Court of Common Council's urgency procedure.

Urgent Authority – Proposed Itemised Education Board Budget for the 2020/2021 Financial Year

1. Approval was granted for the itemised Education Board Budget for the 2020/21 Financial Year, for onward submission to Policy and Resources Committee. It was proposed that the Local Risk element of the Budget is apportioned across the three strategies overseen by the Education Board. It was further proposed that the Central Risk element of the Budget is unchanged from the 2019/21 Financial Year. The Budget is in line with the Education Board 2020/21 revenue budget of £2,782,000 as approved by the Education Board at their meeting on 14 November 2019 and submitted to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee.

Urgent Authority – City Premium Grant January 2020 Funding Round – Allocations to Academies

2. At its meetings on 23 May and 18 July 2019, the Education Board approved the release of £1,666,110 in the City Premium Grant funding allocated to the City of London sponsored and co-sponsored academies. There was £63,890 remaining in the Central Risk Budget to allocate in grants to academies based on the school improvement needs identified through Standards Scrutiny meetings held in October 2019.
3. The Education Unit's Strategic Director and Lead Policy Officer consulted with the Chief Executive Officer of City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) to apportion

the remaining funding to academies aligned specifically to school improvement needs. It was proposed that the proportional amount to be received by the academies and the related areas of school improvement total £63,000. The remaining £890 was to be retained for any additional support required over the early Spring Term but should be fully allocated by the end of the Financial Year.

4. In addition to the £63,890, the Education Unit will allocated £10K earmarked for middle leadership development in the Education Strategy strand of the Local Risk Budget to enable CoLAT to centrally commission a middle leadership development programme for all academies. This initiative responds to a systemic school improvement need to develop middle leaders across all academies.
5. The proposal to release of £63,000 from the Central Risk element of the Education Board budget to be received by City of London academies at the proportional rate proposed within the main report, and that the remaining £890 is being retained for any additional support required over the early Spring Term but will be fully allocated by the end of the Financial Year, was approved.

Urgent Authority – Revised eligibility criteria for the City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity and the City Educational Trust Fund

6. At its meeting of 3 July 2019, the Education Charity Sub-Committee reviewed the eligibility criteria for the City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity and the City Educational Trust Fund. The revised eligibility criteria for the Charities were presented for consideration by the Community and Children's Services Committee and were recommended to the Education Board without comment. Approval was sought from (and granted by) the Education Board, consistent with the City Corporation's charity trustee obligations to keep the relevant charity's governance under review to ensure that the charity continues to operate effectively and achieve the purposes for which it was established.
7. The amended eligibility criteria for the City of London Combined Education Charity under its grant-giving policy aims to maximise expenditure of funds to further the purposes for which the charity was established by widening the meaning of a qualifying connection to London for potential student beneficiaries, which is one of the existing eligibility criteria requirements under the charity's grant-giving policy and consistent with its charitable objects. The amended eligibility criteria for the City Educational Trust Fund extends the period a successful grant applicant must take before re-applying for any further funding from the charity (after a maximum of two years' consecutive funding) from one year to two years to manage the risk of dependency on this charity's grants.
8. Approval was also given to open a new grant round for both Charities under the Education and Employment programme, with a deadline of April 2020.

Background Papers

- Background papers for Members are available from the report author.

Polly Dunn

Senior Committee and Member Services Officer

E: polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Committee(s) Education Board | Dated: 05/03/20 |
| Subject: Culture Mile Learning Update | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Frazer Swift, Head of Learning & Engagement, (Museum of London) and Beth Crosland, Senior Programme Manager (Culture Mile Learning) | |

Summary

This report provides Members with an update from Culture Mile Learning since the previous report at the 14 November 2019 meeting. This report includes:

1. Key programme updates for 2019/20
2. Headlines about the development of the programme for 2020/21
3. Details of future events
4. A reporting timeline

The full report from Culture Mile Learning is included in **Appendix 1**. Further information about the finalists shortlisted for the Fusion Prize is provided in **Appendix 2**.

Recommendations

Members are asked to note the Culture Mile Learning Update in **Appendix 1**.

Main Report

1. The full report provided by Culture Mile Learning is in **Appendix 1**.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Culture Mile Learning Update
- Appendix 2 – Details of finalists shortlisted for the Fusion Prize

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)

E: daniel.mcgrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 0207 332 1864

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Committee(s) | Dated: |
| Education Board Policy and Resources Committee | 5 March 2020 19 March 2020 |
| Subject: Review of funding to The Guildhall School Trust and the Guildhall School of Music & Drama for Scholarships | Public |
| Report of: The Chamberlain | For Decision |
| Report authors: Group Accountant GSMD | |

Summary

This report reviews the City Corporation's payment of £30,000 per annum to the Guildhall School of Music and Drama (the School), as part of the implementation of the City Corporation's Grants Service Based Review. This payment has historically been used to fund scholarships. This report asks Members to agree to continue the annual payment for the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22, and to review the payment again in two years' time in the context of the City Corporation's wider education offering.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Agree to continue the City Corporation's payment of £30,000 to the School to fund scholarships for the 2020/21 and 2021/22 financial years subject to the School reporting back annually to the Education Board on the numbers of scholarships awarded and the impact of the grant.
- Agree to review the payment again after a further two years' funding in the context of the City Corporation's education priorities at the time.

Main Report

Background

1. A one-off grant payment of £30,000 for 2005/06 was approved by the Finance Grants Sub-Committee in May 2005 to The Guildhall School Trust (the Trust) (Charity No. 1082472, Company No. 04041975) to go towards the cost of UK and EU bursaries. A £30,000 payment has been made annually for scholarships since then, into the School's account via journal payment, rather than the Guildhall School Trust's account.
2. The annual payment has been used for scholarships, going into the School's scholarships account and was awarded as an unrestricted award to help attract the best artists to the School and London.

The City Corporation's Service Based Review

3. In March 2016, as part of the implementation of the City Corporation's Grants Service Based Review, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed that the responsibility for all on-going funding commitments from the Finance Grants Sub-Committee would be transferred to the most appropriate Committee and that the recipient Committee be requested to review each commitment. In this instance, the administration of the City Corporation's grant to the Trust for UK and EU bursaries was transferred to the Education Board. This grant (which is now paid directly to the School) will not be paid in future until it has been reviewed by the

Education Board and subject to a budget allocation by the Policy and Resources Allocation Sub-Committee.

Current position

4. The environment in which the School operates has changed significantly since 2005. Tuition fees for home students are now three times higher at £9,250 and the School has closer to 1,100 FTE when compared to around 800 in 2005. The School's competitors are in a position where they can offer both full fee and maintenance scholarships in order to attract and secure the best talent.
5. With Brexit likely to impact on recruitment from the EU, the need for Scholarship funding is greater than ever.
6. The School awards Scholarships of just over £2m to students in both fee and maintenance and awards based on merit. In a highly competitive market place any Scholarship offer is an important one.

Proposal

7. This report proposes that the City Corporation continues to make a payment to the School of £30,000 p.a. for scholarships for the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22. After a further two years' of funding, it is proposed that the payment is reviewed again in the context of the City Corporation's education priorities at that time. This will allow for the effects of Brexit on enrolments to the School to be analysed which may also inform a decision on future funding.
8. It is also proposed that the School reports back annually to the Education Board on the number of Scholarships awarded and the impact of the £30,000 grant.

Implications

9. As the £30,000 payment is made from the City's Cash Finance account, and would continue to be made out of that account, there are no financial implications for the Education Board's budget.

Conclusion

10. This paper reviews the City Corporation's payment of £30,000 per annum to the School, as part of the implementation of the City Corporation's Service Based Review. It asks Members to agree to continue the annual payment, which has historically been used to fund scholarships for high achieving students, for the financial years 2020/21 and 2021/22, after which the payment will be reviewed again within the wider context of the City Corporation's education offering.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Number of scholarships awarded by the Guildhall School of Music & Drama per annum since 2011.
- Appendix 2 – Use and impact of the 2019/20 allocation

Graeme Hood

Group Accountant – Guildhall School of Music & Drama

T: 020 7638 4141 ext 7842

E: graeme.hood@barbican.org.uk

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Committee(s): Education Board | Date(s): 5 March 2020 |
| Subject: Partnerships work of the City's Independent Schools and the Guildhall School of Music and Drama | Public |
| Report of: Town Clerks | For Information |
| Report author: Polly Dunn | |

Summary

This report presents the Partnership reports of the City of London School, City of London School for Girls and the City of London Freeman's School. It also features a report from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama regarding their Guildhall Young Artists (GYA) centre model.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London School, City of London School for Girls and the City of London Freeman's School annually report their partnership work to the Education Board. In July 2019, the Education Board invited the three independent schools to consider aligning the period for their partnership reporting, which has now taken place.
2. At the same meeting, the Education Board also invited the Guildhall School for Music and Drama to submit a similar report concerning their partnership projects, which has now been included.

Current Position

3. Appended to this report is as follows:
 - **Appendix 1:** City of London School, *Working in Partnership 2019*, received in draft form by its Board of Governors on 11 December 2019
 - **Appendix 2:** City of London Freeman's School, *Community and Partnerships Report 2019*, received by its Board of Governors on 5 February 2020
 - **Appendix 3:** City of London School for Girls, *Partnerships Report 2019*, which has not yet been received by its Board of Governors.
 - **Appendix 4:** Guildhall School of Music and Drama, *Guildhall School Partnerships Report 2018/19*, a report drafted specifically for the Education Board.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

4. These reports highlight the exciting partnership opportunities and projects undertaken by the City Schools' staff and pupils with other educational institutions and their wider communities. They also highlight potential future collaborations and developments. This work contributes directly to the City of London's Education, Skills and the Cultural and Creative Learning Strategies 2019-2023.

Conclusion

5. GSMD and the City's independent schools engage in a wide range of enriching programmes and initiatives that support the children, young people, their parents and carers within the City Family of Schools and beyond. Their work, supported by the Education Board, continues to better the unique educational offering of the City of London.

Appendices

- **Appendix 1:** City of London School, *Working in Partnership 2019*, received in draft form by its Board of Governors on 11 December 2019
- **Appendix 2:** City of London Freeman's School, *Community and Partnerships Report 2019*, received by its Board of Governors on 5 February 2020
- **Appendix 3:** City of London School for Girls, *Working in Partnership 2019*, which has not yet been received by its Board of Governors.
- **Appendix 4:** Guildhall School of Music and Drama, *Guildhall School Partnerships Report 2018/19*, a report drafted specifically for the Education Board.

Background Papers

None

Polly Dunn

Senior Committee and Member Services Officer

E: polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|---|--|
| Committee(s) Education Board – For information Policy and Resources Committee – For decision | Dated: 5 March 2020 19 March 2020 |
| Subject: Summer Enrichment Pilot 2019 Evaluation | Public |
| Report of: Andrew Carter – Director of Community and Children’s Services | For information |
| Report Author: Jessica Walsh – Corporate Strategy and Performance Officer | |

Summary

In January 2019, the City of London Corporation (City Corporation) approved £100,000 for a summer enrichment pilot to tackle summer learning loss and summer hunger and offer meaningful and enjoyable activities for pupils and young people in the London Borough of Islington during July and August 2019. The pilot was part of a wider programme of work relating to the City Corporation’s Social Mobility Strategy for 2018-28 – in particular the strategic outcome that ‘*Opportunity is accessed more evenly and equally across society*’, by removing barriers, overcoming gaps and improving access and participation, in order to improve attainment for our pupils experiencing disadvantage or poverty¹. This paper presents the evaluation of the pilot and recommends the City Corporation does not continue to fund summer enrichment activity of this sort in 2020 but continues to be an advocate for enrichment activities aimed at boosting social mobility. The City of London Family of Schools will continue to be invited to apply for funding to support relevant enrichment opportunities through the City Premium Grants fund. This evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor’s Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- i. Note the report and its findings, namely that the City Corporation is best placed to advocate and fund enrichment activities aimed at boosting social mobility for young Londoners, but that schools and local organisations are best placed to design and deliver programmes related to the needs of young people.

¹ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

Main Report

Background and Acknowledgements

1. The idea for the City Corporation to deliver a summer enrichment pilot aimed at tackling summer hunger and summer learning loss, whilst also supporting summer enrichment activities, was led on by Sir Mark Boleat, a former elected Member and Chairman of Policy and Resources for the City Corporation². The pilot was delivered in addition to a variety of enrichment activities including summer schools already offered by a number of the schools within the City Family of Schools, which are funded through the City Premium Grants the school receives.
2. During the school summer holidays, children from low-income families are thought to be at risk from hunger, boredom and social isolation and evidence suggests a gap in educational attainment between children from different socio-economic backgrounds during the holiday³. Therefore, the City Corporation chose to run the pilot in Islington, which is ranked in the most deprived 30 per cent of English local authorities in the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Index, with it also scoring 27.5 per cent in the IMD Index 2019 for the proportion of children living in income deprived households, ranking tenth in the country, and first across the London Boroughs⁴. The pilot intended to assess if the intervention trialled had any cumulative effect on summer hunger and educational attainment and was run in both a school-based (City of London Academy Highbury Grove (CoLAHG)) and non-school-based environment with a target to engage around 400 young people.
3. The design and delivery of the pilot was project managed and delivered by the City Corporation's Corporate Strategy Manager and Corporate Strategy Officer based in the Town Clerk's department, with expert input from the Strategic Education and Skills Director based in the Community and Children's Services department. The City Corporation extends gratitude to the following partners that were instrumental in designing the pilot:
 - a) **The Mayor's Fund for London Kitchen Social Programme Team** for providing advice and insights into the criteria that the projects, including their learning and evaluation, should meet.
 - b) **The Cripplegate Foundation** – for commissioning the two community-based project partners to deliver the pilot.
 - c) **The City of London Academy Highbury Grove** – for hosting the school-based pilot and commissioned the project partner to deliver the pilot based within the school, as well as providing their own staffing and resources to support the project's delivery.

²<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s108130/Summer%20Enrichment%20Pilot%20PR%20and%20PRED%20Paper%20-%20Jan%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

³ https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Mayors-Fund-for-London_Kitchen-Social_Evaluation-Report-1_Nov18.pdf

⁴https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835115/IOD2_019_Statistical_Release.pdf

- d) **Northumbria University** – the delivery partner for the learning and evaluation report.
- e) **All Change** (registered Charity No. 293972) – for delivering a community-based pilot in Islington.
- f) **Global Generation** (registered Charity No. 1106420) – delivered a community-based pilot in Islington.
- g) **Future Foundations** – led the delivery of the school-based pilot at CoLAHG.

Learning and Evaluation

4. Due to the number of partners involved, five separate pieces of evaluation and learnings were organised to analyse the effectiveness of the pilot. Three of the projects were delivered through Northumbria University and Mayor's Fund for London (available on request). A further two studies were organised internally by City Corporation staff, and the findings of these are covered in the full evaluation report attached as **Appendix One**.
5. The practical findings of the reports are presented as the following:
 - The three pilots broadly met their stated aims:
 - To provide experiential learning, physical activity, workshops and team building exercises that promoted critical thinking, communication, collaboration and creativity.
 - To bridge the summer learning gap by developing new skills and confidence in participants, introducing participants to new experiences and opportunities, giving participants a chance to meet new people as well as helping to shape ideas about their own futures.
 - To bring young people, children and families together in the centre of the ward through the creation of a vibrant, shared, pop-up cooking, eating and making space - 'The Cally Table'.
 - To take young people out of their local area to experience something new.
 - To give a core group of young people the opportunity to develop a range of leadership skills, leading to the delivery through August of activities for the community.
 - Whilst a school-based environment was less appealing to participants, interestingly, mean attendance rates were higher at the school-based holiday than the community-based holiday club. However, it is not clear why this was the case. It is likely due to the fact that the school-based provision was only a weeklong and the community-based provision was often competing with other provision/activity being offered in the area. This highlights the issue of the crowded marketplace and many families had already arranged provision for their children affecting take up.
 - 122 young people engaged with the pilot - broken down as 56 participants at CoLAHG and 26 at B Creative and 40 at Global Generation Summer. The average age of participants at B Creative and Global Generation Summer was 17 years old.
 - More boys than girls registered to attend the school-based provision, with the reverse pattern observed in relation to community-based clubs.
 - Take up of the pilot was largely from children from better off families.

- The trips included in the projects were what engaged and interested children the most.
 - Hunger did not seem to be an issue for the children, and they did not particularly enjoy the healthy food provided.
 - The short lead in times from funding to delivery proved an issue to participation. For example, Global Generation recruited 35 people to the project, but only 17 participants who attended regularly. The providers felt had they had more time to promote the provision take up would have been better.
 - Offering provision at different times of the day, such as in the evenings, may benefit some children and young people more.
 - The involvement of teachers and sixth form mentors at the CoLAHG Summer School was helpful in supporting participants to build relationships and rapport with them.
 - Combining the learning and evaluation into one unified process, rather than having a programme of work that split into five areas would be more effective.
6. Evaluation of summer learning loss showed that fusion skills were retained and enhanced through the pilots, but there was no statistically significant evidence that the Year 6 participants who attended the pilot did better in terms of either academic attainment or behaviour and attendance during their first term of Year 7 than those that had not attended the programme.
7. Overall the delivery partners of the projects spoke positively about their experiences, as did the participants, but noted the potential reach and attendance of 122 was disappointing, effectively working out at £76 - £261 per child per day, though the cost per child per day would have been lower if attendance rates had been higher. The delivery partners also felt that the pilot would have been more impactful if it had focussed on either summer learning loss or summer hunger.

Proposals

8. Whilst the findings demonstrated some positive outcomes for participants in terms of their fusion skills, there is no compelling evidence that the pilots addressed summer learning loss or summer hunger. Furthermore, supporting 122 participants at a cost of circa £96,683.20 does not represent the best value for money. The City Corporation does have a City Premium Grants programme which is available to all of the City of London 'family of schools', including CoLAHG, and funding for summer activities aimed at pupils should be granted through this.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

9. This pilot supported the Social Mobility Strategy for 2018-28, which was adopted by the City Corporation in September 2019, and includes an outcome that states that 'Opportunity is accessed more evenly and equally across society', by removing barriers, overcoming gaps and improving access and participation in order to improve attainment for our pupils experiencing disadvantage or poverty⁵. It also links to outcome 3 in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan for 2018-23,

⁵ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

which states that ‘People have equal opportunities to enrich their lives and reach their full potential’⁶.

Conclusion

10. Members are invited to share the findings outlined in this pilot to inform summer enrichment work aimed at young people to address issues of summer hunger and summer learning loss. The evaluation of the pilot proposes the City Corporation is best placed to advocate for summer enrichment activity aimed at boosting social mobility for young Londoners, where are schools and local organisations are best placed to lead the design and delivery of programmes. It is hoped that this evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor’s Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people over the summer. The findings of Northumbria University commend the ‘positive support and strong strategic direction given to the proposal from the City Corporation’. The City Corporation continues to be supportive of innovative programmes to boost social mobility.

Jessica Walsh

Corporate Strategy and Performance Officer

jessica.walsh@cityoflondon.gov.uk

0207 332 3965

Background paper

Summer Enrichment Pilot – Proposal – January 2019

<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s108130/Summer%20Enrichment%20Pilot%20PR%20and%20PRED%20Paper%20-%20Jan%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

Appendices

1. Summer Enrichment Pilot September 2019 – Learning Report

⁶ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Committees Education Board | Dates 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: City of London Academies Trust, Academies Development Programme - Update | Public |
| Report of: Andrew Carter, Director of Community and Children's Services | For information |
| Report author: Gerald Mehrtens, Director of Academy Development, Department of Community and Children's Services | |

Summary

This report is to update the board of the progress of the Academies Development Programme, academy expansion and capital builds for the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT).

The two academies co-sponsored by the City of London Corporation (CoLC) have requested to join CoLAT. Progress on this is detailed in separate report to this board.

Six academies have capital developments, with a projected total capital investment presently of circa £80m. Two of these developments have completed and four are at various stages of construction. Attached as **Appendix 1** (non-public) shows an overview of the capital build programme for academies.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Note the progress reported in this report.

Main Report

Background

1. Under the Academies Development Programme, the number of sole sponsored City academies has increased from two to eight since September 2016, with the date of opening listed below.

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| • Galleywall Primary, City of London Academy | September 2016 |
| • City of London Primary Academy Islington | September 2017 |
| • City of London Academy Highgate Hill | September 2017 |
| • City of London Academy Shoreditch Park | September 2017 |
| • City of London Academy Highbury Grove | November 2017 |
| • Newham Collegiate Sixth Form, City of London Academy | January 2018 |

2. On the 17 May 2018 the CoLC Education Board reiterated its decision of March 2016 to limit the sponsor exposure through the expansion of the CoLAT to a maximum of 12 schools in the next few years. On 29 March 2019 the CoLAT Board approved a strategy of expansion to a maximum of 12 schools with 3 priorities,

priority 1 being CoLC co-sponsored academies joining CoLAT either through full or associate membership.

Current Position

3. Regarding academy expansion, the governing body of City of London Academy Islington (COLAI) on 2 December 2019, and the governing body of The City Academy Hackney (TCAH) on 22 January 2020, resolved to support proposals to join the CoLAT and to enter into formal discussions to that end. These proposals have the support of all co-sponsors, the Regional Schools Commissioner, and both Hackney and Islington local authorities. Progress on this is the subject of a separate report to this board.
4. With regards to academy capital builds, present projections show a circa £80m capital investment across the six schools from a variety of funding sources, notably the DfE, LB Hackney, and the LB of Islington. This figure does not include all the significant amounts associated for temporary accommodation. Attached as **Appendix 1 (non-public)** is a table showing an overview of the capital build programme for academies as well as a summary below of key dates, potential risks, and next steps.
5. **City of London Academy Galleywall**
 - a. Progress to date: Build completed August 2019.
 - b. Projected completion: Build completed August 2019
 - c. Potential risk(s): Remediation works required to UKPN substation.
 - d. Next steps: Defects period commenced
6. **City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI)**
 - a. Progress to date: On track for completion in December 2020.
 - b. Projected completion: December 2020
 - c. Potential risk(s): Planning conditions approval delays
 - d. Next steps: Consultation on planning conditions, and putting in place temporary accommodation arrangements for September 2020
7. **City of London Academy Highgate Hill**
 - a. Progress to date: DfE Feasibility Process complete.
 - b. Projected completion: April 2022
 - c. Next steps: Procurement of contractor via the DfE Framework
 - d. Potential risk: Securing planning through LB Islington.
8. **City of London Academy Shoreditch Park**
 - a. Progress to date: On track for completion by May 2021
 - b. Projected completion: May 2021
 - c. Potential risk:
 - d. Next steps
9. **City of London Academy Highbury Grove**
 - a. Progress to date: Build completed August 2019.
 - b. Projected completion: Build completed August 2019
 - c. Potential risk(s): None identified
 - d. Next Steps: Defects period commenced.
10. **Newham Sixth Form Colligate**
 - a. Progress to date: Feasibility study finalised
 - b. Next steps: Appointment of specialist architects
 - c. Projected completion: December 2022/Early 2023

- d. Potential risk(s): The constraints of the Grade Two listing of the building, to achieve an outstanding learning environment, causing delays.
11. There are two areas of medium risk in the academy capital builds.
- a. For COLPAI, members will note the permanent build completion date is December 2020, requiring the CoLC to secure further temporary accommodation from September 2020. CoLC Policy and Resources Committee have approved additional funding for elements of the permanent build which officer's and members feel is essential but the DfE consider not to be necessities, as well as for temporary accommodations requirements. Regular meetings for members of relevant committees take place to keep members updated.
 - b. For NCS, Following completion of the feasibility study and the recognition that the scheme will not be able to achieve planning approval in its current form the DfE have instructed its technical advisors to appoint a more specialist architectural practice ahead of procuring a main building contractor. The DfE will attempt to complete the first phase ready for occupation by September 2022, but the complete works could well run until December 2022 or early 2023.

Implications

12. All free schools are funded directly by the Education and Skills Funding Agency and there will be no financial liability to the CoLC from the proposed transfers as the schools would become part of CoLAT, a separate legal entity to the CoLC.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

13. This proposal delivers on the following strategic objectives of the CoLC:
- a. to contribute to the outcomes within the CoLC's Corporate Plan to 'Promote effective progression through fulfilling education and employment', and 'to contribute to a flourishing society' as its aim;
 - b. the CoLC Education Strategy for pupils in the City family of schools to have access to transformative education, enabling to achieve their potential, flourish and thrive.
 - c. the Department of Community and Children's Services Business Plan's priority objective 'Potential', which states: "People of all ages can achieve their ambitions through education, training and lifelong learning", with the outcome to be achieved by "Delivering an outstanding education offer through the City of London family of schools

Conclusion

14. TCAH and COLAI are the only two of ten academies sponsored by the City of London Corporation which are not within the City of London Academies Trust. These academies joining CoLAT would enable the benefits provided by the existing co-sponsors to be retained while also gaining the economies of scale, support and expertise the trust offers.
15. The academy development programme through the City Corporation's sponsorship of CoLAT continues to be an ambitious expansion of the City's support for education consistent with the City's commitment in its Education Strategy. These ambitions remain consistent with those of CoLAT and are being successfully progressed as noted in this report. Members will particularly note the continued challenges for the

COLPAI build, arrangements for further temporary accommodation, as well as the measures in place to keep relevant members of committees updated.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 - CoLAT Capital Builds table – update March 2020 (non-public).

Gerald Mehrtens

Director of Academy Development,
Department of Community and Children's Services

T: 020 7332 1002

E: gerald.mehrtens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|---|--|
| Committee(s) Education Board – For decision Policy and Resources – For decision Court of Common Council | Date(s): 05 March 2020 19 March 2020 23 April 2020 |
| Subject: City of London Academies Trust – Expansion by the transfer of the two Co-Sponsored Academy Trusts | Public |
| Report of: Andrew Carter, Director of Community & Children’s Services | For Decision |
| Report author: Gerald Mehrtens, Director of Academy Development | |

Summary

This report seeks approval for the transfer of The City Academy, Hackney (TCAH) and the City of London Academy Islington (COLAI) (co-sponsored by the City of London Corporation (CoLC)), to the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) (the CoLC being sole sponsor).

On 16 January 2020 Members of the Education Board supported the recommendation that the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, provide the CoLC’s written consent as required under the CoLAT Sponsorship Agreement to the expansion of CoLAT by the transfer of TCAH and COLAI to CoLAT, subject to the Town Clerk being satisfied of the outcome of the Due Diligence in each case.

At the time of writing this report, it is anticipated the CoLAT Board will also have given its approval for TCAH and the COLAI to transfer to CoLAT on 11 March 2020.

These proposals have the support of the two co-sponsors of TCAH and COLAI (KPMG and the City, University of London, respectively), the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), and local authorities for the areas in which the secondary schools are located, Hackney and Islington.

In order to secure the arrangements being in place by September 2020, the start of the new academic year, given the endorsement of the above key stakeholders, initial discussions/negotiations are already underway with the RSC and the Department for Education (DfE).

To further inform the CoLC’s decisions, Due Diligence Reports are provided at **Appendices 1 and 2 (non-public)**; and the key academic results of all CoLC sponsored secondary academies are provided **Appendix 3**.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that with the endorsement of the Education Board, that Policy and Resources Committee resolve to recommend to the Court of Common Council that:

- The City of London Corporation approve the transfer of The City Academy, Hackney and the City of London Academy Islington to the City of London Academies Trust.

- Funding of up to £20,000 be allocated for legal and professional services to protect the City Corporation's interests.
- Authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of both Policy and Resources Committee and the Education Board, to take any decisions or steps required to give effect to this decision.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation (CoLC) first became an academy sponsor with the opening of City of London Academy, Southwark in 2003 (sole sponsored), followed by the City of London Academy Islington (COLAI) opening in 2008 (co-sponsored by City, University of London (City University)) and The City Academy, Hackney (TCAH) opening in 2009 (co-sponsored by KPMG). Each of these academies were established as companies limited by guarantee and are exempt charities.
2. Following the decision by CoLC to apply for and sponsor further Free Schools, the Court of Common Council resolved in January 2016 to support changes to the governance of the City of London Academies, Southwark (as it then was, having taken on another school since it was first incorporated) such that that academy trust company would become the legal vehicle for all subsequent CoLC sponsored academies. The company was renamed "The City of London Academies Trust". The CoLC now sponsors ten academies with only TCAH and COLAI operating outside of CoLAT.
3. On 2 December 2019 the Governing Body of COLAI resolved: "to support the proposal for the Academy to join the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) and for the Academy's Joint Sponsors to enter into formal discussions to that end". This proposal also has the support of City University as co-sponsor of the COLAI. On 22 January 2020 the governing body of TCAH resolved: "That it supports in principle the proposal for the Academy to join the City of London Academies Trust and for the Academy's joint sponsors to enter into formal discussions to that end." This proposal has the support of KPMG as co-sponsor for TCAH.

Current Position

4. Both the London Borough of Hackney in the case of TCAH, and the London Borough of Islington in the case of COLAI, are supportive of these proposals. In addition, the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), whose consent is required, has, on the advice of the Headteachers Forum at their meeting on 29 January 2020, also approved these academies joining CoLAT.
5. On 16 January 2020 the Education Board resolved that the Town Clerk be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of that Committee, to provide the CoLC's written consent (as required under the CoLC's Sponsorship Agreement with CoLAT) to the expansion of CoLAT by the transfer of TCAH and COLAI, subject to the Town Clerk being satisfied of the outcome of the Due Diligence exercise in each case. The Due Diligence Reports are attached as **Appendices 1 and 2**. In addition, on 11 March 2020 it is expected that the CoLAT Board will also give its approval to the transfer of TCAH and the COLAI to CoLAT.

6. Both KPMG and City University have given clear indications that they will continue to support the relevant academies should they join CoLAT. KPMG have written confirming their intention to continue supporting TCAH at an equivalent level to that presently provided should the school join CoLAT. Equally, City University has confirmed its intention to continue with its unchanged support should COLAI join CoLAT. This would be dependent on there being agreement between TCAH, COLAI and CoLAT as to any changes to CoLAT's governance, and/or the make-up of the new governing bodies for TCAH and COLAI, to provide for appropriate continued participation by KPMG and City University in the running of those schools. (Academy governing bodies are sub-committees of the CoLAT Board of Trustees/Directors.)
7. Having regard to the anticipated timetable for the transfers of TCAH and COLAI (by September 2020, the beginning of the academic year), and the endorsement of the proposals by key stakeholders as noted above, discussions/negotiations with the RSC and the Department for Education (DfE) have commenced. The process for transfer of both academy trust undertakings will next involve - new Supplementary Funding Agreements for each academy school under the CoLAT Master Funding Agreement (which may also require amendment); the novation of leases; and necessary staff consultations for Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE), etc. The TCAH and COLAI companies will also need to be dissolved at the appropriate time.
8. Given the clear intention of our co-sponsors of TCAH and COLAI that they will continue to provide an equivalent level of assistance to that which they currently provide, and the broader benefits to the schools from the support and expertise of being part of CoLAT, from the CoLC's perspective as academy sponsor in each case there is a strong argument to support the proposed consolidation of the undertakings within CoLAT. There will be clear advantages in the delivery of education and in operating through one legal entity, achieved through economies of scale, consolidation of expertise and support (governance, teaching and administrative), and mitigation of risk. Furthermore, insofar as the CoLC is concerned, in delivering on our educational vision the new arrangements will enable more targeted and cohesive support to the academy trust itself and its schools (whether governance, financial, administrative or in-kind support).

Proposals

9. This report seeks approval of the CoLC as sponsor of CoLAT, and co-sponsor of TCAH and COLAI, for the transfer of the co-sponsored academies to CoLAT.
10. By giving our approval, the three academy trusts can continue the discussions/negotiations with the RSC and the DfE for a Supplementary Funding Agreement for TCAH and for the COLAI, progress changes to property/lease arrangements, and undertake the necessary staff consultations for Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE), with an aim that arrangements will be in place by September 2020, the beginning of the next academic year.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

11. This proposal delivers on the following strategic objectives of the CoLC:

- a. to contribute to the outcomes within the CoLC's Corporate Plan to 'Promote effective progression through fulfilling education and employment', and 'to contribute to a flourishing society' as its aim;
- b. the CoLC Education Strategy for pupils in the City family of schools to have access to transformative education, enabling to achieve their potential, flourish and thrive.
- c. the Department of Community and Children's Services Business Plan's priority objective 'Potential', which states: "People of all ages can achieve their ambitions through education, training and lifelong learning", with the outcome to be achieved by "Delivering an outstanding education offer through the City of London family of schools".

Implications

12. All free schools are funded directly by the Education and Skills Funding Agency and there will be no financial liability to the CoLC from the proposed transfers as the schools would become part of CoLAT, a separate legal entity to the CoLC. However, consistent with its role in supporting the delivery of the Education Strategy, the Education Board may choose to make discretionary grants from its central risk budget to benefit any of the academy trusts and schools, and the proposed changes may impact upon how those funds are allocated.
13. The transfer of the TCAH and CoLAI undertakings (which will include assets and liabilities) is likely to involve:
 - TCAH, COLAI, CoLAT and the Secretary of State for Education entering into a deed of novation and variation in respect of existing funding agreements or entering into new Supplemental Funding Agreements for TCAH and COLAI;
 - A TUPE transfer of staff to CoLAT;
 - Transfer agreements between the parties in respect of assets and liabilities;
 - CoLAT and other relevant parties entering into land agreements so that the schools can continue to operate from their current sites
14. The existing TCAH and CoLAI companies will then be dissolved. Existing company members and Directors'/Trustees'/Governors' roles within those companies will then cease. The extent to which those individuals will continue to have a role within CoLAT will need to be considered, and will be a matter for agreement. As noted above, the extent to which the previous co-sponsors, KPMG and City University, will have an involvement in the governance of the schools they previously co-sponsored or otherwise in the governance of CoLAT will also need to be agreed with the co-sponsors in advance of any transfer. Changes may be required to CoLAT's governance, or otherwise formally agreed separately between the parties.
15. Due to the specialist nature of the arrangements external professional advice is likely to be required. Consistent with the previous approach adopted in reviewing academy trust governance, it is likely to be prudent for the CoLC as sponsor of CoLAT, and co-sponsor of TCAH and COLAI, to lead in obtaining such advice and for us to share it with other parties in a collaborative way. To the extent that any conflict or potential conflict arises, parties could then take separate advice. The CoLC will wish to ensure that the CoLC's interests and educational vision are protected, and specifically that its influence as sole sponsor of CoLAT is not eroded

in putting in place arrangements for the on-going support of KPMG to TCAH and City University to COLAI.

Conclusion

16. TCAH and COLAI are the only two of ten academies sponsored by the CoLC which are not within CoLAT. By joining CoLAT the benefits provided by the existing co-sponsors could be retained for each school, while also gaining the economies of scale, support and expertise CoLAT offers. From the CoLC's perspective, as sponsor, these academies will be better managed and supported by operating within CoLAT. It is recommended that the CoLC give its formal approval to the proposal to enable the three academy trust companies to progress the discussions/negotiations for the transfers, with the aim that arrangements will be in place by September 2020, the beginning of the next academic year.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – COLAI Due Diligence Report (non-public)
- Appendix 2 – TCAH Due Diligence Report (non-public)
- Appendix 3 – CoLC sponsored secondary academies - academic results 2019

Gerald Mehrtens

Director of Academy Development,
Department of Community and Children's Services
T: 020 7332 xxxx
E: gerald.mehrtens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Validated 2018/19 Results | |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | Public |
| Report author: Anne Bamford, Strategic Education and Skills Director | For Decision |

Summary

This paper asks Members to note that the Department for Education (DfE) have published the validated 2018/19 results for all schools. The validated results for the Family of Schools is included in **Appendices 1 and 2**. Members are also asked to approve the proposed school performance data reporting cycle in paragraph 7 which aligns with the DfE's data publication timetable.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the validated 2018/19 results for the Family of Schools in **Appendices 1 and 2**.
- Approve the proposed school performance data reporting cycle.

Main Report

Background

1. At the Education Meeting on 12 September 2019, Members received the provisional unvalidated 2018/19 results for the Family of Schools. In that report, the Strategic Education and Skills Director provided a detailed commentary on the results including a summary for each Key Stage and the key lines of enquiry on areas for improvement which would be explored in the forthcoming school performance scrutiny meetings.
2. Scrutiny meetings for the City of London Corporation's sponsored and co-sponsored academies were held on 30 October 2019 in accordance with the quality assurance and accountability framework for academies. At the Education Board meeting on 14 November 2019, Members received a report on the analysis, targets and next steps for each academy.

Current Position

3. The DfE published validated primary results in December 2019 and validated Key Stage 4 results in February 2020. The validated results data is included in **Appendix 1 (primary)** and **Appendix 2 (secondary and A Level)**. There are very marginal changes from the unvalidated provisional results and therefore the commentary submitted to the 12 September 2019 and 14 November 2019 Education Board meetings remains accurate and comprehensive.

School Performance Data Reporting Cycle

4. At the Education Board on 15 October 2015, Members approved a Quality Assurance and Accountability Framework for sponsored and co-sponsored academies. The Framework sets out that the Education Board will receive

provisional results in October, scrutiny meetings would take place in the Autumn Term, and validated results will be received in the Spring following publication from DfE. This framework has been implemented each academic year.

5. In its role as Sponsor, and to implement its role of challenge and support, the Education Board have requested reports on other school performance areas including exclusions, attendance and safeguarding. These requests are in line with the Sponsorship Agreements but are not included in the Accountability Framework.
6. City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) have implemented a data collection and reporting cycle with their schools and the Board of Trustees. To minimise the burden on schools to provide multiple datasets at varying times throughout the year, the Education Strategy Unit are proposing to align with the CoLAT cycle which will ensure the Education Board receive timely reports on school performance areas in line with the Accountability Framework and DfE publication timetable.
7. Members of the Education Board are asked to approve the following school performance data reporting cycle for sponsored and co-sponsored academies to commence from the 2020/21 Academic Year:

| Education Board meeting | September | November | January |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Data and reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisional unvalidated Primary, Key Stage 4 and A Level Results. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on school performance scrutiny meetings with targets for following academic year. | |
| Education Board meeting | March | May | July |
| Data and reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validated Primary, Key Stage 4 and A Level Results with Progress Data. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid-year attendance, exclusion and safeguarding data compared with previous academic year. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on school finance scrutiny meetings. |

8. Members are asked to approve that data and reporting requests on school performance outside of this timetable should be exceptional and reviewed on a case-by-case basis according to risk and expediency.

Conclusion

9. This report provides Members with an update on the validated results for the Family of Schools and asks Members to approve a proposed school performance data reporting cycle.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Validated 2018/2019 Results (Primary)
- Appendix 2 – Validated 2018/2019 Results (Secondary and A Level)

Anne Bamford

Strategic Education and Skills Director

T: 020 7332 3158

E: Anne.Bamford@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Education Board Budget Update 2019/20 | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Daniel McGrady, Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills) Mark Jarvis, Head of Finance | |

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the latest forecast outturn position for the 2019/20 Education Board Budget.

Main Report

Current Position

1. The forecast outturn position for the 2019/20 financial year as of Period 10 is outlined in the table at the end of the report. At this stage, £2.640m of the overall £2.879m allocation has been spent or committed.
2. Members should note that presently, the forecast outturn is predicting an underspend of £126,673 at the end of the Financial Year.
3. Of this underspend, £24,507 is an underspend on PIP funding which will be automatically carried forward into the next Financial Year. This will support the Education Board to implement the recommendations from the Safeguarding Review and the Independent Feasibility Study.
4. The £102,166 underspend in the Local Risk element of the budget is predominantly due to underspends in two programmes of work:
 - a. Skills Strategy – Budget was allocated for research into fusion skills assessment tools which was subsequently secured free of charge through a partnership with the University of Coventry, London. The budget has been repurposed to other activities contributing to the Fusion Skills Programme in the 2020/21 Financial Year.
 - b. Cultural and Creative Learning Strategy – Budget was allocated for the development of a digital 'one-stop-shop' to support schools to more readily access the City's cultural learning and skills programmes. The project was not mobilised in time to spend the budget due to a delay in securing resource to project manage the governance and procurement processes. A contractor has now been secured to lead this area of work which has rolled into the 2020/21 Action Plan. The Education Strategy Unit will request a carry forward of £50K to implement this project, noting that it is an outcome in the Education, Skills and Cultural and Creative Learning Strategies
5. The Education Strategy Unit are identifying areas of work which were earmarked for a future Annual Action Plan, but which could be mobilised before the end of the Financial Year with the current provisions in the budget. This includes purchasing a subscription to improve access to school performance data and a subscription to improve governors' access to training and resources.

Conclusion

6. Members are asked to note the spend to date and that the Education Board Budget is forecasting an underspend.

Daniel McGrady

Policy Lead (Education, Culture & Skills)

T: 020 7332 1864

E: Daniel.mcgrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Mark Jarvis

Head of Finance

T: 020 7332 1221

E: Mark.Jarvis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| <u>2019-20</u> <u>Budget</u> | | <u>Actuals</u> <u>2019/20</u> | <u>Balance</u> | <u>Forecast</u> <u>Outturn</u> <u>19/20</u> |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------|---|
| <u>Local Risk</u> | | | | |
| | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| 90,000 | COLAT FUNDING | 90,000 | 0 | 90,000 |
| 327,000 | SALARIES | 309,672 | 17,328 | 337,284 |
| 24,000 | Leadership & Governance | 16,527 | 7,473 | 26,527 |
| 36,000 | Enrichment (Fusion) Programmes | 26,107 | 9,892 | 32,505 |
| 60,000 | EDUCATION STRATEGY | 42,635 | 17,365 | 59,033 |
| 107,000 | Leadership & Governance | 66,249 | 40,751 | 66,249 |
| 60,000 | London Careers Festival | 52,373 | 7,627 | 56,215 |
| 167,000 | SKILLS STRATEGY | 118,622 | 48,378 | 122,464 |
| 30,000 | Leadership & Governance | 13,787 | 16,213 | 13,787 |
| 65,000 | Enrichment (Fusion) Programmes | 23,540 | 41,460 | 23,540 |
| 305,000 | Culture Mile Learning | 305,000 | 0 | 305,000 |
| 400,000 | CULTURAL & CREATIVE LEARNING STRATEGY | 342,347 | 57,673 | 342,327 |
| 13,000 | CENTRAL EDUCATION UNIT (Printing, Legal Frees, Training etc.) | 3,724 | 9,276 | 3,724 |
| 1,057,000 | | 906,980 | 150,020 | 954,831 |
| <u>Central Risk</u> | | | | |
| | £ | | | |
| 250,000 | COLAS | 250,000 | 0 | 250,000 |
| 250,000 | COLAI | 250,000 | 0 | 250,000 |
| 250,000 | COLAH | 250,000 | 0 | 250,000 |
| 100,000 | Redriff | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| 60,000 | Galleywall | 60,000 | 0 | 60,000 |
| 40,000 | COLPAI | 40,000 | 0 | 40,000 |
| 200,000 | Highgate Hill | 199,830 | 170 | 200,000 |
| 140,000 | Shoreditch Park | 117,050 | 22,950 | 140,000 |
| 250,000 | Highbury Grove | 249,230 | 770 | 250,000 |
| 150,000 | NCS | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 |
| 40,000 | Interventions/standards | 0 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| 1,730,000 | CITY PREMIUM GRANTS (ACADEMIES) | 1,666,110 | 63,890 | 1,730,000 |
| 92,000 | PIP Funding¹ | 67,496 | 24,504 | 67,496 |

¹ This forecast outturn does not include £100,000 for the Summer Enrichment Pilot which is on the same budget ledger but is not managed by the Education Board.

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| 1,822,000 | 1,733,606 | 88,393 | 1,797,496 |
| 2,879,000 | 2,640,586 | 238,413 | 2,752,327 |

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Music Education Call for Evidence | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Daniel McGrady Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills) | |

Summary

Members are asked to note that the Department for Education (DfE) have released a 'call for evidence' on music education¹ to inform the development of a refreshed Nation Plan for Music Education. The consultation provides an opportunity for Education Board Members to contribute their views on the current provision of music education and the implementation of the National Plan 2011-2020 as a sponsor and co-sponsor of academies and a grant-funder of music education for school-aged pupils. Members are invited to discuss the points in this report to inform the preparation of a consultation response.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- note the Call for Evidence: Music Education in **Appendix 1**;
- discuss the bullet points in this report to inform the preparation of a consultation response.

Main Report

Background

1. The consultation closes on 13 March 2020 and asks for evidence from parents and carers, young people, schools and education providers, organisations providing music activities, Music Hubs, employers and other educational professionals and researchers.
2. Music education is a strategic priority for the Education Board and the Cultural and Creative Learning Strategy includes the outcome that an ambitious programme for music and performing arts education is delivered through the Family of Schools; and that music and performing arts have a strengthened role across a sustained and sequential cultural and creative learning offer from early years through to post-16 education.
3. Discussion points are provided overleaf relating to the questions which seek responses from: 'everyone' and 'leaders in education'. The Barbican and Guildhall School of Music and Drama have been engaged for their views on questions seeking responses from: 'those working in music services' and 'employers in the music industry'. The discussion points use the evidence gathered from the detailed review of music education across the Family of Schools conducted by the Education Strategy Unit and discussed at the Education Board meeting on 18 July 2020.
4. Following the outputs of the Education Board's discussion, a consultation response will be drafted by offers for submission.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/music-education-call-for-evidence>

Questions 11-14: Music Education for All

| Consultation questions | Discussion points |
|--|---|
| <p>11. Music is compulsory in the curriculum from Key Stages 1 to 3, and pupils in maintained schools have an entitlement to study an arts subject, including music, at Key Stage 4 if they wish.</p> <p>11.2. To what extent do you believe that it is being delivered? Please explain your answer.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The variables affecting pupils' access to music education include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Space on school timetable ○ Music leadership in the school ○ Expertise and number of music teachers in the school ○ Access to information about music activities and programmes ○ School's engagement with Music Hubs ○ Demand from pupils ○ Access to a range musical offers (e.g. world-of-work experiences in music, digital music) ○ Schools' investment in teachers' CPD ○ Schools' value of music • Across primary schools in the Family of Schools, the music offer is consistently broad in EYFS and KS1 but varies in breadth at KS2 with one school offering double the breadth of offers than another. No primary schools have a designated Music Lead or Music Coordinator in the school, but 3/4 schools do have a qualified music teacher in the school. • Across secondary schools, 6/9 schools offer free instrumental lessons to pupils in KS3 which drops to 2/9 schools at KS4. At KS4, not all secondary schools teach GCSE Music. All the surveyed secondary schools have a designated Music Lead or Music Coordinator in the school and all schools employed a qualified music teacher. |
| <p>12. What could Government do to ensure greater awareness of the entitlement to music education in school?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the role of music education in the Ofsted Inspection Framework. • Consider the adoption and training associated with the DfE's Model Music Curriculum expected to be published in Summer 2020. • There are no centrally funded digital access routes to local music education offers such as online search engines and one-stop-shops for local music offers. • The Family of Schools are mostly likely to find out about music education offers via: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City of London Corporation ○ Teachers' own cultural experiences ○ Other schools ○ Parents (primary schools) |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>13. Please let us know whether you think that any one or more group sharing one or more of the protected characteristics listed above is underrepresented in music education? If so, please let us know which group(s) and what you think might be done to improve their representation, including any examples you might have of good practice.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The representation of protected characteristics in music education is not set out in a curriculum for music and so varies from school to school, relying on the exposure which pupils have to different genres, styles, and composers of music. • Across primary schools in the Family of Schools, music teachers felt that pupils with SEND received the same music education offer as all pupils, both in the school and through externally provided music offers. This level of certainty reduces for secondary schools. |
| <p>14.1 Please share up to three examples of good practice you have seen that facilitates inclusive education for children with SEN, young carers, those living in care, or with economic disadvantage.</p> <p>14.2 Please share up to three examples of positive impact music has had particularly for children with SEN, young carers, those living in care, or with economic disadvantage.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Schools' Concert – An annual event combining music composition and music performance, uniting academies with high percentages of Pupil Premium (65% average) and pupils with SEND (in two cases, twice the national average). • Museum of London Day – An annual event which uses cultural participation to inspire musical composition and performance. The event is led by City of London School for Girls and invites academies with high levels of economic disadvantage. • Free instrumentation lessons for pupils at City of London academies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At City of London Academy Highgate Hill, all pupils in Year 7 and 8 received free instrument lessons which led to 50% of Years 7 and 8 being involved in the academy end of year musical which was the largest musical production in the history of the school. The academy now also run a GCSE Music cohort in Year 9 compared to zero interest in the previous year. ○ At City of London Academy Shoreditch Park, all Year 7 and 8 pupils learn an instrument. 82% of Year 7 pupils made 3 subgrades of academic progress in music over the year, meeting or exceeding their targets. |

Questions 15-17: The National Plan for Music Education

| Consultation Questions | Discussion points |
|---|--|
| <p>16. How effective do you think the National Plan for Music Education</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across primary schools in the Family of Schools, by KS2 all schools offer group instrumental and singing practice and opportunities to performance to an audience. |

| | |
|--|--|
| has been in meeting the Government's vision that children 'from all backgrounds and every part of England have the opportunity to learn a musical instrument; to make music with others; to learn to sing; and to have the opportunity to progress to the next level of excellence' since 2012? You may expand on your answer if you wish. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across secondary schools in the Family of Schools, there is variation in opportunities to learn musical instruments, sing and make music with others. Most schools offer group instrumental and singing practice at KS3 and KS4 but not all schools offer one-to-one peripatetic instrumental lessons. • Across secondary schools in the Family of Schools, overall, the breadth of music education offers is continuous from lower KS3 to Sixth Form. The increase in some offers in KS4 (e.g. workshops and performances from visitors to the school) suggests some sequencing of music education as pupils move into higher year groups. A potential gap in the sequencing of music education offers is in world-of-work experiences in music. • To truly assess whether the offers are continuous for pupils, further analysis would be required to map pupil journeys through the school, and through the transition from primary to secondary school, to understand whether there are a clear and lineated access routes for pupils and the offers are sequential and progressive. |
|--|--|

Questions 18-23: Local Music Education Hubs

| Consultation Questions | Discussion points |
|--|---|
| 21. What challenges do you think your local music education hub faces to effectively meet the roles listed above in your area? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across secondary schools in the Family of Schools, only 3/9 secondary listed their local Music Hub as a point of information for music offers which could suggest there is a lack of knowledge and engagement between schools and their local Music Hubs. Similarly, many of our schools are not using their local Music Hub's instrumental loan service. • System Leadership – Music Education Hubs may have a different relationship with academies as they do with Local Authority maintained schools. • Scale and resourcing – Music Education Hubs have a very large remit of schools. |
| 23. Please provide up to three examples of good practice that demonstrate a music education hub working effectively. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Islington Music Hub have a strategic partnership with Guildhall School of Music and Drama and the Culture Mile Learning Network to enhance the provision of music offers in Islington. |

Question 24: Music Technology

| Consultation Questions | Discussion points |
|------------------------|-------------------|
|------------------------|-------------------|

| | |
|--|---|
| 24. Please detail up to three uses of technology to deliver music education you are aware of which are particularly effective and explain their effectiveness. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing increased access for pupils. • Providing increased engagement for pupils. • Enabling composition of music free of musical skill or training. • Across primary schools in the Family of Schools, no schools selected digital music experiences as something offered by the school. Using music-making apps and digital composition were both highlighted as valuable CPD areas. • Across secondary schools in the Family of Schools, most schools offered digital music experiences, however there were low levels of delivery in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Experiences of music-making apps ○ Experiences of mixing/DJing ○ Experiences of digital sound production ○ Using assisted music technology for pupils with SEND |
|--|---|

Questions 51-55: Questions for Head Teachers and other Leaders in Education

| Consultation Questions | Discussion points |
|--|--|
| <p>51. What do you consider the key benefits of effective music provision in your school?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Greater levels of confidence amongst pupils/students b) Improved academic performance in other subject areas c) Improved behavioural standards d) Greater sense of collegial spirit and togetherness e) More students choosing to study music at a higher level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across the Family of Schools, 75% or more secondary schools felt that Music Education developed the following skills 'to a great extent': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Oral communication/presentation skills ○ Collaboration and teamwork ○ Resilience ○ Creativity ○ Independent working/autonomy ○ Cultural awareness • At primary level, schools also felt that music education could develop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiative ○ Problem solving ○ Organisational skills • At City of London Academies Shoreditch Park and Highgate Hill, the provision of free instrumental lessons to all KS3 pupils led to increased engagement in the school production, better results in music, greater willingness to study music at higher levels, and improvements in other areas of the curriculum. |

Conclusion

This reports asks Members to share their views on the discussion points contained within this report to inform the preparation of a consultation response to the DfE's Call for Evidence on Music Education.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Music Education: Call for Evidence. Department for Education.

Background papers

- Education Board: 18 July 2019 – Music Education Mapping across the Family of Schools.

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)

T: 020 7332 1864

E: daniel.mcgrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk



Department
for Education

Music education: call for evidence

Launch date 9 February 2020

Respond by 13 March 2020

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Who this is for | 3 |
| Issue date | 3 |
| Enquiries | 3 |
| Additional copies | 3 |
| The response | 3 |
| Confidentiality of your responses | 4 |
| About this call for evidence | 5 |
| Respond online | 6 |
| Deadline | 6 |
| Foreword | 7 |
| Questions | 9 |
| Q1-10: Personal Information | 9 |
| Q11-14: Music Education for All | 11 |
| Q15-17: The National Plan for Music Education | 12 |
| Q18-23: Music Education Hubs | 13 |
| Q24: Music Technology | 15 |
| Q25-33: Questions for Young People aged 13-25 | 15 |
| Q34-40: Questions for Parents and Carers | 17 |
| Q41-50: Questions for all Teachers and Schools, Colleges, Music Education Hubs and other Music Services | 19 |
| Q51-55: Questions for Head Teachers and other Leaders in Education | 21 |
| Q56-62: Questions for Employers in the Music Industry | 23 |

Introduction

The Department for Education is seeking views on music education, to inform its proposals for the refresh of the National Plan for Music Education.

Who this is for

- Parents and carers
- Young people
- Primary schools
- Secondary schools
- Further Education (FE) and sixth-form colleges
- School and college staff, including governors
- National and local voluntary and community organisations providing musical activities for children and young people
- Music Education Hubs and other music services
- Musicians
- Employers in the music industry
- Other educational professionals including academics and researchers

Issue date

The consultation was issued on 9 February 2020.

Enquiries

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the call for evidence you can contact the DfE music policy team by email: Music.CONSULTATION@education.gov.uk

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the DfE Ministerial and Public Communications Division by email: Consultations.Coordinator@education.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the [DfE Contact us page](#).

Additional copies

Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from [GOV.UK DfE consultations](#).

The response

This call for evidence closes at 11.59pm on 13 March 2020. The results of the call for evidence and the Department's response will be published on [GOV.UK](#) later in 2020.

Confidentiality of your responses

Information provided in response to this call for evidence, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 2018 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want all, or any part, of a response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department for Education will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and, your personal information will only be used for the purposes of this call for evidence. Your information will not be shared with third parties unless the law allows it.

You can read more about what the DfE does when we ask for and hold your personal information in our [personal information charter](#).

About this call for evidence

The National Plan for Music Education (the Plan), published in November 2011 and running to 2020, set out the Government's vision for music education, that children:

‘from all backgrounds and every part of England have the opportunity to learn a musical instrument; to make music with others; to learn to sing; and to have the opportunity to progress to the next level of excellence’.

To help ensure this vision is a reality, the Plan announced a range of measures, including the establishment of music education hubs to drive up the quality and consistency of music education.

Music education hubs are funded to develop and deliver a local strategic vision which supports high-quality music education both in and out of schools. There are 120 hubs nationally, working in place-based partnerships to meet the core and extension roles as set out in the Plan. These partnerships often include the local music service, local authority, schools, arts organisations, and community or voluntary organisations.

Our ambitions for music education are high – the opportunity to study and understand music isn't a privilege, it's a vital part of a broad and balanced curriculum. That is why it is compulsory in the National Curriculum up to Key Stage 3. It is in this context that we are now refreshing the National Plan for Music Education, to ensure we continue to deliver high-quality music education for all pupils.

This call for evidence forms part of that process. It invites views on music education, the current level of provision, the National Plan for Music Education and how it should be revised. As the current Plan states, great music education is a partnership between classroom teachers, specialist teachers, professional performers and a host of other organisations, including those from the arts, charity and voluntary sectors. We are therefore seeking to hear from a range of interested parties, including young people, parents, teachers, employers in the music industry and music educators. The insights shared will help us ensure the National Plan for Music Education remains fit for purpose.

Wider Departmental policy, for example on assessment, accountability or school funding, does not fall within the scope of the National Plan for Music Education, and therefore does not fall within the scope of this call for evidence.

Following the closure of the call for evidence, responses will be analysed and considered as part of the formulation of proposals for the refreshed Plan.

Respond online

To help us analyse the responses please use the online system wherever possible. Visit www.education.gov.uk/consultations to submit your response.

Other ways to respond

If for exceptional reasons, you are unable to use the online system, for example because you use specialist accessibility software that is not compatible with the system, you may request a word document version of the form and email it or post it to the Department.

By email

- Music.CONSULTATION@education.gov.uk

By post

Music team, Department for Education, Sanctuary Buildings, 2nd Floor, Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BT.

Deadline

The consultation closes on 13 March 2020.

Foreword

Music is not a nice-to-have part of the curriculum for the privileged few. It is a vital part of a broad and balanced curriculum for all pupils. It builds confidence, helps children live happier, more enriched lives, and discover the joy of expressing themselves. There is evidence that actively making music with others promotes wellbeing from infancy to old age, develops identity and builds self-esteem. And, importantly, it opens doors to our world-renowned music industry.

For all these reasons and more, we want to give all children the opportunity to develop a love of music: we want all children to have the opportunity to play an instrument, to sing and to perform in choirs and orchestras at their school and to learn to read and write musical notation. We have made great strides towards this, investing in a network of music hubs working with schools to nurture the budding seeds of musical passion that can unlock so much pleasure throughout life. In 2016/17 alone, hubs worked with 89% of state-funded schools on at least one core role and helped over 700,000 pupils begin to learn to play a musical instrument in whole class teaching.

These hubs were established by our 2011 National Plan for Music Education. The Plan expressed our ambition that every child should have the opportunity to play a musical instrument; to make music with others; to sing; and to progress to the next level of proficiency. Our commitment to this remains as strong as ever: already this year, we have announced continued funding for the music hubs programme totalling £80million. With music compulsory in the National Curriculum to Key Stage 3, we want to see it taught in all schools. And our plans to introduce a £100million Arts Premium, funding creative opportunities in secondary schools, will mean the arts and music will become an increasingly important part of the secondary school curriculum and extra-curricular opportunities for young people.

Much has changed since 2011, and with a renewed mandate, we want to ask if we're still doing the right things to support our schools in providing a world-class music education. That is why we are refreshing the National Plan for Music Education, starting by building understanding of experiences of music education through this call for evidence. We want our future Plan to be informed by as wide a range of evidence and good practice as possible, and I am grateful to my colleagues in the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport for supporting this. We would like to hear from heads and teachers in all kinds of schools and colleges, representatives from our music industry, from academia and from the organisations up and down the country that provide musical opportunities. We would also like to hear from young people themselves, their parents and carers, so that they too have a voice in shaping our future Plan.

I'd like to thank you for taking an interest in the future of music education. Studying, and playing music is a vital part of a child's education and we want to make sure that every child can benefit.

The Rt Hon Nick Gibb MP

Minister of State (Minister for School Standards)

Questions

Before you start answering the questions in this call for evidence, please note that:

It would be helpful if you would first give some information about yourself as context for your other responses. This information is confidential and we will not publish any information that could identify you without your permission.

You may want to answer all or just some of the questions, but please note that some questions may not be particularly relevant to you:

- Questions 1 – 24 are for everyone responding to the call for evidence
- Questions 25 – 33 are for young people aged 13 - 25
- Questions 34 – 40 are for parents and carers
- Questions 41 – 50 are for teachers and those who are working in schools, colleges, music education hubs and other music services
- Questions 51 – 55 are for head teachers and other leaders in education
- Questions 56 – 62 are for employers in the music industry

Q1-10: Personal Information

1. Name

First Name:

Last Name:

Please note: It is helpful to have your name if we want to contact you about your answers to the questions in this call for evidence. You do not have to give your name, and your views will be considered whether or not you give your name.

2. What is your email address?

Email address:

Please note: It is helpful to have your email address if we want to contact you about your answers to the questions in this call for evidence. You do not have to give your email address, and your views will be considered whether or not you give your email address.

3. Are you happy to be contacted directly about your response (required)?

- a) Yes
- b) No

We may wish to speak to you directly about your responses to help our understanding of the issues. If we do, we will use the email address you have given above.

4. Are you responding as an individual or as part of an organisation (required)?

- a) Individual
- b) Organisation

5. If you are responding as an individual, how would you describe yourself (required)?

- a) A young person aged 13 - 25
- b) A parent or carer
- c) A teacher or someone working in a school, college, music education hub or other music service
- d) A head teacher or other leader in education
- e) An employer in the music industry
- f) Other (please specify)

6. If you are responding for an organisation, what type of organisation is this (required)?

- a) A school
- b) A college
- c) A music education hub
- d) A music service (not a music education hub)
- e) A music industry employer
- f) Other (please specify)

7. What is the name of your organisation?

8. What is your role?

9. In which local authority are you located?

We are interested in knowing what the picture is in different parts of the country. Knowing the local authority in which your school, college or activity is situated will help us to understand the context of your responses. If you are a national provider, or if you are not based in any particular local authority (for example a national charity), then please indicate this.

10. What is your postcode?

Please note - for the open questions, we would recommend keeping your answers concise (up to approximately 250 words).

Q11-14: Music Education for All

All children regardless of experience or background should expect a high-quality music education. However, evidence shows that levels of engagement in music and rates of progression are inconsistent.

11. Music is compulsory in the curriculum from Key Stages 1 to 3, and pupils in maintained schools have an entitlement to study an arts subject, including music, at Key Stage 4 if they wish.

11.1 Were you aware of this?

11.2 To what extent do you believe that it is being delivered? Please explain your answer.

- a) Fully - high quality music education is available to all children
- b) Fairly - music education is available to all children but the quality could sometimes be better
- c) Poorly - music education is not available to all children and the quality could be better
- d) Other (please give details)

12. What could Government do to ensure greater awareness of the entitlement to music education in school?

Inclusivity

In accordance with the Equality Act 2010, public bodies must have “due regard”, when making decisions, to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations, in relation to relevant protected characteristics (disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, age, pregnancy and maternity, sex and sexual orientation).

13. Please let us know whether you think that any one or more group sharing one or more of the protected characteristics listed above is underrepresented in music education? If so, please let us know which group(s) and what you think might be done to improve their representation, including any examples you might have of good practice.

14. We are keen to understand how access to music education opportunities can help make the greatest positive difference to groups of children and young people vulnerable to poorer life outcomes, such as those living in poverty/with economic disadvantage, having a disability or special educational needs (SEN), being a young carer, living in care and others.

14.1 Please share up to three examples of good practice you have seen that facilitates inclusive education for children with SEN, young carers, those living in care, or with economic disadvantage.

14.2 Please share up to three examples of positive impact music has had particularly for children with SEN, young carers, those living in care, or with economic disadvantage.

Q15-17: The National Plan for Music Education

15. Which of the following best describes your level of awareness of the National Plan for Music Education, prior to being made aware of this call for evidence?

- a) I am very familiar with it, have read it in full and refer to it often
- b) I am familiar with it and have read all of it or some of it
- c) I am aware of it but have not looked at it
- d) This is the first I have heard of it

- e) Other level of awareness

16. How effective do you think the National Plan for Music Education has been in meeting the Government's vision that children 'from all backgrounds and every part of England have the opportunity to learn a musical instrument; to make music with others; to learn to sing; and to have the opportunity to progress to the next level of excellence' since 2012? You may expand on your answer if you wish.

- a) Very effective
- b) Fairly effective
- c) Neither effective nor ineffective
- d) Ineffective
- e) I don't know

17. If I have a query relating to music education, I am most likely to turn to:

- a) The National Plan for Music Education
- b) My local music education hub
- c) A head teacher or music teacher
- d) A music specialist or performer
- e) None of the above (please provide details)

Q18-23: Music Education Hubs

While it is the responsibility of schools to deliver the music curriculum, music education hubs have played an important role in ensuring young people have opportunities to sing, learn a musical instrument, play together and progress. Hubs are made up of groups of organisations working in partnership and were introduced in the current National Plan for Music Education. Their work focuses on four core roles:

- ensure that every child aged 5 to 18 has the opportunity to learn a musical instrument (other than voice) through whole-class ensemble teaching;
- provide opportunities to play in ensembles and to perform from an early stage;
- ensure that clear progression routes are available and affordable to all young people;
- develop a singing strategy to ensure that every pupil sings regularly and that choirs and other vocal ensembles are available in the area.

In addition, the current Plan outlines 'extension' roles for hubs, which they are expected to deliver where possible. These are that hubs:

- offer continuing professional development (CPD) to school staff, particularly in supporting schools to deliver music in the curriculum;
- provide an instrument loan service, with discounts or free provision for those on low incomes;
- provide access to large scale and/or high-quality music experiences for pupils, working with professional musicians and/or venues. This may include undertaking work to publicise the opportunities available to schools, parents/carers and students.

18. Were you aware of music education hubs before reading this?

- a) Yes
- b) No

19. Which of the following descriptions most closely matches your impression of the effectiveness of your local music education hub in meeting the roles listed above?

- a) My local music education hub is extremely effective
- b) My local music education hub is fairly effective
- c) My local music education hub is not effective
- d) I don't know

20. Hubs are groups of organisations and partnerships which seek to work together to ensure the best use of resources. How well do you feel your hub engages with local stakeholders, communities and partners?

- a) My local music education hub is extremely effective
- b) My local music education hub is fairly effective
- c) My local music education hub is not effective
- d) I don't know

21. What challenges do you think your local music education hub faces to effectively meet the roles listed above in your area?

22. Do you think the current core and extension roles for hubs are appropriate?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) I don't know

23. Please provide up to three examples of good practice that demonstrate a music education hub working effectively.

Q24: Music Technology

Music technology has evolved since the publication of the National Plan for Music Education in 2011, and supports the creation, recording and production of music. It also appears in both GCSE and A level syllabuses.

24. Please detail up to three uses of technology to deliver music education you are aware of which are particularly effective, and explain their effectiveness.

Q25-33: Questions for Young People aged 13-25

25. Which of these best describes your current stage in education?

- a) Secondary school student
- b) FE student
- c) Apprentice
- d) University or conservatoire student
- e) Attending a specialist music school
- f) I am no longer in education
- g) Other (please specify)

26. Why do you think music education is important?

- a) Music education is important to me because I want a career in music
- b) Music education is fun

- c) Music education improves my mental wellbeing
- d) Music education improves my confidence
- e) Music education helps me with my wider studies
- f) Music education isn't important to me
- g) Other (please provide details)

27. What music education activities do you currently engage in?

- a) I listen to music
- b) I take music as a subject in school
- c) I receive lessons on an instrument or for singing in school
- d) I receive lessons on an instrument or for singing outside of school
- e) I am learning an instrument or learning to sing using lessons online
- f) I am part of an ensemble (e.g. wind band, orchestra, choir, rock band) at school
- g) I am part of an ensemble (e.g. wind band, orchestra, choir, rock band) outside of school
- h) I create music
- i) I don't do any music
- j) Other (please provide details)

28. If you are engaged in musical activities outside of your normal school lessons, how did you find out about them?

- a) From my teachers
- b) From my parents/carers
- c) From my friends
- d) I found them online
- e) Other (please provide details)

29. Has anything stopped you taking up musical activities?

- a) I'm not interested
- b) I don't have time
- c) It's too expensive

- d) I'm not good enough
- e) The activities offered are not what I want
- f) My parents/carers don't think I should
- g) Other (please provide details)

30. Do you have any examples of music opportunities you have had either through your school or other organisations that have been positive? Please explain what they were, who provided them, whether you had help in some way to be able to take part, and what was so good about them.

31. If you have chosen to study a music qualification (e.g. GCSE or A level), please explain why.

32. If you wanted to study a music qualification but weren't able to, please explain why that was.

33. How would you find information about careers in music?

- a) Teachers
- b) Parents
- c) Friends
- d) Online, please specify
- e) I struggle to find any information
- f) Other (please provide details)

Q34-40: Questions for Parents and Carers

34. Which of these best describes your child's current stage in education?

- a) Primary school student
- b) Secondary school student
- c) FE student
- d) Apprentice
- e) University or conservatoire student

- f) Attending a specialist music school
- g) No longer in education
- h) Other (please specify)

35. Why do you think music education is important for your child?

- a) Music education is important because it will help my child's career
- b) Music education is fun for my child
- c) Music education improves my child's mental wellbeing
- d) Music education improves my child's confidence
- e) Music education helps my child with their wider studies
- f) Music education isn't important to me/my child
- g) Other (please provide details)

36. What music education activities does your child currently engage in?

- a) They listen to music
- b) They take music as a subject in school
- c) They receive lessons on an instrument or for singing in school
- d) They receive lessons on an instrument or for singing outside of school
- e) They are learning an instrument or learning to sing using lessons online
- f) They are part of an ensemble (e.g. wind band, orchestra, choir, rock band) at school
- g) They are part of an ensemble (e.g. wind band, orchestra, choir, rock band) outside of school
- h) They create music
- i) They don't do any music
- j) Other (please provide details)

37. How do you find the music education opportunities that you would like your children to take up?

- a) Recommendations from people I trust (e.g. teachers, parents, relatives, friends)

- b) Found online
- c) I only choose activities offered by the school my child attends
- d) Through the local music service or music education hub
- e) I have not found any
- f) Other (please provide details)

38. How do you decide which music education opportunities would be good for your child?

39. What is your opinion of the quality of the music education opportunities available to your child?

40. Has anything stopped your child taking up musical activities?

- a) They're not interested
- b) They don't have time
- c) It's too expensive
- d) They're not good enough
- e) It's more important for them to focus on other activities
- f) There's nothing available for them in our area
- g) Other (please provide details)

Q41-50: Questions for all Teachers and Schools, Colleges, Music Education Hubs and other Music Services

41. Are you responsible for delivering music education?

- a) Yes [if Yes, please go on to question 42]
- b) No [if No, please go on to question 46]

42. If you answered Yes to question 41, please indicate what sort of activity or activities you offer.

- a) School/FE or higher education (HE) music teaching in the classroom
- b) Individual or group instrumental, singing, theory or composition lessons
- c) Individual or group instrumental, singing, theory or composition lessons – out of school

- d) Ensembles and choirs
- e) Workshops or group sessions in or out of school
- f) Other (please provide details)

43. If you answered Yes to question 41, what differences (if any) have you seen in children and young people as a result of the music education activities that you are responsible for? Please tick all that apply and provide examples.

- a) Improved career prospects
- b) Improved mental wellbeing
- c) Improved confidence
- d) Improved attainment in their wider studies
- e) Improved attendance
- f) Improved engagement with peers
- g) Other (please provide details)

44. If you answered Yes to question 41, how do you know that these activities are having an impact on the children and young people and how do you evaluate this? If any of your evaluation is published, please provide links. Please provide up to three examples.

45. If you answered Yes to question 41, how do you ensure that these activities are high-quality?

Q46-50: For Classroom Teachers Only

46. What type of institution do you teach in?

- a) Primary School and/or Infant School
- b) 11-16 school
- c) 11-18 school
- d) FE or sixth-form college
- e) Other (please specify)

47. Which of the following statements best describes your level of confidence in delivering music education?

- a) Very confident
- b) Quite confident
- c) Somewhat lacking in confidence
- d) Extremely lacking in confidence

48. Which of the following sources would you look to in order to improve your knowledge and/or skills in teaching music?

- a) CPD offered through my school
- b) Training offered by my local music education hub
- c) Training offered by another music education provider
- d) Private learning done in my own time
- e) Other (please provide details)

49. Do you have any examples of music training you have had either through your school or other organisation that have been positive? Please explain what they were, who provided them and what was so good about them. Please provide up to three examples.

50. The Government supports a range of funded music programmes, including music education hubs. Based on any experience you have had working with these programmes, how could they better support you to deliver effective music provision?

Q51-55: Questions for Head Teachers and other Leaders in Education

51. What do you consider the key benefits of effective music provision in your school?

- a) Greater levels of confidence amongst pupils/students
- b) Improved academic performance in other subject areas
- c) Improved behavioural standards
- d) Greater sense of collegial spirit and togetherness
- e) More students choosing to study music at a higher level

- f) It is a valuable subject in its own right
- g) Music improves pupils' wellbeing
- h) Other (please specify)

52. When designing music provision, which of the following resources would you regularly use?

- a) National Curriculum on gov.uk
- b) The National Plan for Music Education
- c) Local music education hub
- d) Other music provider
- e) Other (please specify)

53. If you chose music education hub in the question above, how would you describe your relationship with your hub? You may provide additional detail if you wish.

- a) Excellent
- b) Good
- c) Adequate
- d) Poor
- e) Other (please specify)

54. If you are not engaging with your local music education hub, which of the following best explains why? You may provide additional detail if you wish.

- a) Lack of awareness of support available
- b) A negative previous experience
- c) The hub is not able to offer the support required
- d) No support required
- e) Other (please specify)

55. The Government supports a range of funded music programmes, including music education hubs. Based on any experience you have had working with these programmes:

55.1 Please provide up to three examples of how they have effectively supported you to deliver good music education.

55.2 How could they better support you to deliver effective music provision?

Q56-62: Questions for Employers in the Music Industry

56. Have you/your business actively engaged with a music education hub or other music education provision in your local area?

- a) Yes [if Yes, please go on to question 57]
- b) No [if No, please go on to question 58]

57. If you answered Yes to question 56, please provide up to three examples of good practice you experienced during this engagement which you consider to be mutually beneficial to both students and the music industry.

58. If you answered No to question 56, please tell us why?

- a) I am not aware of music education hubs/other music education provision in my local area
- b) My local music education hub is not effective
- c) The music education hub offer is not relevant for a career in the music industry
- d) Other (please specify)

59. Do you/your business offer any kind of skills/training to young people aiming to pursue a career in the music industry?

- a) Yes [if Yes, please go on to question 60]
- b) No [if No, please go on to question 61]

60. If you answered Yes to question 59, please give details.

61. If you answered No to question 59, please tell us why.

62. If you answered No to question 59, is there anything that might incentivise you to consider offering skills/training to young people

aiming to pursue a career in the music industry in the future? Please give up to three examples.

Thank you very much for completing the call for evidence. The results will be used to help us better understand what good music education looks like.

Please let us know any further comments or thoughts that you would like to share with us by emailing us at: Music.CONSULTATION@education.gov.uk



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2020

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Education Activities Update | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Daniel McGrady Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills) | |

Summary

This report updates Members on recent events and activities across the three strategies overseen by the Education Board: Education, Cultural and Creative Learning, and Skills. A calendar of forums and events over the 2019/20 academic year is included in **Appendix 1**.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the update on recent events and activities across the three strategy areas.
- Note the calendar of forums and events over the 2019/20 academic year in **Appendix 1**.

Main Report

Education

1. City of London and Liveries Education Network Meeting
The Strategic Education and Skills Director has established a City of London and Liveries Education Network which aims to convene the education leads across the Livery Companies with a strategic priority around education and skills. The Network will discuss, collaborate, and share best practice on education, cultural learning and experiences of the world of work. Several synergies are emerging across the network including a commitment to school improvement, a priority around social mobility and fusion skills, schools benefiting from economies of scale and ensuring continuous lasting impact. The January meeting was hosted by The Mercers' Company and the forthcoming meeting on 29 April 2020 will be hosted by The Skinners' Company.
2. Education Board Dinner – 12 February 2020
The Education Board's annual dinner was hosted at the Grocer's Hall. The Chair of the Education Board, Henry Colthurst, thanked Members and Headteachers from the Family of Schools for their hard work and commitment towards delivering exceptional education. Prefects from Newham Collegiate Sixth Form and the City of London School provided persuasive arguments both for and against formal examinations as a means of preparing young people for further study and the world of work. Education Board Member, Tim Campbell and Professor Armand D'Angour, Fellow and Tutor in Classics at Oxford, also offered their insights into academic and business success. The dinner was attended by esteemed guests from a range of organisations across Education, Culture and Skills including from Ofsted, London Local Authorities, the Livery Companies and others.

Cultural & Creative Learning

3. City Schools' Concert – 30 January 2020

The annual City Schools' Concert was hosted at the City of London School and united the Family of Schools to perform music, dance, choral and instrumental pieces themed on the Culture Mile venues. This year, each piece was a mixed-school performance and so pupils directly collaborated with pupils from other schools in the City of London Family of Schools, learning from and supporting each other. Paul Griffiths and Sigrun Sævarsdóttir-Griffiths produced the concert and facilitated the schools to collaboratively devise a whole-group performance. The Concert was opened by the Chair of the Education Board, Henry Colthurst, and the proceedings were closed by Deputy Chair of the Education Board, Ann Holmes. The feedback on the evening and the preparatory workshops has been overwhelmingly positive from pupils, teachers, parents and members of the audience. The concert supports the Cultural and Creative Learning Strategy through enabling pupils to perform in public performance spaces, whilst also developing pupils' Fusion Skills of collaboration, creativity and resilience.

Upcoming activities

4. Chess Tournament - 20 March 2020 – 12:30-15:30 – Livery Hall
The Family of Schools' Chess Tournament will take place in the Livery Hall and will facilitate primary and secondary school pupils to compete against each other in chess matches. The event supports pupils to develop the Fusion Skills of problem solving, autonomy and critical thinking. Members of the Education Board are invited to drop-in at any point during the event to see the Tournament in action.
5. Fusion Cities Meeting – 5 June 2020 – 08:00-15:00 – Mansion House
The second Fusion Cities Meeting will take place on 5 June 2020 hosted by the Lord Mayor, Alderman William Russell, at Mansion House. The meeting will bring together delegates from international cities with change-makers and experts from across education, culture and business to raise the profile and develop shared approaches to fusion skills. Last year's event focused on establishing the disruption factors which necessitate a transformation in what and how we learn. Since then, we have explored definitions of fusion and the practical ways to assess fusion skills in lifelong learning. The 2020 Fusion Cities meeting will serve to update on the progress since last meeting and pose the challenge of how we transform across a system, at scale and with maximum impact. The meeting will be an important next step in the shared focus on developing and enhancing skills for the future within an ethical context of social mobility and sustainability. Members of the Education Board will receive invitations to the event with an Eventbrite link to book.
6. The calendar of forums and events over the 2019/20 academic year is included in **Appendix 1**.

Appendices

- **Appendix 1** – Calendar of forums and events over the 2019/20 academic year linked to the Education, Cultural & Creative Learning, and Skills Strategies.

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)

T: 020 7332 1864

E: daniel.mcgrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Committee | Dated: |
| Education Board | 05/03/2020 |
| Subject: Apprenticeship Levy Policy Update | Public |
| Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services | For Information |
| Report author: Daniel McGrady Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills) | |

Summary

This report provides Members with the background and a summary of recent literature on the Apprenticeship Levy. This is brought to the Education Board noting their strategic remit over the Skills Strategy 2019-23 which commits to: ensuring that the City Corporation provides high quality apprenticeships; working with partners to achieve a diverse workforce; and fostering the City of London as a place of interconnectivity between industry, schools and businesses. Members are asked to note and discuss the report.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note and discuss the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The Apprenticeship Levy was introduced in the United Kingdom (UK) in April 2017¹. It is an annual tax of 0.5% on an employers' annual pay bill and is collected monthly by HMRC. It applies to all employers with an annual pay bill of over £3m including businesses, charities, public sector bodies and schools and multi-academy trusts.
2. The levy funds paid by an employer are then made available to 'claim back' through the Digital Apprenticeship Service for the sole purpose of training apprentices within the organisation using an approved training and assessment provider. Levy-paying employers have 24-months to spend their levy funding on apprenticeships, receiving a 10% top-up from the UK Government. Any unspent levy is made available to other employers for the same purpose. The levy can be spent on training and assessment for apprentices only and cannot cover the cost of wages, travel, recruitment, licensing or any other business requirements for taking on apprentices.
3. The Apprenticeship Levy was introduced by the Government to increase the amount and improve the quality of apprenticeships in the UK as well as devolving the responsibility to employers for identifying and sourcing apprentices based on skill requirements.

Current position

4. This report provides Members with data and recent literature on the Apprenticeship Levy. The data and evaluation of the City of London's apprenticeship programme will be included in the annual report from the Adult

¹ It was first announced in the [Chancellor's 2015 Budget Speech](#), was set out strategically in November 2015 in the [Government's consultation response](#) and became legislation in the [Part 6, Finance Act 2016](#).

Skills and Education Services (ASES) due to be submitted to the May 2020 meeting of the Education Board.

2018/19 Data

5. Numbers, achievement and progress

- According to statistics from the Department for Education (DfE), a total of 393,400 apprenticeship starts were reported for the 2018/19 Academic Year, a 4.7% increase from 2017/18 (375,800) but 22.8% lower than the number in 2015/16 (509,400) prior to the introduction of the Apprenticeship Levy².
- Of the total number of apprenticeships starts, 56.9% were levy-supported starts.
- In 2018/19, there were more apprenticeships at Level 4 and less at Levels 2 and 3 showing a trend towards higher-level apprenticeships.
- There were slight increases in the number of apprenticeship-starts by people who are from a black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) group and people who have a learning disability than the previous year.
- In 2018/19, the number of achievements³ and level of participation⁴ showed a downward trend since before the introduction of the apprenticeship levy.
- There is an upward trend in the length of apprenticeships and number of off-the-job training hours. This has been attributed to the rise in higher-level apprenticeships which take longer and require more intense training. The average length of an apprenticeship was 611 days in 2018/19 compared with 498 days in 2015/16 and the number of training hours was 670 hours compared with 630.

6. Young starters and workforce entrants

- The DfE statistics on KS4 leaver destinations⁵ show a steady percentage of pupils entering apprenticeships over time (between 4-5%). There is no evidence to suggest that the Apprenticeship Levy has had an impact on pupils choosing apprenticeships as a progression route after Key Stages 4 and 5.
- In a recent briefing paper published by the House of Commons Library⁶, the data shows that the age profile of people starting apprenticeships changed between 2017/18 and 2018/19, with a lower proportion of starts from younger apprentices. Meanwhile the proportion of starts by apprentices aged 25 or over increased by 5% from the previous year.
- In November 2018, a DfE survey⁷ of apprentices revealed that most apprenticeships (62%) go to existing employees rather than new labour market entrants.

7. Sector trends

- In 2018/19, over half of apprenticeship starts were in Business Administration and Law (30%) and Health, Public Services and Care (25%). Engineering and

²https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/848534/FE_and_Skills_commentary_November_2019.pdf

³ Completion of an apprenticeship.

⁴ Number of apprenticeships in a given year.

⁵https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/860135/Destinations_main_text_2020_REV.pdf

⁶ <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06113/SN06113.pdf>

⁷https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/808273/BRA_NDED-Learners_and_Apprentices_Survey_2018_-_Main_Report_-_14_May_2019_-_Clean.pdf

Manufacturing Technologies and Retail and Commercial Enterprise were also popular sectors.

- There are very few apprenticeship starts in the Arts, Media and Publishing and the Science and Mathematics sectors. This is disconnected with the aspirations of young people reflected in a recent report from Education and Employers⁸ showing that the Arts, Culture, Entertainment and the Sport and Legal, Professional, Scientific and Technical sectors were the top preferences for young people across the world. Similarly, pupils across London surveyed at the London Careers Festival⁹ chose Arts and Communications and Science, Technology and Engineering among their top preferred sectors.

Other reports on opportunities and challenges

8. Reported Opportunities arising from the Apprenticeship Levy

- On the two-year anniversary of the Levy, the then Minister for Apprenticeships and Skills (The Rt Hon Anne Milton) published a statement¹⁰ which highlighted the following benefits of the Apprenticeship Levy:
 - There is more funding than ever before for apprenticeship training;
 - There is flexibility in the system for employers to transfer their Levy funds to other organisations, helping smaller businesses;
 - The introduction of the National Apprenticeship Service offers support to businesses and apprentices.
- Additionally, London Councils identified that enabling employers to recruit apprentices based on their identified skills gaps and the scope to develop Training Standards in their sectors are key opportunity areas¹¹.

9. Reported Challenges arising from the Apprenticeship Levy

- The number of apprenticeship starts is reducing over time. The National Audit Office reported¹² that in 2017/18, only 9% of available Levy-funding was drawn down from employers to fund apprenticeship training in their organisations.
- The quality of apprenticeship training is dependent on the quality of the training provider. According to Ofsted's annual report¹³, as at 31 August 2019, 22% of apprenticeship providers that had received a 'new apprenticeship provider monitoring visit' were judged to have made inadequate progress in at least one area.
- The results of an employer survey published by CIPD in a July 2019¹⁴ revealed that over a third (36%) of employers had used the Levy to upskill their existing workforce, over a fifth (22%) stated that they had used it on training that would have happened anyway, 15% stated that it had been used to accredit skills that existing employees already have and 14% reported that it had directed funds away from other, more appropriate forms of training.

⁸ <https://www.educationandemployers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Disconnected-Career-aspirations-and-jobs-in-the-UK-1.pdf>

⁹ <http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s121222/Appendix%201%20-%20London%20Careers%20Festival%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/key-facts-you-should-know-about-the-apprenticeship-levy>

¹¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/apprenticeship-levy>

¹² <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/The-apprenticeships-programme-Summary.pdf>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/further-education-and-skills-inspections-and-outcomes-as-at-31-august-2019/further-education-and-skills-inspections-and-outcomes-as-at-31-august-2019-main-findings>

¹⁴ https://www.cipd.co.uk/Images/addressing-employer-underinvestment-in-training_tcm18-61265.pdf

- The CIPD report also highlighted the widely reported ‘rebadging’ of existing graduate schemes and the use of the Levy for generic leadership and management training. The employer survey revealed that more than a third were looking to use their levy pot in this way and the Team Leader/Supervisor had the most starts of any standard for 2017/18. This approach taken by employers could limit the access to apprenticeships for lower-skilled and younger people entering the workforce.

Strategic considerations

10. Members of the Education Board have a strategic interest in the Apprenticeship Levy due to its influence over the outcomes in the Skills Strategy. In particular, Members may want to consider this update as it relates to:

- Strategic and partnership work with businesses and employers in the City of London and beyond
- Progression routes and pathways for pupils in the City of London Family of Schools
- Education Board-funded work-related learning and careers events, e.g. London Careers Festival
- The City Corporation’s provision of levy and non-levy funded apprenticeships
- The advocacy of fusion skills across lifelong learning

Conclusion

This report provides Members with the background and a summary of recent literature on the Apprenticeship Levy noting the Education Board’s strategic remit over the Skills Strategy 2019-23.

Appendices

No appendices.

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)

T: 020 7332 1864

E: daniel.mcgrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank