

## Response ID ANON-EKAK-F3MF-8

Submitted to **Schools that Work for Everyone**

Submitted on **2016-12-12 14:30:34**

### Introduction

**1 Welcome – would you like to provide your email address?**

**Email::**

paula.graham@chead.ac.uk

**2 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select which type of organisation you represent.**

**Please select::**

Representative body for higher education institutions/staff

**If you selected 'other', please specify::**

**Please provide the name of your organisation::**

Council for Higher Education in Art & Design (CHEAD)

**3 If you are responding as an individual, please select your interest in the schools system.**

**Please select:**

**If you have selected 'other', please specify::**

**4 What local authority area are you based in?**

**Please select:**

### Families who are just about managing

**5 How can we better understand the impact of policy on a wider cohort of pupils whose life chances are profoundly affected by school but who may not qualify or apply for free school meals?**

**Please see families who are just about managing section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

**6 How can we identify them?**

**Please see families who are just about managing section in the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

### Independent Schools

**7 What contribution could the biggest and most successful independent schools make to the state school system?**

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

**8 Are there other ways in which independent schools can support more good school places and help children of all backgrounds to succeed?**

Not Answered

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

**9 Are these the right expectations to apply to all independent schools to ensure they do more to improve state education locally?**

Not Answered

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

**10 What threshold should we apply to capture those independent schools who have the capacity to sponsor or set up a new school or offer funded places, and to exempt those that do not?**

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

#### **11 Is setting benchmarks the right way to implement these requirements?**

Not Answered

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

#### **12 Should we consider legislation to allow the Charity Commission to revise its guidance, and to remove the benefits associated with charitable status from those independent schools which do not comply?**

Not Answered

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area.

#### **13 Are any other changes necessary to secure the Government's objectives?**

Not Answered

**Please see Independent Schools section of the consultation:**

We have no data in this area.

### **Universities**

#### **14 How can the academic expertise of universities be brought to bear on our schools system, to improve school-level attainment and in doing so widen access?**

**Please see Universities section of the consultation document:**

Ensuring the continuity and quality of secondary creative education and CPD is of considerable concern to our members. We are already aware of a crisis in the creative skills pipeline resulting, in part, from the exclusion of creative subjects from EBacc [NSEAD 2016 Survey <http://www.nsead.org/downloads/survey.pdf>] and the Crafts Council's 2016 report Studying Craft [<http://www.craftscouncil.org.uk/what-we-do/studyingcraft>]. It is crucial that creative education is properly supported and included in mainstream curriculae at primary and secondary levels.

Involvement with schools is also welcomed as an excellent opportunity to ignite interest in creative subjects at an early age and so see it developed coherently through more 'joined up' pathways. However, we have strong concerns that the approach outlined here is more likely to restrict access to creative skills rather than widening participation. At present, pupils in independent schools are most likely to have access to creative education, we believe this proposal would intensify rather than ameliorate exclusion of less privileged communities from creative education.

Most of CHEAD's member Higher Education Institutions (HEI) already have strong involvement with local schools and many include FE provision as well as informal sponsorship of local schools. "Around half of England's higher education institutions have some kind of sponsorship arrangement with schools, mainly backing academies or university technical colleges, but so far there have been only around 10 university free schools." [Guardian 21/3/16: <https://is.gd/WI8XHe>] These include successful initiatives in the creative sector by CHEAD member HEIs which can provide models for modernising creative education in schools: the collaboration between Ravensbourne and the Stationers' Company to found a new Greenwich academy [<https://is.gd/WxJdLo>] which will become the first to specialise in digital media; and Plymouth College of Art's freeschool Plymouth School of Creative Arts. There is more comprehensive data on schools sponsored by Higher Education providers in HEFCE's policy briefing [<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/workprovide/schools/>]. We have also noted independent enterprise initiatives such as the Plymouth Arts Academy [<https://theartacademyportsmouth.com>].

Most of our members are already extremely active in nurturing creative education in local schools. Cleveland College of Art and Design (CCAD), for example, besides offering high quality FE provision, also collaborated extensively with schools on 14-19 Provision [<https://is.gd/VfcQu3>]. CCAD regularly provides ad hoc cover for local schools experiencing difficulties in delivering creative subjects, runs regular 'taster' events and Saturday clubs, and engages extensively with the regional NSEAD Chapter.

Many of our member HEIs already have experience of Ofsted governance frameworks through their involvement with local schools or in-house FE provision. Closer involvement in school governance is also welcomed as this offers full participation in decisions relating to curriculum mix. An art and design advocate on a governing body can make a marked difference locally.

We have noted that the successful free school projects commonly have co-sponsorship between an HEI and either a Guild, local authority, and/or major corporate partner and that in many cases there can be further barriers in developing these relationships where, for example, a local authority may not be keen to support free schools or in areas of creative employment where small-scale enterprise is the norm and there are few, if any, substantial corporations with adequate resources and with a concerned awareness of skills shortages. The scale of this proposal is likely to outrun the capacity of key partners.

There is increasing competition, furthermore, among small, specialist creative HEIs to recruit new students locally in some areas which is likely to intensify in an increasingly competitive global recruitment context and Brexit. This presents further challenges to HEIs in developing successful partnerships with local schools. Area Reviews [<https://is.gd/YuHfkD>] were intended to resolve resilience issues but with partial success at best. It is, as yet, unclear what effects the deregulation Degree Awarding Powers [DAPs] will have in this context.

#### **15 Are there other ways in which universities could be asked to contribute to raising school-level attainment?**

Yes (please provide further comments below)

**Please see Universities section of consultation document:**

CHEAD's members' concern has deepened following publication of NSEAD's 2016 Survey [<http://www.nsead.org/downloads/survey.pdf>] and we have been meeting with NSEAD and with Higher Education Subject Associations as well as other sector organisations to explore how to address the crisis in creative secondary education revealed by the survey whilst making best use of very limited resources.

Through this initial exploration it has become extremely clear to us that the primary barrier is one of resources. There is no shortage of good ideas and commitment and, indeed, a great deal of existing activity. HEIs already have specialised staff engaged in schools outreach activities, NSEAD has a network of committed teachers, the HE Subject Associations have the expertises and many HEIs have strong industry partnerships. We have met with nothing but enthusiasm to engage creatively with the problem of providing creative education opportunities for children and CPD for school teachers and thus securing the feed to creative HEIs. The issue is that there is extremely limited resource for this kind of work within HEIs and within equally overstretched sector organisations as well as schools also already struggling with resourcing issues. We believe such models as the Ravensbourne Greenwich Academy should be disseminated but we must also address the issue of adequate creative CPD for teachers in mainstream schools and additional provision outside schools. We are considering approaching national academy chains in order to explore whether successful initiatives can be scaled via national academy networks to support more creative education in mainstream academies.

We have no data on the success of independent enterprise approaches at local level but such initiatives can at least part-fund by charging reasonable fees to participants. This approach, however, seems extremely likely to favour children living in areas where there are sufficient private resources to pay for fee-based educational supplement and to defeat efforts to provide a more level playing field.

**16 Is the DfA guidance the most effective way of delivering these new requirements?**

No (please provide further comments below)

**Please see Universities section of the consultation document:**

Changes in the way that HEIs engage with schools needs to take account of the Progression Agreement models intended to ensure higher progression rates into Higher Education particularly for learners from vocational and non-traditional backgrounds. This kind of freeschool provision may be expected to manifest some of the disadvantages of more traditional forms of selective provision in that parents with access to resources will seek to 'game' the system, further disadvantaging children from poorer backgrounds.

Provision must avoid the 'postcode' stratification of secondary education which may act to restrict children's choices at the point of secondary selection leading to effective 'lock out' of entrance of students from non-selective schools who are subsequently unexpectedly successful in qualifying for university entrance. Conversely, students attending selective university schools may find it more difficult to change their focus as they develop. If HE becomes increasingly stratified as an outcome of the Higher Education Bill there would also be a tendency to 'lock in' children selected for creative and technical subjects to the Post-1992 sector at the point of university entrance. Selection at the age of 11 should not become iron-clad destiny.

**17 What is the best way to ensure that all universities sponsor schools as a condition of higher fees?**

**Please see Universities section of the consultation document:**

In our consultations with our member HEIs and with other organisations, including NSEAD and the Crafts Council, there are clear indications that increasing the existing levels of engagement with schools to more formal governance arrangements will pose significant resourcing issues. Currently, school sponsorship and engagement represents an indirect cost to our member HEIs, mainly in the form of staff time. We note that government would meet capital and revenue costs for the setup of free schools but more formalised sponsorship and direct engagement in governance could significantly increase the level of indirect cost for HEIs to challenging levels. It is also not clear whether direct costs incurred by the provider HEI in setting up free schools would be met as part of the revenue cost of the free school. It is difficult, therefore, to speculate on how this condition might be met within existing resources.

**18 Should we encourage universities to take specific factors into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment?**

Yes (please provide further comments below)

**Please see Universities section of the consultation document:**

Again, many of our member HEIs already engage in such activities and would very much welcome the opportunity to expand their involvement as it is strongly in their interests to do so. Currently, such engagement is restricted by the resource intensity of activities and this proposal offers no solution to resource constraints.

Overall, we are far from convinced that this proposal can deliver the kind of radical intervention in creative secondary education which we feel is crucial to the future of this vibrant sector. It represents merely a step-change in extensive existing work and, in the absence of additional resource to underpin an intensification of HEI involvement, we would expect that it runs the risk either of focusing what is currently an extensive approach too narrowly, or overstressing existing strategic and practical engagement with schools and negatively impacting the quality of these initiatives. We are already concerned that children from independent schools are far more likely to have encountered high-quality creative education than children attending state schools - we find it difficult to envision how further selection will be able to deliver improvement on the necessary scale.

CHEAD's membership is very deeply concerned about the crisis in creative education in schools and has been exploring the issues with NSEAD to identify the most effective approach to addressing this within available resources. What is needed is radical innovation in provision of creative CPD in mainstream schools coupled with the inclusion of creative education in the mainstream curriculum. The kind of selective provision outlined in this proposal seems overly prescriptive, lacking in the necessary scope, and failing to take into account the enormous effort already undertaken by HEIs in the creative sector.

**Selective Schools**

**19 How should we best support existing grammars to expand?**

**Please see Selective Schools section in the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**20 What can we do to support the creation of either wholly or partially new selective schools?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**21 How can we support existing non-selective schools to become selective?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**22 Are these the right conditions to ensure that selective schools improve the quality of non-selective places?**

Not Answered

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**23 Are there other conditions that we should consider as requirements for new or expanding selective schools, and existing non-selective schools becoming selective?**

Not Answered

**Please see Selective Schools section in the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**24 What is the right proportion of children from lower income households for new selective schools to admit?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**25 Are these sanctions the right ones to apply to schools that fail to meet the requirements?**

Not Answered

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**26 If not, what other sanctions might be effective in ensuring selective schools contribute to the number of good non-selective places locally?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**27 How can we best ensure that new and expanding selective schools and existing non-selective schools becoming selective are located in the areas that need good school places the most?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**28 How can we best ensure that the benefits of existing selective schools are brought to bear on local non-selective schools?**

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**29 Are there other things we should ask of existing selective schools to ensure they support non-selective education in their areas?**

Not Answered

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**30 Should the conditions we intend to apply to new or expanding selective schools also apply to existing selective schools?**

Not Answered

**Please see Selective Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

## **Faith Schools**

**31 Are these the right alternative requirements to replace the 50% rule?**

Not Answered

**Please see Faith Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**32 How else might we ensure that faith schools espouse and deliver a diverse, multi-faith offer to parents within a faith school environment?**

**Please see Faith Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**33 Are there other ways in which we can effectively monitor faith schools for integration and hold them to account for performance?**

Not Answered

**Please see Faith Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>

**34 Are there other sanctions we could apply to faith schools that do not meet this requirement?**

Not Answered

**Please see Faith Schools section of the consultation document:**

We have no data in this area and would support the more expertly informed position of the NSEAD <http://www.nsead.org/>