



**Investigation into support packages
for schools who apply for an Artsmark Award
from September 2011**

**Anne Gallacher
January 2011**

CONTENTS

- 1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
- 2. BACKGROUND**
 - 2.1 Context
 - 2.2 The new Artsmark test
 - 2.3 The brief
- 3. METHODOLOGY**
- 4. OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH**
 - 4.1 Challenges faced by schools and colleges in the Artsmark process
 - 4.2 Existing and recent school and college support models
 - 4.3 School kitemarks in other curriculum areas
 - 4.4 Arts Award training model
- 5. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS**
- 6. RECOMMENDATIONS**
- 7. NEXT STEPS**

APPENDIX 1 – CONSULTEES

APPENDIX 2 – KITEMARK COMPARATORS

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who took part in this research. Consultation was carried out by phone and through written feedback from schools and Artsmark assessors, and all those I spoke to are listed in Appendix 1. Everyone who contributed to the research process was generous with their time and their feedback, sharing valuable insights and experience.

In particular I would like to thank Charlie Bunker, Artsmark Test Manager, Arts Council England, for her contribution throughout this consultancy, and Chantal Kennedy and Lucy Bampton from the Artsmark team for their support.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Context

Artsmark is Arts Council England's national awards scheme, which recognises schools' commitment to the arts. Artsmark has run for 10 years and its key aims are:

- to encourage schools to increase the range, quantity and type of arts that are provided to children and young people;
- to raise the profile of arts education.

It provides a 'kitemark' for arts provision in a school, indicating that children and young people have access to a wide range of experiences in art, dance, drama and music as part of their education. Over 4500 schools currently have Artsmark status, representing almost 20% of all schools in England.

The application for Artsmark acts as an auditing tool through which schools can gain an overall picture of their arts education provision. Artsmark has been awarded at three levels: Artsmark, Artsmark Silver and Artsmark Gold. All three levels provide a positive endorsement, a genuine incentive and a great source of pride for participating schools.

The future of Artsmark is under review, and the Arts Council is currently developing a revised model with a view to relaunching Artsmark in September 2011.

2.2 The new Artsmark test

Following consultation with key stakeholders and a survey of Artsmark schools in summer 2010, a new streamlined process has been tested and is now being refined. The award is now available at two levels – Artsmark and Artsmark Gold – and all information will be submitted via an online application system currently in development.

A two part application process has been introduced. Part 1 – 'Are You Ready For Artsmark?' - enables an initial eligibility assessment based on quantitative data; this

is assessed at one level which is equivalent to the old Silver level, requiring at least 12% of curriculum time dedicated to the arts. Part 2 focuses on qualitative information, and schools are asked to select whether they wish to apply for Artsmark or Artsmark Gold; all applicants answer a standard set of questions and there are additional questions for Gold applicants.

During the test process, schools who were unsuccessful at Part 1 received a support visit from an assessor, aiming to support the school in submitting a successful re-application in the future. Schools who submitted Part 2 of the application received an assessment visit, during which the assessor advised the school if they were meeting the criteria, and suggested areas for development.

Of the 87 schools and colleges invited to participate, 52 schools and 5 FE colleges took part in the Artsmark test process, and at the time of writing the test is being evaluated. A further group of schools who are part of the Royal Shakespeare Company's network are currently trialling a peer assessment model, and the Royal Opera House will also undertake a test of the forms and peer assessment process between January and March.

Feedback will be taken on board and the revised process will be finalised in the spring, before the national relaunch in September.

2.3 The consultancy brief

This consultancy aimed to identify a range of potential support options for schools applying for an Artsmark award, taking account of issues of scalability subject to the available budget. The brief asked for consideration to be given to the various areas of expertise required, and the differing types of support needed at each stage of the process.

3. METHODOLOGY

This report is based on the following research activities:

- Review of the Artsmark test paperwork;
- Consultation with colleagues working on the Artsmark test:
 - The Arts Council's Artsmark team
 - Felicity Woolf, who devised the original Artsmark and also the revised test model
 - Tom Fleming, who is carrying out an independent evaluation of the test
 - Rob Elkington, Head of Education Partnerships at the Royal Shakespeare Company;
- Review of feedback on the Artsmark test from schools, colleges and assessors - see below for more details;
- Attendance at assessment visits to Kings Langley School in Hertfordshire and Penn School in High Wycombe; the former is a secondary school and

specialist arts college, and the latter a secondary school for young people with communication difficulties;

- Consultation on existing school support models in the arts; consultees were suggested by the Arts Council's regional Learning and Skills Relationship Managers, and are listed in Appendix 1;
- Web-based research into other school kitemarks across a range of curriculum areas; see Appendix 2 for full details;
- Consultation with Arts Award on their training model.

School feedback material

Online questionnaires were used to gather feedback from schools at three key points in the test process – after completion of Part 1, after the support visit for those who were unsuccessful at Part 1, and after completing Part 2 for those who continued to that stage.

In addition, schools who completed Part 2 and received an assessment visit were asked to complete an evaluation form, which in some cases was actually completed by their assessors.

Assessor feedback

Assessors were also asked to complete a feedback form after each visit, and this was followed up with a phone conversation with assessors who made particular observations around school support; these assessors are listed in Appendix 1.

4. OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH

4.1 Challenges faced by schools and colleges in the Artsmark process

This section of the report has been informed by feedback from schools and assessors who took part in the test process, and observations from consultees who were involved in supporting schools applying for the 'old' Artsmark. Some feedback in this section is likely to overlap with feedback in the wider evaluation process.

The challenges faced by schools in preparing for the application process vary, but the following points were raised by a number of consultees:

- many schools find it challenging to develop an arts policy
- schools in a county with very few professional arts organisations may struggle to find arts partners, and may have little or no experience of working with artists and arts organisations as a result
- some committed teachers may not have the support of their Headteacher and therefore may struggle in achieving a team approach

The research highlighted some areas of the country where support mechanisms are likely to be available for Artsmark when it is relaunched – usually through local authorities - while in other parts of the country support is unlikely to be available (see section 4.2 for more details). Similarly existing school clusters and networks

were highlighted as being valuable to schools going through the application process, but they do not exist in an appropriate format everywhere. This could lead to a 'postcode lottery', with some schools more likely to find support locally than others.

Many schools who participated in the test and were new Artsmark applicants struggled with the criteria, and suggested the need for additional written support. Suggestions from schools and assessors included:

- Case studies of successful schools, showing the impact across the curriculum;
- Online forms available as reference copy PDFs, so schools can make an informed decision on whether or not to apply, and can identify support needs and an appropriate timescale before registering;
- Exemplar answers to both Part 1 and Part 2 of the process;
- Some sample successful applications to help schools benchmark themselves;
- Access to the guidance provided to assessors;
- FAQ document.

Some consultees pointed out that the timing of paperwork being issued can be a challenge, i.e. if new paperwork is issued in September for a November deadline, this is very late for schools who are preparing their applications.

Unsurprisingly, schools taking part in the test who had not applied for the 'old' Artsmark expressed greater support needs than those who had previously completed the old-style form. Some said they would have liked to talk to a more experienced school, and the lack of someone to consult was a challenge for many new schools – they wanted a contact person to clarify things and to ask questions of as they wrote their application. One of the schools I visited commented on how valuable they find the Arts Award Helpdesk, and suggested that something similar for Artsmark would be useful.

The support visit to test schools who were unsuccessful at Part 1, and the assessment visit to those who completed Part 2, were valued by participating schools. The opportunity to discuss their applications and the challenges they encountered with someone with a broad understanding of the arts in a school context was a helpful development tool, and in most cases would inform future progress.

Schools had varying responses to questions about the need for training in advance of the application process. Only a small sample completed the online questionnaire after submitting Part 2 of the application, however of those who responded only 30% thought training would be valuable. Assessor feedback suggested that training would be valuable for schools going through the process for the first time, but less support is needed thereafter. Some respondents said that any trainers should have a full understanding of education phases and models, though one school would have welcomed artist input to support their work towards Artsmark.

Schools and colleges suggested the possibility of networking opportunities that bring together successful schools with new applicants, and one suggestion was that this

approach could be cross-phase, i.e. acknowledging that primary, secondary, special and FE institutions could all learn from each other's practice.

Some schools and assessors raised questions about the lack of opportunity for progression after Artsmark Gold has been awarded, and particularly highlighted the fact that there were schools within the test process who had been awarded Gold on 3 successive occasions.

A number of schools and assessors raised the issue of rigour in assessment if external visits are not part of the process, with the potential for schools who are good at form-filling doing better than those who are not. Some people stressed the need for clarity on whether the scheme is a development programme for schools or an award, or both. One person raised a concern about the Arts Council's role if the scheme tries to play both roles, questioning whether the integrity of the award would be maintained if the Arts Council both leads the development process and makes the award.

There were mixed responses to questions about payment for Artsmark, with some schools saying they would pay if support and/or an assessor visit is included in the package, some saying that they would only pay for support, and others saying that they would not pay. This was a small sample, however it is worth noting that there have previously been local training and support models across the country for which schools have paid (see section 4.2 for more details).

Finally, although not directly relevant to the brief for this work, it is perhaps also important to note that many consultees emphasised the positive impact on schools of the annual regional celebrations.

4.2 Existing and recent school and college support models

I consulted a number of organisations who support the development of schools' and colleges' arts provision, to explore the benefits and challenges of different support models. Almost every model that I identified had some connection with Artsmark, and it would certainly appear that many school arts development programmes in recent years have seen Artsmark as an important mechanism for school improvement.

The most common model of Artsmark support provided before the current test process included a training seminar followed by some form of one-to-one support, either face to face or by phone, however the context and financial arrangements for this support varied. As examples:

- KEAP, Truro, offered a free seminar for any school interested in applying for Artsmark, after which a one-to-one support meeting could be arranged at cost of £60. During the individual meeting, the draft application would be reviewed in detail.
- ArtForms, the Music and Arts Service for Leeds schools, has held an Artsmark briefing session each spring, followed by a development session in the

autumn for schools who have decided to apply, and ongoing support for individual schools where necessary; no charge has been made for this support in the past. Alongside this, ArtForms offers a range of developmental packages that are sold to schools, including support in undertaking an arts audit and developing an arts policy.

- The Forge in County Durham have piloted a school membership scheme which offered a range of benefits including Artsmark support; a seminar and individual surgery were offered, and non-member schools could also make use of this service at a cost of £10 for the seminar and £40 for the surgery.
- Halton Council offers an “Arts and Cultural Education Service” which schools can buy into on a Service Level Agreement basis. A range of provision and support is provided including a programme of CPD. A termly Arts Education Network meeting is open to all schools (whether or not they are subscribers), and has been used to promote and brief schools on Artsmark. Artsmark has been seen by the authority as a key mechanism for increasing arts provision and improving quality, and support is given to schools who are applying through their Service Level Agreement. Experienced schools have also acted as support for schools going through the process for the first time.
- Gateshead and Newcastle Councils’ Cultural Ambassadors Network was set up to ensure the widest possible access to culture for children and young people. An adult in any organisation that works with young people volunteers to act as a conduit for all material from cultural organisations, becoming the Cultural Ambassador. Alongside the information-sharing mechanisms that are in place, Gateshead and Newcastle Creativity Development Team offer advice and support, and the network has actively promoted Artsmark as well as offering CPD to schools who are applying. Central to the Cultural Ambassadors Network is a Virtual Learning Environment, which enables schools to share their experiences with each other. At present the only activities that schools and youth groups are charged for are CPD.
- North Herts College – a National Skills Academy founder college – operates a number of peer networking groups that support curriculum development; some of this work is based on geographical relationships (e.g. with Amersham & Wycombe College), while others are with colleges that are further afield but share aspirations and/or characteristics (e.g. City College, Norwich). Staff are involved across a range of levels (managers, lecturing staff, support staff), and are released to undertake visits and related activities; this requires a budget allocation to ensure necessary cover.

Some consultees stressed that working with schools when their thinking on Artsmark is at an early stage can help identify those who are not ready to apply, and to plan support that would prepare them for a successful application over time. Consultees also highlighted the fact that schools who are applying to renew their status need considerably less support than schools going through the process for the first time.

It was also pointed out that attendance at training and time spent in developing the application is a cost for each school/college.

The future for providers

The local authority contacts I spoke to all saw value for their authority in encouraging schools to apply for Artsmark, and were intending to relaunch their own support mechanisms when the revised programme is relaunched nationally. Local authority relationships with schools are changing however, and where arts posts remain within education or children's services teams they will almost certainly charge for their services (as many do already).

For cultural organisations who have offered support to schools in the past, the outcome of the current National Portfolio Funding Application process will be key to their future work in this area.

A key issue moving forward, therefore, is that available support is likely to be patchy. In some areas, arts advisers and/or school improvement staff are expected to remain despite the imminent cuts, though their services are very likely to be charged for. In other areas those posts (where they still exist) are likely to be cut. Similarly the future of cultural organisations who have previously provided support is currently uncertain. As a result, schools could find themselves in a 'postcode lottery', with some finding it easy to access local support and others not having any support to draw on.

A related issue is that the Arts Council has no mechanism to ensure the quality or consistency of any training available around the country, nor to ascertain that the training and support is up-to-date.

Encouragement and support for schools whose arts provision is not yet strong

Some consultees raised a concern about the impact of the current cuts programme on development work with schools who do not currently prioritise the arts, and had questions about whether Artsmark is an award or part of a school improvement strategy, or both. They felt that the loss of Creative Partnerships and other national initiatives will result in a gap in models of good practice that can inspire developments elsewhere.

One option that was suggested was the development of a package based on Creative Partnerships' Creative Agent model, which would offer a 'creative friend' to the school to support the development of their arts programme. This could be designed to support the school in auditing their work and filling any gaps that exist in relation to Artsmark criteria.

4.3 School kitemarks in other curriculum areas

I carried out web-based research into other school kitemarks, and the full findings are attached in Appendix 2. With the exception of the Healthy Schools Mark this research did not identify any planned changes to these kitemarks due to new government policy and/or budget cuts, though it is likely that at least some of the existing schemes will change.

The research identified a range of kitemark models, and I would highlight the following observations and questions as being particularly relevant to this research:

Development tool or kitemark?

Most of the examples provide both a development mechanism and a kitemark, though the balance in emphasis between the two varies. For example, the Eco-Schools programme guides schools towards sustainability and also makes awards based on achievement, whereas Governor Mark (a relatively new initiative) acknowledges that some development work may be needed between first and second assessment visits, however they state that the Mark is an accreditation programme not a training initiative.

The Healthy Schools programme will no longer offer a national kitemark from April 2011, but will continue as a development programme only.

Assessment approaches – self-evaluation and assessor visit

Models range from self-evaluation only (e.g. Design Mark), self-evaluation followed by random moderation visits (e.g. Healthy Schools), peer scrutiny of self-evaluation (e.g. Quality in Study Support), self-evaluation at lower levels and assessor visits at higher levels (e.g. Eco-Schools), and assessor visits for all applicants (e.g. Inclusion Quality Mark).

The assessment approach does not always relate directly to cost, e.g. Design Mark is charged for despite only offering a self-evaluation process, whereas the Eco-Schools programme is free. However most of the listed programmes that require an assessor visit do make a charge.

Support mechanisms

Obviously the focus of this consultancy is support for schools going through the Artsmark process, and a range of support models is on offer across the kitemark schemes that I have looked at:

- *Online resources*
Many of the programmes offer online resources. The Eco-Schools site is particularly strong in this area, including Case Studies, Review and Action Plan templates, sample Eco-Codes for schools, lists of potential funders, and links to a wide range of other relevant websites. Similarly the national Healthy Schools site includes a wide range of resources, which is augmented by resources provided on local area sites.
- *Wider support included in price of package*
Design Mark offers mentor support by phone, which is provided by successful schools as a condition of their award; a school visit can be arranged at an extra cost. Quality in Study Support offers support from a 'critical friend'

which is included in the cost of the award. Healthy School Status has offered support and training through their local co-ordinators, and the International School Award programme also has a network of regional and local contacts who can offer support.

The Basic Skills Quality Mark offers a subscription model which includes the first assessment, a support visit after 18 months, and the renewal assessment, all within an annual subscription package.

- *Bought in training and support packages*
The Basic Skills Quality Mark offers Guidance Booklets at a cost of £7.05. The Eco-Schools programme offers training on specific aspects of environmental development at a cost, and the Inclusion Quality Mark offers chargeable support for which quotes are provided on request.
- *Peer / network support*
As outlined above, Design Mark schools are expected to offer support to other schools applying for the award. Similarly schools applying for the Inclusion Quality Mark can be put in touch with a successful school, and the Stephen Lawrence Education Standard requires schools to work in partnership with other schools for revalidation. The Quality in Study Support programme is a little unclear as to who can be a 'critical friend' within their process, however their emphasis on peer scrutiny of self-evaluation would suggest that this role is taken by other teachers.

Costs

The costs vary from schemes that are free, to £1,200 for validation as an Advanced Level Study Support Centre.

Award numbers were not available online for every kitemark, but of those who provided this information Healthy Schools and Eco-Schools have the highest number of awards. Healthy Schools expects to reach 92% of schools by the time the national award comes to an end in March. While it is reasonable to assume that the lack of a charge is relevant, it is also important to note that there has been extensive local promotion and support for Healthy Schools, and the award has been the most closely aligned to school priorities related to Every Child Matters.

Eco-Schools and the Inclusion Quality Mark offer the application and award process at no cost, but charge for training and – in the case of the Inclusion Mark – for consultancy support.

Some kitemarks charge a one-off registration fee. The Basic Skills Quality Mark also charges for training for assessors, which assessors would expect to recoup through being employed to carry out assessment visits.

Models for further review

The next phase of the Arts Council's work on Artsmark will look in more detail at the business model for the revised programme, and to this end I would suggest that further research into other models would be valuable to inform future plans. Specific suggestions are included in the list of Recommendations in section 6.

4.4 Arts Award training model

Bearing in mind that various training and support models are available for other school kitemarks, and also that some local Artsmark training models will be offered by local authorities and other bodies, I consulted Trinity College London about the training programme they run for Arts Award. Although not a direct comparator scheme for Artsmark, subject to decisions on the future business model there could be parallels in Arts Award's training model.

There are two groups of trainees:

- Advisers, who support young people taking the Award
- Those who train the advisers

Adviser training

Trinity College licenses training agencies to provide training for Arts Award advisers around the country. Most of the training agencies have a geographical remit, though there is a small number with a sector-specific focus, and usually each agency has one nominated trainer though some have two.

There are two models of adviser training: public training and in-house training, the latter being offered to organisations who want to train 8 or more people as advisers.

Every adviser who attends a public course pays their individual fee to Trinity, who then pay the relevant agency one fee for each course they run. Trinity calculates the financials on the basis of a minimum and maximum number of attendees.

Organisations booking in-house training pay a smaller fee per individual participant to Trinity College, and also pay their trainer's fee direct to the training agency. In addition they provide the venue and catering. This is a more economic approach for organisations with a number of advisers.

Training the trainers

The trainers all undertake adviser training themselves, followed by a 2-day 'training the trainer' programme which takes place at Trinity and includes a chance to meet the national team, to familiarise themselves with the marketing materials, etc. Everyone who attends this course is provided with a detailed blueprint training manual, and the intention is that each trainer will take the blueprint and adapt it to their delivery style.

After passing their training, each trainer will initially lead adviser training alongside another experienced trainer, before beginning to offer adviser courses on their own.

Quality control of adviser training

A group of senior trainers regularly monitor and observe adviser training. They give feedback to the trainer at the end of the day, and report back on their findings to Trinity.

New model of regional lead agencies

Trinity is now developing the concept of a 'lead training agency' in each region. This organisation will:

- Co-ordinate regional training network meetings
- Co-ordinate dates for public training with other agencies in the region
- Co-ordinate promotion of public training
- Provide mentor support for any new trainer in their region

Licences

Demand for Gold adviser training is far less than for Bronze and Silver, so generally only one training agency per region is licensed to deliver Gold training, while a number are licensed for Bronze and Silver. All training agencies are licensed to deliver public and in-house training.

Initially Trinity focussed on developing good coverage of training agencies across the country, and offered training to agencies on demand. However they are now finding that most advisers want to attend courses in metropolitan areas, and there have been some issues with training agencies trying to sell courses on other agencies' 'patches'; the current climate (with agencies and individuals concerned about future work) is encouraging this.

As a result Trinity is now considering a different approach, where agencies will still deliver training but will pay Trinity for the licence including 'training the trainers' courses, and adviser training materials.

Trinity is also considering a paid-for consultancy offer, which could – for example – meet the needs being met by the current RFO consultancy project, in advising RFOs about how to build Arts Award into their programmes. They anticipate providing a list of approved trainers who would offer this kind of service.

5. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Key findings from this research were:

1. There are differing support needs at different stages of the process:
 - Before applying schools and colleges need to understand the programme and criteria, and many need support in identifying relevant gaps in their provision and ways of filling those gaps.
 - During the application process, support with completing both the Part 1 and Part 2 forms would be valuable. Some of this could be provided through a helpdesk, but many schools appreciate someone to advise them on a draft application. In the test process, new schools identified greater support needs than those who had been through the process before.
 - Support for schools who are unsuccessful at either stage was highlighted as being valuable during the test, to enable a successful application at a later date.
 - Schools that have been repeatedly successful in their Artsmark applications raised a question about support for their continued development.
2. A range of printed materials – available in hard copy and online – would be helpful to schools in clarifying the criteria, enabling them to benchmark their provision, and supporting them in completing the forms.
3. The assessment visit was valued by schools during the test, and was used as a development tool. It was also considered to add rigour to the process.
4. Support from a telephone and online helpdesk would be of value to schools when they are planning and completing their applications; many wanted someone to ask questions of during the test.
5. Support from other schools and colleges would be valued by Artsmark applicants, and the chance to learn from other successful schools' and colleges' experiences was highlighted as something applicants would welcome.
6. Some consultees raised questions about engagement with schools before they are ready for Artsmark, with concern being expressed about who will support schools where the arts are not yet strong.
7. Training and support is likely to be available to schools in some parts of the country, offered on a local basis and charged for; the Arts Council currently does not have a direct relationship with potential training providers.
8. Artsmark has been provided at no cost to schools previously, and the test and other research has indicated that many schools would consider paying for

any support that is needed to ensure a successful application; whether a wider charge could be made is less clear, and is beyond the brief of this particular consultancy.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The assessment process and business model for Artsmark have not yet been confirmed, though a peer assessment model is seen as a likely scenario. The following recommendations on support take account of this as an option, but do not assume that this model will be finally adopted.

1. *Clarity on the development role of Artsmark and the Arts Council's role within the programme*

Some consultees questioned whether it was realistic for the programme to be a development tool and accreditation model, and specifically whether the rigour of the award is weakened by the Arts Council supporting the development process and also acting as the accrediting body.

Research into other kitemarks has shown this dual role to be commonplace and effective, but highlights that mechanisms need to be implemented to ensure that assessment decisions are validated. Should assessors also play a support role within the new Artsmark, I would suggest that a robust mechanism is put in place to moderate their assessment recommendations. Without this, concerns about the rigour of the award may weaken its impact.

2. *Further research – other kitemarks*

I would suggest that further research is carried out into the following comparator kitemarks, to inform thinking on the business model:

- The Basic Skills Quality Mark is run as a partnership between NIACE and delivery partner Tribal, and knowing more about how this works and the financial relationship between the two organisations and schools could be valuable. Their subscription model for schools is the only one I have found, and may also be worth exploring further.
- Quality in Study Support is a much smaller scheme in terms of numbers of schools, however their accreditation option for the 'critical friend' role could offer an interesting model which might be attractive to teachers considering becoming peer assessors for Artsmark. This scheme also has a direct relationship to a research programme at Canterbury Christ Church University, adding another aspect to the programme which may be of interest to the Arts Council.
- The Leading Aspect Award have begun training young people as verifiers, and knowing more about their experience of working with young people in this role could be of value to the future Artsmark model.

3. Further research – online networking

Gateshead's Cultural Ambassadors programme offers a Virtual Learning Environment as a networking and support tool for schools. This could provide an affordable model of school support, and/or augment the support provided by a face to face peer network, and I would therefore recommend further research into the effectiveness and value of online communities as a potential support mechanism for Artsmark.

4. Online and printed resources

As a basic level of support for schools and colleges applying for Artsmark, I would recommend developing a new Artsmark website. This should include a range of downloadable materials requested by schools during the test, and some other resources based on previous successful materials:

- Case studies of successful schools, showing models of good practice and their impact across the curriculum;
- Online Artsmark forms available as reference copy PDFs, so schools can make an informed decision on whether or not to apply, and can identify support needs and an appropriate timescale before registering;
- Exemplar answers to both Part 1 and Part 2 of the process;
- Some sample successful applications to help schools benchmark themselves;
- Access to the guidance provided to assessors;
- FAQ document;
- Guidance notes on some of more challenging Artsmark requirements, e.g. "How to develop an arts policy", "How to commission an artist", etc, perhaps supported by case studies;
- Revised and updated artform guidance for schools who face in challenges in individual artform areas.

Attractive and accessible resources that address issues across the Artsmark criteria and application process could be valuable not only for Artsmark schools, but also for others who are not yet ready to apply. These resources could also support advocacy within schools, providing useful material for teachers who are keen to encourage a team approach in their school.

Case studies could include examples of further development undertaken by schools following an Artsmark award, giving ideas of how schools can develop their work further during the 3-year period of their award.

While schools are increasingly IT literate, this does not apply to every school and making this information available in hard copy would also be valuable. New and updated materials should be made available well in advance of the deadline.

Should a training programme be made available (see below), the website would also provide a promotional tool.

5. Helpdesk

As an additional support I would recommend establishing a telephone and email Helpdesk for schools going through the Artsmark application process, enabling them to contact someone for advice on completing their form and meeting the criteria.

6. Facilitate and licence a national network of training opportunities and consultancy support

It is clear that Artsmark training and support will be available in some areas of the country, at varied costs to schools and with no national overview of content and quality, while in other areas support will not be available. This is a challenge for the programme, and one that I would suggest the Arts Council seeks to address. I would recommend that the Arts Council should:

- Develop a licence programme for Artsmark trainers and consultants. This should include ‘training the trainers’ courses and the provision of training materials, with regular refreshers and course observations. Consistent charges should be offered nationally to ensure fairness for schools, and this should be part of the licence agreement.

Local authorities and other training providers are key players in Artsmark, not least in promoting the programme within their local areas, and it will be important to strike a balance between having a collaborative relationship with key partners and taking a quality control role.

Licensed trainers should be willing to provide a minimum service which could be added to. The minimum service should include general introductory seminars about the programme and a one-to-one consultancy meeting for schools developing their applications; additional opportunities could include training on specific aspects of Artsmark requirements such as working with artists, however I would suggest that there needs to be flexibility about the structure and content of additional training to enable trainers to integrate this most effectively within their own wider provision.

- Promote this programme to potential providers nationally – e.g. local authorities, other education training bodies, and cultural organisations including the new strategic children and young people organisations - monitoring take-up and ensuring that geographical gaps are addressed where possible. It will be essential to ensure that all trainers have a broad understanding of the arts within schools, and clear criteria for identifying trainers should be developed.
- Explore the possibility that repeat Artsmark Gold schools might take on a training role for other schools, perhaps with a reduced licence cost as a benefit of their Artsmark status.

Trinity College London already has a mechanism in place to run a similar model, and could therefore be a potential partner in this; the demand will be less than for Arts Award training so financial models would have to be thoroughly tested, but making use of an existing model could keep the set-up costs low. A discussion with NIACE and Tribal could potentially identify an alternative option (see Recommendation 2 above).

If the licensing model is not affordable, a less costly option would be to develop and sell a detailed pack of training resources to anyone offering Artsmark training to schools. This would not allow the Arts Council to oversee the quality of provision however.

7. *After an Artsmark award*

For many schools, a successful Artsmark application marks the end of contact with the Arts Council for 3 years until they reapply. The issue of future development for successful schools – especially those who have achieved Artsmark Gold – was raised throughout this consultancy, and could be supported by any or all of the support mechanisms suggested here.

The potential for peer support and peer assessment offer particular opportunities for experienced schools to support less experienced schools, and as suggested above Gold schools may want to take on a training role within a new support model.

8. *Facilitate and support Artsmark school networks*

Regional and local school networks are a potential mechanism for peer support, and could dovetail with a peer assessment model should this be introduced. As outlined in section 4.2 there are existing local networks, so developing a picture of the networks that are in place and seeking to fill local gaps would be valuable. The development of a potential virtual learning environment (see Recommendation 3) could provide a further valuable tool for peer support.

Buddying or mentoring by another teacher could also be of value, and again could be part of a peer assessment model. The time taken to set up and support networks and partnerships would need to be carefully considered.

The new strategic organisations for children and young people could potentially have a role to play in this.

9. *Timing of the relaunch*

Bearing in mind the concerns raised about the timing of available materials, and the potential time taken to develop new materials including (potentially) a new website and training licence model, I would suggest that the Arts Council considers delaying the relaunch. I recognise that this means a lengthy gap for schools which is not a good thing, however relaunching the programme if there is not complete confidence that it is ready could be counter-productive. Of course the provision of web

resources and training opportunities could be phased in, but it is important to be confident that enough information and support is available for new schools in particular.

10. Scalable packages

In summary, the table below outlines a scalable model of school support. Option 1 is a basic model of support, with Option 2 adding an additional element. Option 3 and Option 4 could be added separately or together.

Scale of packages	Artsmark stage	Costs	Potential income
Option 1 – basic support model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website & printed materials Including wide range of resources Providing the platform for online applications 	Depending on content of resources, the website could be valuable to schools at all stages of the process, including those who have already been awarded an Artsmark	Website and resource development and maintenance – costs would be front loaded to design and build the site and commission resource materials, followed by ongoing maintenance and updating costs	None if all materials are open access; a charge could be levied for some resources.
Option 2 - Add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phone & email Helpdesk 	For schools/colleges considering or going through the application process	Salary of person staffing the helpdesk	None
Option 3 - Add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Packages of face-to-face support available locally that are chargeable, including training courses and consultancy advice on draft applications 	For schools/colleges considering or going through the application process. Consultancy support could also be valuable for unsuccessful schools. Successful Gold schools could play a delivery role.	Development, introduction and promotion of licence model; cost of delivering ‘training the trainer’ courses and/or developing training materials; development and regular review of training materials	Income from licences and/or sale of training materials

Scale of packages	Artsmark stage	Costs	Potential income
Option 4 - Add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artsmark school networks; • Virtual learning environment on website; • Buddying/mentoring scheme that pairs schools (possibly connected to peer assessment) 	For schools/colleges considering or going through the application process. Experienced schools can play a role in supporting less experienced schools.	Co-ordination and support costs Cost of developing and maintaining virtual learning environment Unclear if teachers undertaking peer support role would require payment	None

7. NEXT STEPS

This research has highlighted the value of Artsmark to schools and local authorities nationally, and has also identified a range of challenges faced by schools going through the process.

The business model for the revised Artsmark will inform the development of support packages, and the next priority will be to explore how the suggested packages would fit with the options being considered for assessment and finance. Undertaking further research into the suggested comparator kitemarks and into virtual learning environments would also inform this next phase of the work.

APPENDIX 1 – CONSULTEES

Organisations offering support models to schools

- Chris May, Chief Executive, Curious Minds, Lancashire & Merseyside
- Ann Brian, Arts Education Development Officer & Cultural Services Adviser, Halton Borough Council (*also an assessor for the Artsmark test*)
- Denise Alexander, Director, Creative Futures Cumbria
- Clare Price, Head of Arts Development, Education Leeds
- Andrew Heath-Beesley, School Improvement Officer, Kirklees MBC, Education
- Amanda Harris, Director, and Helen Reynolds, Information Manager, KEAP, Truro
- Ednie Wilson, Creativity Development Manager, Gateshead Council
- Fiona Melvin, Programme and Business Development Director, The Forge, Co Durham (*also an assessor for the Artsmark test*)
- David Pitcher, Assistant Principal, Creative and Cultural Services Academy, North Hertfordshire College

Test assessors

- Ann Brian (see above)
- Andrew Mutter
- Mark Novels
- Marigold Ashwell
- Liz Macfarlane
- Fiona Melvin (see above)

Arts Award training

- Alice Young, Head of Arts Award Programme, Trinity College London

Artsmark test contributors

- Charlie Bunker, Test Manager, Artsmark, Arts Council England
- Felicity Woolf, Director, Felicity Woolf Associates
- Tom Fleming, Director, Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy
- Rob Elkington, Head of Education Partnerships, Royal Shakespeare Company

APPENDIX 2 – KITEMARK COMPARATORS

The table below has been developed from internet research.

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
Sportsmark / Activemark	Run by Youth Sport Trust as part of the School Sport Partnership programme. Activemark is aimed at primaries & primary aged special schools; Sportsmark is aimed at secondaries and secondary aged special schools.	Schools are automatically assessed for one of the marks through the national school sport survey, in which all School Sport Partnership schools take part. Requirement for at least 90% of students to take part in at least 2 hours of high quality sports activity each week.	Awarded at one level.	Certificate & logo	1 year	None	No training. Active website is provided for School Sports Partnership schools	?	http://ssx.youthsporttrust.org/page/xchange/index.html (School Sport Exchange section of the Youth Sports Trust website) 2008 Factsheet on Teachernet website: http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/doc/13182/Activemark%20and%20Sportsmark%20008%20Factsheet.doc
Design Mark	Developed jointly by the former DCSF, The Design Council, and the Design and Technology Association. Provide a self-evaluation framework, which sets a standard against which provision can be assessed.	Submission of self-evaluation.	Awarded at one level.	Certificate & logo; benefits & resources from sponsoring partners; opportunity to share school's work via Design Mark website. Also expected that schools will support other local schools, mentor up to 5 local schools applying for Design Mark, & provide exemplar materials.	3 years	Secondary - £500 Primary - £250	No training. 7 examples of self-evaluation submissions are included on the website. Mentor support will be given by phone to schools that are applying – NB this is provided free by schools who already have the Design Mark. A school visit can be arranged at an extra cost. If unsuccessful, feedback will be given and schools have up to 6 months to submit additional info.	19 listed on website	http://www.thedesigmark.org/ Also further info on Design & Technology Association website: http://www.data.org.uk/generaldocs/curric2008/Designmark/Design%20Mark%2009-10%20Teacher%20Information.doc

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
National Healthy School Status	Will end as a standard in March 2011, though a revised school development scheme is currently being planned. Healthy Schools Toolkit will be published early in 2011 – will include guidance, case studies and tools to help schools plan and track progress. Recognition of Healthy School Status could continue at a local level.	Schools audit against 41 criteria across 4 themes: – PSHE education, healthy eating, physical education, emotional health & wellbeing. Any gaps will be summarised in an action plan which schools can follow at their own pace. When a school feels they have met at least the minimum standards they submit a self-validation online. A random sample of schools receives a moderation visit.	Awarded at one level, though enhancement model introduced in 2009 as so many schools had achieved the Status.	Logo and plaque. Marketed to schools on the basis of its contribution to Every School Matters, i.e. the impact on children and the community etc.	Ongoing but subject to an annual review.	Free	Healthy Schools Local Programme Co-ordinator provides support when schools register. Training offered by Local Co-ordinators. National and local websites include extensive resources.	90% of English schools (anticipate 92% by the time the national status comes to an end)	http://home.healthyschools.gov.uk/ Local areas have their own sites. Cornwall is particularly good: http://www.cornwallhealthyschools.org/home/
Quality in Study Support	Provides a validation of the self-evaluation process undertaken using the <i>Extending Learning Opportunities; a framework for self-evaluation in study support</i> .	Based on peer scrutiny of self-evaluation. School uses the framework to self-evaluate, ideally within a network and supported by a 'critical friend', and puts together a portfolio of evidence. This is presented to peers at a Recognition Meeting who make recommendations to QiSS.	3 levels as outlined in the framework: Emerged, Established, Advanced	?	?	1 Centre: £380 (or £240 reduced cost for schools with 2 form entry or less), clusters range from £450 to £650 based on number in cluster. Revalidation costs slightly less. Advanced: £1200.	University staff can take on the 'critical friend' role, and also offer training – costs not quoted on website. Critical Friend training can lead to a Post Grad Cert.	Over 450 schools and study support centres	http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/education/quality-in-study-support/Home.aspx Based at Canterbury Christ Church University, and has a research strand attached. Self evaluation model can be downloaded at http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/doc/14679/DCSF-Learning-opp.pdf

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
International School Award	Recognises curriculum-based international work. Provides a framework to develop international partnerships and achieve curriculum goals.	Online application for Foundation and Intermediate; portfolio is required for the Full Award.	Foundation: school intends to embed international work. Intermediate: global issues beginning to be integrated. Full Award: international ethos across the whole school.	Certificate from the British Council; use of logo.	Full ISA valid for 3 years. Schools have to apply for revalidation after 2 years.	None	Network of regional coordinators. Website also highlights local contacts who can support with international work. Some downloadable resources on website, including signposts to funding for international partnerships and sample applications.	?	http://www.globalgateway.org.uk/default.aspx?page=4174
Eco-Schools	International award programme that guides schools towards sustainability, providing a framework to help embed these principles into the heart of school life. Run by the Foundation for Environmental Education and Managed in England by Keep Britain Tidy.	Bronze and Silver are self-assessed online. Green Flag applications are submitted electronically and schools are visited by an assessor. Green Flag Ambassador is for schools who have had Green Flag for 2 years and have made progress on the Eco-School topics.	Bronze, Silver, Green Flag, Green Flag Ambassador.	Bronze & silver: certificate Green Flag: letter, certificate, green flag, and can use logo	2 years	Free	Training provided but charged – £99 per half day, £199-£299 for full day. Can also have courses delivered to a staff team, cost from £1500-£2500. Some online resources, e.g. review template, action plan, Eco Code etc. Grants are available for relevant environmental projects.	Bronze: 4822 Silver: 4165 Green Flag: 1259	http://www.eco-schools.org.uk/

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
Inclusion Quality Mark	Supports schools to become inclusive. 10 elements assessed include pupil progress, management and leadership, the learning environment, the community.	'Tracking Document' issued on registration, and each element can be completed and submitted individually. Assessment visit takes at least a full day, and sometimes 2 or 3 days. Assessor will feed back at the end. Recommendation goes to the Quality Assurance Board for ratification.	Awarded at one level.	Use of logo	3 years	Registration: £29.50 – only paid once. Other costs depend on the no. of students on roll – as an indication, cancelling the assessment date costs £300	Support can be provided at differing levels, and is chargeable – schools invited to get in touch for a quote. Schools can be put in touch with another school which has been through the award, and may be able to arrange to visit them.	?	http://www.inclusionmark.co.uk/
Governor Mark	National Governors' Association quality standard for governing bodies. An accreditation, not a training process. Looks at governance processes and impact.	Eligibility criteria relate to the grade of the last Ofsted inspection – assessment visit lasts one day. However now moving to open the scheme up to all schools, though for those graded <i>satisfactory</i> or <i>inadequate</i> the visit would last 2 days. A self-evaluation is completed, followed by assessment visit.	Awarded at one level.	?	3 years	£495 for an assessment involving a 1-day visit. Likely to cost around £895 if 2 days are required.	None at present, but for those going down the route that requires 2 visits there could be development work between the two visits. Many of the assessors are governor trainers in their local area, and may be offering training for governing bodies thinking of applying.	7 in first year (to Jan 2009)	http://www.nga.org.uk/GMark.aspx

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
Anti-Bullying Charter Mark	Locally-run initiative, in which young people play a leading role. e.g. in Sunderland – partnership between the local authority and the youth parliament led to their Charter Mark. Other Charter Marks exist in Coventry, Surrey, etc.	Vary	Some areas seem to offer bronze, silver and gold, while others don't differentiate.	Usually a logo developed locally	Variable	Usually free	None	?	No single site
Basic Skills Quality Mark	<p>Celebrates and supports improvement in basic literacy and numeracy. Provides a framework for self-evaluation and continuous improvement for all pupils. Run by the Alliance for Lifelong Learning – a collaboration between NIACE and Tribal.</p> <p>There are 10 elements to the award – schools must meet all of them.</p>	<p>94 local authorities are in partnership with the Alliance and carry out assessments; schools in other areas are assessed by the Alliance. Application process varies across local authorities.</p> <p>Self-audit templates are downloadable. Seen as a starting point when preparing for assessment, and can also be the basis of a final submission.</p> <p>½ day assessment visit follows.</p>	One	<p>Promoted as a development tool.</p> <p>Plaque awarded and logo can be used by the school.</p>	3 years	<p>£30 admin fee to process application.</p> <p>Subscription scheme – inc initial assessment, support visit after 18 months, & renewal assessment in annual package. Cost from £300-£510 initially then £175-£250 annually. Costs for schools who “pay as you go” are set locally - usually £650 + VAT + travel</p>	<p>Guidance booklets available at a cost of £7.05.</p> <p>Regular training provided for assessors. Criteria for who can be an assessor are outlined on website. Cost of training: £250 + VAT</p>	4758 (4356 primary; 361 secondary; 41 post-16)	<p>http://www.qm-alliance.co.uk/</p> <p>Tribal's website: http://www.tribalgro.co.uk/education/advisoryprogrammes/Programmedelivery/Pages/Qualitystandardsandaccreditations.aspx</p>

Scheme	Background	Application process	Levels	What are schools offered?	Duration	Cost	Support & training	No. of schools	Website
Leading Aspect Award	<p>Self-evaluation framework designed to support educational organisations' own agendas – applicants decide what is leading practice based on their own strengths.</p> <p>Need to demonstrate commitment to quality, processes for monitoring and review, impact on your organisation. Need to be willing and ready to share practice.</p>	<p>Self-assessment & evidence submitted online. Assessment panel decides if the application is successful, and if so a verifying visit is arranged. Some schools may be designated "working towards..."</p>	<p>Awarded at one level.</p>	<p>Framework for self-review. Raises profile of good practice.</p> <p>Certificate provided and logo can be used.</p> <p>Promoted to local authorities as a way of encouraging and disseminating good practice across their schools.</p>	<p>3 years</p>	<p>£500 – includes visit, certificate, case study on website.</p> <p>NB can apply for up to 3 awards in any year.</p> <p>Can apply as a cluster or partnership.</p>	<p>All Leading Aspect organisations have their work presented as a case study on the website.</p> <p>A couple of local authorities have begun training young people as verifiers.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>http://www.leadingaspectaward.org.uk/</p>
Stephen Lawrence Education Standard *	<p>Local award developed in Leeds. Set up to encourage schools to promote race equality. Last government intended to roll it out nationally. Camden Council launched the award in their schools in 2010.</p>	<p>Self-evaluation and evidence of progress against the criteria are submitted as a portfolio of evidence for assessment. Successful schools are required to work in partnership with other schools for revalidation.</p>	<p>3 levels – bronze, silver, gold</p>	<p>Designed to celebrate and share good practice. Annual celebration event. Termly newsletter.</p>		<p>None</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>http://www.educationleeds.co.uk/sles/index.aspx</p>

*NB Leeds Council is currently developing a quality framework for school evaluation in which the arts are included – see <http://www.bluewaveswift.co.uk/> . Local authority staff hope it will dovetail with the new Artsmark.