



Primary EiC - Manchester

- Primary Pilot – September 2000 to March 2004

55 of 149 primary schools

- 55 – Learning Mentor Strand
- 21 – G&T Strand
- 2 – PLSUs

Central Coordination – Primary Coordinator employed on fixed-term contract by Partnership



Funding

- 3% top-sliced to pay for central coordination
- LM Strand – formula: Core element - £15,000 per school
Unit value based on FSM entitlement
Average allocation - £37k per school
- G&T Strand – formula: Unit value based on FSM entitlement
Average allocation - £12k per school
- PLSU - £153k pa revenue budget



Identification of schools

- All schools invited to introductory meeting
- Headteacher Steering Group (7) plus Partnership Coordinator

Criteria: Low attainment

Capacity to improve/Leadership potential

Initiative involvement

Record of sharing good practice

Considerations: Geographical representation

Faith representation

- Primary representation on Partnership Strategy Board
 - 7 Secondary Headteachers
 - 7 Primary Headteachers
 - 4 LEA officers
 - Partnership and Primary Coordinators (non-voting)



Positive Outcomes

Strands:

LM - immediate positive impact. Embedded. Replicated in non-EiC schools. Adopted by Action Zones

G&T – implementation lag. Structures kick-started whole-school awareness. Improved provision. Replication in non-EiC schools.

PLSU – stalled implementation. Initial scepticism and resistance. Centres of innovation. Replication in individual schools and incorporated in city-wide SEN strategy. Outreach support to schools and training to Diversity & Inclusion Team.

continued



Positive Outcomes continued

- Strong primary voice on Partnership Strategy Board
- Cluster cooperation at unprecedented level
- Understanding of LM role
- Acceptance of G&T – *pull attainment up*
- Major boost for Social and Emotional interventions
- Positive response from schools



Lessons along the way

- Good communication with schools essential – representation and consultation
- Transparent and consistent criteria for involvement
- Significant level of funding
- Initial limited awareness of LM role and varying conditions of employment fuelled conflict
- Broad-based national training confused some LMs
- Opportunities for LMs to share good practice valued and effective
- G&T guidance practical and effective starting point – not end state



Lessons along the way continued

- Whole school approach accelerates and heightens effectiveness
- PLSUs can only serve very close neighbours – ideally single school
- Monitoring best supported by financial sanctions
- Cluster collaboration most effective when supported by central coordination