

Evaluation of the 'Making a Mark' programme

March 2014

Project partners: Captain Cook Birthplace, Cleveland Ironstone Mining, Dorman, Hartlepool, Head of Steam, Kirkleatham and Preston Park museums

Evaluation by

Dr Sarah K Jackson and Fiona Forsythe

Email: skjvoronezh@yahoo.co.uk

Email: Fiona@fionnconsultancy.co.uk

Tel: 01904 659155

Mob: 0789 9092299

Supported by North East Museum Development Programme (funded by Arts Council England and managed by Tyne & Wear Archives & Museums)

Contents

1: Introduction.....	4
The ‘Making a Mark’ programme	4
This evaluation.....	4
Methodology and responses gained	5
2: Executive Summary	6
3: Overall impact of the ‘Making a Mark’ programme	8
Most impactful elements, in rank order	8
Less impactful elements across all partner programmes	10
4: Impact on teachers’ classroom practice	11
The most significant impact on teachers’ practice	11
The second most significant impact on teachers’ practice.....	12
The third most significant impact on teachers’ practice	12
5: Impact on pupils	14
6: What the museums can learn from the teachers.....	17
Programme specifics that could be improved	17
Some suggestions to follow up in the buddy sessions	18
Teacher buddy arrangements.....	19
7. The new curriculum	20
Background information on the new curriculum	21
8: Participation in cultural activities	23
School visits in general	23
Visits to museums.....	23
Reason for participating in ‘Making a Mark’	24
9: Relationships between schools and the ‘Making a Mark’ museums.....	26
Making the programme bespoke to needs	26
Changes in perceptions about museums.....	26
Funding issues	27
10: Marketing to schools	29
Successful elements of the programme	29
Marketing approaches.....	30
11: Advocacy work.....	31
Impact of taking part on likely future involvement with cultural venues	31

Using what has been learnt to advocate for similar programmes	32
12: Final conclusion	33
13: Recommendations.....	35
14: Appendices	37
Appendix 1: Methodology	37
Appendix 2: On- line survey.....	38
Appendix 3: In-depth interview questions	48

1: Introduction

This section sets out the background information on the project.

The 'Making a Mark' programme

'Making a Mark', funded by the Department for Education, is administered by Arts Council England as their Museums and Schools Programme 2012-2015. It is a partnership project between seven Tees Valley museums and the National Portrait Gallery. The Tees Valley was one of ten programmes funded nationally to increase 'the number of high quality educational visits by schools in areas which currently have lower than average cultural engagement.'¹ There is a clear focus on enhancing the curriculum and educational experience.

The seven Tees Valley museums engaged in the programme in partnership with the National Portrait Gallery are: Captain Cook Birthplace Museum; Cleveland Ironstone Mining Museum, Skinningrove; Dorman Museum, Middlesbrough; Hartlepool Museum & Art Gallery; Head of Steam, Darlington; Kirkleatham Old Hall Museum; and Preston Park, Stockton. In addition, the programme is supported by the following organisations: Bridge NE; Tees Valley Arts; and Sage Gateshead.

'Making a Mark' has a clear vision: *'an innovative yet sustainable programme that encourages teachers and students to have pride in the past, ownership of the present and optimism for the future of their locality.'*

The focus of the programme is to help teachers and pupils explore ways in which the Tees Valley, particularly through the industrial age, made its mark on Britain; and to demonstrate that this influence can still be seen today.

This evaluation

This piece of evaluation, completed in the Spring of 2014, looks at five clear impacts, viz:

- What is the impact on classroom practice?
- What is the impact on museum participation?
- What is the impact on museum to school relationships?
- What impact has this had for students?

¹ www.artscouncil.org.uk/what-we-do/our-priorities-2011-15/children-and-young-people/museums-and-schools-programme/ (accessed 19th March 2014)

- Which aspect of the programme has had the greatest impact?

In addition, as it was announced by the Government during the life of the programme that there will be a new National Curriculum from September 2014, what will this change mean for the continuing development of the programme?

It should be noted that this evaluation in March 2014 is one of several that have been undertaken: one produced in October 2013; and another one due very soon. In addition, there is a separate pupil voice survey underway, and the collation of (informal) museum staff feedback

Methodology and responses gained

Details of the methodology utilised for this evaluation can be found in Appendix 1. In total, 36 teachers responded to the on-line questionnaire; the majority of whom (26 of them) are teachers at Key Stage 2 (72.2%; of 36 respondents). Of these 26 teachers, 2 are from secondary schools and 1 is a deliverer of home schooling from Key Stage 1-4. The majority of teachers who responded to the on-line questionnaire are employed in schools in Redcar and Cleveland (38.9%; of 36 respondents to this question). Of the 36 responses, one is a North Yorkshire school which visited one of the Teesside museums.

Darlington	1	2.8%
Hartlepool	5	13.9%
Middlesbrough	10	27.7%
Redcar and Cleveland	14	38.9%
Stockton-on-Tees	5	13.9%
Other: North Yorkshire	1	2.8%
TOTAL	36	100%

The programme was delivered differently in each of the 7 partner museums. The majority of schools who responded had attended the Cleveland Ironstone Mining Museum (c.30%; of 35 respondents to this question) and Kirkleatham Museum (c.25%; of 35 respondents to this question). NB Two schools had visited 2 museums each. Apart from Cleveland Ironstone Mining Museum, these numbers roughly reflect the totals each museum is contributing to the overall targets.

Captain Cook Birthplace	2	c.5%
Cleveland Ironstone Mining	11	c.30%
Dorman	6	c.16%
Hartlepool	5	c.14%
Head of Steam, Darlington	1	c.2%
Kirkleatham	9	c.25%
Preston Park	3	c.8%
TOTAL	37 visits (by 35 schools)	100%

2: Executive Summary

This evaluation has focussed on five main areas. These are the impact which the 'Making a Mark' programme has had on: classroom practice, cultural participation, museum to school relationships, and on pupils; in addition, it examined those aspects of the programme which had the greatest impact overall. It was undertaken in Spring 2014, using on-line surveys and follow-up telephone interviews with teachers only.

A key strand of the vision for Making a Mark '*encourages teachers and students to have pride in the past*' is clearly represented in the programme, with three quarters of teachers responding saying that the focus on local heritage and identity was the element of the overall programme which had the greatest impact. Using very local resources to bring history to life in a stimulating, 'hands-on' way is what has been the great success of the programme. Teachers have been both surprised and enthused by the wealth of material and information available and this, in turn, has enthused their pupils and encouraged greater learning.

In terms of the impact of the programme on classroom practice this can be classified, in the main, as covering four areas:

- resources (from object handling, to being able to see local cliffs as a resource)
- developing learning opportunities (from remembering the difference 'hands on' can make to developing a reflection and investigation ethos)
- subject knowledge (teachers had the opportunity to develop their own knowledge in certain subjects)
- curriculum design and delivery (developing ways for more cross-curriculum work).

School visits to museums increased through the programme; and a few isolated comments from teachers indicated that a handful of pupils returned in their own time, too. The main driver for this increase in school visits would appear to be the topics which were on offer from the museums. However, this increase should not be viewed as a direct cause and effect. There are more factors than 'offer topic x and schools will come'. Respondents were also influenced by the cost, the closeness of the museum and by previous relationships (and those of others) with the museums involved.

For this evaluation, the impact on pupils was viewed solely through the perception of their teachers. Teachers responded that the impact of the programme was visible through the pupils having a greater knowledge of their local area. The pupils were willing to develop this knowledge (e.g. by asking questions), and also demonstrated some pride in their area, through voicing their own opinions on local issues. The pupil voice survey, outside the remit of this evaluation study, will add more to programme knowledge in this area.

Museum to school relationships were very positive, with 100% of teachers saying that they would attend another three sessions. However, when cost was brought into the question, around a third of the respondents were not so sure that they would be able to continue with the same 3 visit model. Continuing to require the same number of visits for the programme is likely to be a challenge if transport costs are involved. Yet, overall, where schools consider there to be a quality offer of high educational value, they will seek to find a way to visit. In addition, the schools' experiences during their engagement with the museums encouraged them to be open to engaging with other cultural establishments, too.

It is this relationship between the teaching and museum staff that is the crucial one, and one which underpins all the other areas of impact. This relationship starts with the initial approach to the school and continues through the communications that ensue. The extent to which museums are adaptable and open to meeting the bespoke needs of schools and the particular pupils attending, plays a significant role. The 'Making a Mark' programme cannot be formulated as a simple 'one size fits all' offer. Suggestions on potential areas for improvement are shown in the report; as are the successes of the programme and how these can be utilised for marketing purposes.

In terms of the impact of the programme on new and deeper relationships between schools and museums, quotes from several teachers reveal that:

- they have been surprised by what museums can offer and deliver (thereby confirming that this relationship was a new one)
- they have used their involvement to subsequently ask for further support from the museum (e.g. by borrowing other artefacts for their Roman topic)
- they are already planning how they can work with the museum next year to deliver certain curriculum areas.

It should be remembered that however flexible and open the museum staff are, it is the school's ethos and the teacher's attitude which are both crucial factors in determining whether the relationship with museums can be prolonged and deepened amid increasing pressures on the school timetable, funding and pupil attainment. In this report, teachers' responses to how the requirements of the new National Curriculum, in place from September 2014, could impact on the final year of delivery of the 'Making a Mark' programme, emphasise this. Ultimately it is the teacher's desire and ability to focus on the benefits to their pupils in taking them outside the classroom to engage with different artefacts and the experts who understand them, which reveal who is likely to commit to working collaboratively again. The relationship can only be a two-way process.

'Making a Mark' is a programme which has captured the imagination and enthusiasm of pupils and teachers alike. There are clear impacts from the programme and specific opportunities to further develop museum to school relationships, particularly through the 'teacher buddy' relationships and the shared knowledge that these can bring to the museum partners. It is in the 'local study' requirements of the history section of the New Curriculum that museums and teachers have the chance to develop stronger, more exciting hands-on elements to the programme that really highlight the role of the Tees Valley in the past and future of its citizens.

This report concludes with a number of recommendations which have been split into those for the programme as a whole, those directed at museum staff and those for consideration by teachers/schools.

3: Overall impact of the ‘Making a Mark’ programme

Detailed below are those elements of the programme which teachers felt had the most impact overall. Figures from the on-line survey are shown first, followed by further feedback and examples.

Most impactful elements, in rank order

The greatest impact

In terms of which element of the programme had the greatest impact of all, the majority of teachers indicated that it was **the focus on local heritage and identity**. Just over three quarters of teachers noted this (76.9%; 10 out of 33 respondents ranked this particular element first).

One teacher added that the experience at the museum was precisely what the school required:

“As we were studying this within school, this was the exact experience we were looking for to show our children what life was like many years ago and how again, our area came to be. Along with the Century in Stone DVD we couldn’t have asked for anything more.”

This was reflected in the in-depth interviews. One member of staff was very enthusiastic about the local element that they could now focus on with pupils:

“We started planning last night, and I asked ‘what did we enjoy last year?’ Everyone agreed the Rivers and Bridges topic and so we decided that we could have a theme ‘Why is the Tees important to Teesside?’ (looking at the impact on environment, on people etc.).

We want to talk more about local heritage next year and to make children more aware of their local heritage.”

Staff had also found subsequent ways to build on work which had started during their engagement: “we were able to build on it [the visit to the museum] during our annual walk up the Eston Hills. The children now know what is in the hills!”

The second greatest impact

The second greatest impact, in teachers’ views, was **the focus on active learning**. Just over 60% of teachers indicated this (61.5%; 8 out of 33 respondents ranked this particular element second).

One teacher commented:

“I know that it seems obvious, but giving the children chance to have a go at the activities rather than just watching makes a huge difference and allows them to experience it first-hand. It also adds to the fun of the experience, too. It also means that children who struggle to read and/or write can still access the information.”

The amount of active learning which the children engaged in had surprised and pleased some teachers. In an in-depth interview, one teacher described an activity which she wanted to re-visit, as the class had run out of time to complete it during the museum session:

“we went to the beach to look for rocks, children asked to plot rocks on a map, but started to run out of time. This was a really good activity, and the children were really engaged, we should perhaps have done the ‘plotting’ back inside.”

Teachers were keen to encourage museum staff to keep the active learning approach, saying: “keep [the sessions] practical, be careful with the theory”.

The third greatest impact

The third greatest impact, in teachers’ views, was **the use of national paintings to put local achievements into context**. Again, just over three quarters of teachers noted this (77.8%; 7 out of 33 respondents ranked this particular element third).

This was a new experience for pupils and teachers alike as “this is something that we would never have been able to do in school”.

In the in-depth interviews, one teacher commented that the use of national paintings could have been further developed: “when we looked at art, we had a portrait of someone who was skilled in their field, with an example of a local man; [it] would have been good to have explored that person more”.

For another member of staff the links to the national portraits were important:

“we came away enthused about the links [to the portraits] – if I’m enthused then that has a knock on effect to the students. Really impressed at the richness of the resources in the area.”

Other important elements

However it should be noted that a few other elements were considered important, too, they just did not receive the majority of respondents’ top 3 votes. These are:

- The opportunity to work with a skilled leader/creative practitioner
- The chance to work closely with a museum
- The cross-curricular approach.

One teacher expressed the further development of his/her own learning during the in-depth interview:

“[Working with museum staff] has expanded my knowledge of history of Middlesbrough in all areas, industrial as well as design. I had never heard of Christopher Dresser – always used Morris, now I’m going to use Dresser as he was a Middlesbrough designer.”

The opportunity to work closely with a museum increased one teacher’s confidence to the extent that a topic was decided on for next year’s curriculum, because of the support the school had received:

“We decided on this [topic for next year] because of the help we’ve had from the museums and realised that there are a lot of resources to help us.”

The cross-curricular nature of the sessions were commented on, too:

“it was being able to put 2 and 2 together – mirco-organisms in general with pond dipping and being able to link that back to art, and discussing evolution.”

Less impactful elements across all partner programmes

Several elements received few votes which indicates that they were important elements of the programme in only a handful of cases (i.e. not significant elements of all 7 partner programmes):

- The focus on independent learning
- The focus on social and collaborative learning
- The time and space to learn and reflect over 3 sessions.

Caught in between this data, therefore, were the following elements of the programme i.e. they were neither considered to be the most, nor the least, impactful parts when the programme is looked at in its entirety:

- The focus on enquiry based learning
- The use of a creative approach.

Summary

The focus on local heritage has clearly made an impact on teachers who have commented that increasing their own knowledge of subject areas as diverse as rocks and fossils of the beach to Christopher Dresser – the first and most important designer in the Aesthetic Movement – has both enthused staff, and enabled new areas of knowledge to be taken back to the classroom.

It is clear that the local environment and heritage is a particular area in which museums, through their resources and the staff’s knowledge, are able to have a positive impact on the delivery and support of the curriculum. Combining this with hands-on learning activities is a powerful approach.

4: Impact on teachers' classroom practice

In the on-line survey, teachers provided qualitative feedback on which elements of the programme had the greatest impact on their own practice. Some further feedback about this was also provided in the in-depth interviews.

New to Year 3 of the programme is an offer of CPD sessions for teachers; previously, in Years 1 and 2, the only contact with teachers had been through the museum visits which were focused on delivering learning outcomes for students. Therefore the impact on teachers' practice noted below is not an element of the programme that has been planned from the start but is a positive additional outcome that may partly be attributed to the 3 visit structure.

The most significant impact on teachers' practice

"for me personally, it extended my learning in many areas and gave me ideas of activities that could be adapted back into the classroom"

Teachers gave the following comments on the most significant changes to their practice as a result of taking part in the programme:

Experiential/hands-on learning techniques

- The use of secondary resources; including objects, real life experiences, and the local area
- The relevance of hands-on learning i.e. linking what children have seen to what is done in the classroom
- Linking the past to the present: "using exhibits and artefacts to bring history to life"

"I have been able to link the work we are doing in class to something real, something the children have already seen and it allows them to link the information in their own mind."

Enquiry based learning techniques

- "We have tried to follow the reflection and investigation ethos"
- "our visits to the museum linked to a project [in school] – it provided a stimulus and inspired the children and staff to be more creative in the work set for the children"

Improved teacher knowledge

- A wider knowledge of local artists and the local area
- "Subject knowledge, particularly in art and science (specifically micro-organisms) has been extended"
- Cross-curricular work
- Knowing that children can be educated off-site

Improved teacher self-belief

- "more confident when teaching those areas to children" (art and science)
- "My own belief in my skills when completing a piece of art work"

On-going relationship with the museum

- "Having a contact at the museum to go to for help, advice and further work"

- “being able to access materials back at school that the museum loaned to us”

Following up those comments made on the on-line survey during the in-depth interviews, teachers re-emphasised a range of impacts on their classroom practice. In one interview, a teacher wanted to summarise the impacts that she had highlighted during the on-line survey as:

“This is a highly deprived area, just getting on a bus is an experience for some children. Giving an experience to children is something I can build on [back in the classroom]”

Another teacher found it harder to differentiate between subject knowledge, cross-curriculum links and resources. In talking about the local resources, he said that he had: “not realised the proportion of coverage the mine had had. It brought to life that this was ‘bread n’ butter’ for the community”.

One teacher described the observational opportunity that was offered by the programme – something that teachers can rarely have, but an opportunity that is highly beneficial: “not delivering the activity, so I had the opportunity to step back and watch kids”.

The second most significant impact on teachers’ practice

In addition to mentioning some of the same areas of impact as above, such as increasing their own knowledge, teachers also stated the following:

Ideas that can be used back in school

- A variety of approaches to the same topic e.g. outdoor learning, making fossils, adding more drama to learning
- “Building in more opportunities for the children to work creatively. Taking this forward into planning for the New Curriculum”

“it has allowed me to use several of the activities in class and out in the yard i.e. games”

Impetus for more trips

- “intention to take children on more visits”
- “developing more links within the local community”
- “to know that if we are planning for a topic we can approach the museum to see if they can help with a visit or resources”.

The third most significant impact on teachers’ practice

Again, several of the same impact areas were noted as those shown above. In response, many teachers reiterated the fact that they could now visit the museum again, could ask for support from museum staff and could work with museum staff to extend their pupils’ learning. They identified a real value to this: “children talking to experts really pays off... I will certainly look into this in future”.

One teacher particularly noted the impact that the use of these techniques can have on pupils who might otherwise struggle with traditional approaches to learning:

“children are much more enthusiastic about the topic, particularly the lower ability, as they now have something to relate to, something that they already understand as a base to the topic. They can now add the new information to something they already know”.

Summary

Teachers identified a range of areas in which 'Making a Mark' had impacted on their classroom practice; indeed, most teachers were easily able to cite at least two very significant impacts on their own practice. Some of these areas were inter-related, for example through working with artefacts and other resources, the teacher's knowledge of a subject area developed. Others were very simple, merely having the opportunity to have another practitioner working with the class so as to allow the teacher to objectively see the impact on their pupils.

The breadth of the impact on teaching practice which has been cited reflects the variety of sessions which are being offered in the 'Making a Mark' programme. This provides ample material for museums to use when approaching schools in the future.

5: Impact on pupils

The teachers who responded to the on-line questionnaire provided feedback on what had made an impact on pupils, in their view. This was not part of a triangulated longitudinal study, nor had benchmarking of individual pupil's starting points taken place; and teachers were commenting in some cases on a very recent experience, and in other cases on a visit in the previous academic year. Hence teachers were asked to provide a broad indication of the number of pupils who had benefited from the programme using the indicators 'significant impact', 'some impact' and 'no impact' on the 'majority of pupils', 'less than half of the pupils' or 'only a handful of pupils'.

A significant impact on the majority of pupils

In the majority of teachers' opinion, the following had the greatest impact on most pupils:

- They know more about their local heritage
- They are better able to make connections across subject areas
- They are prouder of their local area
- They are more inquisitive and better able to ask questions
- They are more motivated in general

However, there are nuances within this information, as one teacher pointed out:

"The significance for the two class groups was different. As the Year 4 class teacher, I am aware that the activities have lent themselves to the children becoming more inquisitive in relation to history as well as more analytical. Year 3 children appear to have become more aware of their local heritage and applying things better across the curriculum"

In addition, in the majority of teachers' opinion, the following had the greatest impact on less than half of their pupils:

- They are more motivated in general
- They are keener to put forward ideas
- They know more about their local heritage
- They are prouder of their local area
- Their art and design skills have improved

Another teacher provided further feedback to say that:

"there was some impact on the children's analytical skills, helping them to think about their surroundings and how they have been changed over time due to industry or nature. This gave the children a greater knowledge of their local area and they became even more inquisitive"

These areas of impact are, therefore, not absolutes for all pupils.

No impact on the majority of pupils

In the majority of teachers' opinion, the following had no impact on most pupils:

- They are more inquisitive and better able to ask questions
- They are prouder of their local area
- They work more collaboratively
- Their analytical skills have improved

In addition, the majority of teachers' felt that there were two areas in which there had been no impact on less than half of their pupils:

- They have visited other museums with their family/carers/friends
- Their art and design skills have improved.

Again, caution should be taken in reading these responses as correct for all pupils.

Sustaining the impact on the pupils

"The 'Making a Mark' project was valuable but the impact was not long term because it was only a short project. Maybe if we had a programme given to follow when we got back to school we would have followed it up, maybe with the staff visiting us later?"

The above comment from one teacher highlights a key question for the 'Making a Mark' programme. In the on-line survey, teachers were asked to comment on the extent to which they feel that the impact on pupils has been sustained in the meantime. This obviously links in with the question of impact on teachers' classroom practice shown in the previous section, section 4; (and also the teacher's quote on page 9 in section 3 about the fact that if the teacher is enthused, then the pupils are too).

Some teachers felt unable to comment on sustained impact, particularly where they had been involved in the programme in the previous year and they were no longer teaching the same cohort of pupils. For a few other staff, the engagement with the programme had only just happened – or was just about to – and therefore this question was not immediately answerable.

Other teachers have seen and encouraged the repeated use of some of the skills back into their lessons in school. For example:

"They have remembered a lot of the information they learned and the enquiry skills they were taught, which they have used in subsequent History topics"

One teacher mentioned how they have approached the museum again for further support with resources for specific lessons:

"We have set up similar activities for our current Roman project using ideas (and resources) provided by [museum name]. The engagement by the children in school was phenomenal. I wouldn't have thought of the range of hands on activities without our visit. I certainly wouldn't have had access to resources as supplied by [museum name]. The Headteacher visited the class and witnessed the engagement first hand"

Several other comments were provided by teachers during the in-depth interviews. For one secondary teacher, even being in a different location had a beneficial impact on pupils:

"The way that we can use the space expands the students' knowledge – a different environment to work in"

In addition, during the in-depth interviews teachers provided some information on the impact of the programme outside of the classroom. Teachers had noted different activity here, too:

- *“ [the kids] getting badges to go back to the museum free has been great. I know kids have done it and taken other people”*
- *[The Curator] tells me that she does see some of my students in the museum working”*
- *“[The kids are] taking more notice of the hills, usually when we do our walk up the hills around half the class haven’t been up, but that is changing”*

Summary

The teachers responding to the on-line survey have expressed a range of different views. In taking account of those, as well as the different cohorts of pupils and their varied experiences at the 7 partner museums, we can say that – in general – teachers have seen the most impact on pupils in the following areas:

- They know more about their local heritage
- They are better able to make connections across subject areas
- They are more motivated in general
- They are keener to put forward ideas.

Conversely, the least impact on pupils is seen – in general – in the following areas:

- They work more collaboratively
- Their analytical skills have improved
- They have visited other museums with their family/carers/friends
- Their art and design skills have improved.

Therefore these are areas for further attention in the programme, should they be relevant to individual partners’ programmes.

There are two areas of impact which are difficult to call as they were seen as having an impact – in certain schools – on some pupils, but this was not the case in other schools. These are: ‘they are more inquisitive and better able to ask questions’ and ‘they are prouder of their local area’.

The impact of the programme on teachers is crucial as they are the ones who may – or may not – then continue with the application of the knowledge and/or skills back in the classroom. Teachers can also find out, and at times even encourage, the strengthening of this knowledge and/or skill outside of the classroom too.

Therefore teachers’ own attitude to the programme can have a significant impact on the extent to which pupils’ learning is retained and can become further embedded. Museum staff can try to encourage this by providing ideas for repeated work back in the classroom, and offering incentives for pupils to return again in their own time, but their influence is obviously limited as this is only a very small engagement in relation to children’s time in school. This means that the question of the relationship between the Education Officer and school staff is again highly significant.

6: What the museums can learn from the teachers

Comments on which elements of the 'Making a Mark' programme were done particularly well are shown in section 10. Below are responses from teachers about areas for improvement and suggestions that could be followed up in the 'buddy' sessions.

Programme specifics that could be improved

In the on-line survey, teachers were asked to provide comments on how the programme could be improved. Their responses can be grouped as follows:

- **Nothing**

By far the majority of comments related to the fact that, in the teachers' view, nothing needed to be changed. An example of an extended comment, was:

"Nothing. It was a brilliant experience. The education staff were amazing and nothing was too much bother for them"

- **Less talking and information-giving for younger pupils**

A number of primary teachers, 5 in total, felt that possibly having less talking time and more activities might have worked better:

"possibly less talking time with the year 3 children – move to activity for them quicker"

For staff, pitching the level of information provided to the children's age might have proved more beneficial.

- **Better preparation and communication beforehand**

Three staff felt that better information beforehand to help prepare the pupils would have been good, but one teacher felt that this might have been a failing on his/her part:

"children were occasionally expected to know a bit about the topic but we were expecting them to learn from the trip. I think this was a lack of communication from my part though"

However, it should be noted that in section 10, there were four times more comments about how well planned and organised the programme was; hence these 3 comments can be seen as isolated examples.

There were a number of comments about improvements in other areas:

- a guide for the museum tour would have helped as it was "a very long session to just be wandering around" (3 comments on this)
- more space and equipment e.g. more space, more chairs (3 comments)
- more resources e.g. costumes, artefacts, history photos (3 comments)
- more action "maybe a little less free time" (2 comments)
- tighter session timings e.g. shorter sessions (2 comments)
- BUT more time in the museum "as we would have liked to stay longer"! (1 comment)

There were a few other additional comments. One related to more high quality work to take back to school; and another felt that although the drawing session was “excellent”, the painting session was “weaker”. Of significance in relation to Home Schooling was the following:

“it was a difficult group to teach from the front as it has such a wide age range and the children are not used to school structure. Perhaps breaking into two age groups would have made it easier; overall I was happy with it though”

Hence the main point to be emphasised from this feedback is the degree to which it is important to pitch the session at the age group of the pupils attending; particularly in terms of concentration span, length of the session, and having a suitable mix of listening time and activities.

Some suggestions to follow up in the buddy sessions

In the on-line survey, teachers were asked what the session leaders in the museums could have learnt from them. These may be helpful for further learning during the ‘buddy’ sessions.

“I felt the session leader was incredibly skilful and obviously experienced.... she knew more about her specialism than I did!”

As with the majority of answers to the previous question about areas for improvement, many teachers felt there was nothing to add on their part and – indeed – wanted to express how well the leaders had delivered the programme with comments like the one above and: “they were very able without any support”; and “there was nothing that I would have done differently”.

There were, however, a number of very useful comments that could be taken into consideration in the further development of the programmes; and could also be discussed during the ‘teacher buddy’ sessions (see section below re the arrangements for this.) Some of these re-emphasise what was said above in relation to areas for improvements.

Understanding the specific needs of the pupils in front of them:

- “maybe if we communicated what the children already know, and what we wanted them to learn, may help the session leaders more”
- Adapting for children’s special needs/SEN
- The nuances of the particular children i.e. type of activity best suiting different children
- Behaviour management strategies

Different delivery techniques:

- How to engage less able children
- “a little more time for children to share their ideas between each other and how they could be improved”
- The use of questioning during discussion so more children are involved
- “Asking all children questions about their opinion and ideas and not just the children that appear really keen to answer. Therefore every child will get the best experience out of the day”.

Content specifics:

- “may be a bit more focus on the aim of the writing”

- “more practical and a little less information at points. Especially with my class”
- “ideas for a Museum Trail specifically based on the different parts”
- “maybe given us different materials and media to use that we don’t normally experience at school?”
- “although the hand writing and picture cutting task was lovely, some children will always find it stressful as they will still find it hard”
- “sessions were led well – just a bit more consideration on the quality of the written tasks would make them even better”.

The in-depth interviews did not produce more or expanded responses in this area. When asked ‘Where are museums missing a trick, or how do you think the programme could be improved’, respondents re-emphasised comments from the on-line survey. These included:

- *“Keep the links local”*
- *“Make it practical, watch the pitch”*
- *“I was impressed by all – nothing really jumps out”*
- *“Something for the Tudors – there’s nothing in the area”*

Teacher buddy arrangements

Each of the 7 partner museums in the Tees Valley is spending a day with a teacher to focus on an area to improve in the ‘Making a Mark’ programme. Funding for staff cover is provided to the school to support this activity. The evaluators supported this process by finding 4 of the 7 ‘teacher buddies’.

When asked as to whether they would be interested in finding out more about becoming a ‘buddy’ with an Education Officer, of the 29 respondents to this question in the on-line survey, 17 teachers agreed and 12 declined. Several teachers commented that they would not have time for this.

Summary

The majority of teachers commented that they could not offer any suggestions as to areas in which museum staff could learn from teachers. However, a few teachers did offer comments which were based around improving the delivery of individual sessions. These including improving the communication between Education Officer and teacher prior to the session, advising on the level of the session and having the correct proportion of talking to activity to maintain the interest of younger, or less able children. Strategies for managing classroom behaviour was another area in which teachers felt they could help improve the skills of the Education Officers. These issues provide a realistic framework for the meetings of ‘teacher buddies’.

7. The new curriculum

The new curriculum will be delivered from September 2014. On the whole, most primaries appear to be doing their planning for it after Easter in preparation for delivery in the new academic year. Therefore there is still an element of the unknown for some of the respondents to this question.

When asked in the on-line survey, most teachers felt that the introduction of the new curriculum would not adversely affect their ability to work with museums again.

Table 7a: implications of the introduction of the new curriculum				
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
Will you visit museums as frequently as you have due to Making a Mark?	63.6% (21)	6.1% (2)	30.3% (10)	100% (33)
Will you work with the museum Education Officers in the same way?	60.6% (20)	3% (1)	36.4% (12)	100% (33)
Will you ask museums to support delivery in a different way?	48.5% (16)	9.1% (3)	42.4% (14)	100% (33)

One teacher gave a circumspect response in relation to the 3 questions in the table:

“other than Literacy, Numeracy and Science, the new curriculum is very rigid and concise. I do not think it deters the above comments, nor does it encourage them either”

Yet other teachers who have also started to look at the new curriculum are more positive e.g. “still exploring the new curriculum but early signs suggest that we should be able to work in a similar manner with museums and education officers in the future”. And, in relation to subject-specifics, another teacher confirmed: “Science has not changed, but the order of topics has”.

When questioned further, many teachers felt that – on the whole – the existing features of the ‘Making a Mark’ programme would likely still be ones that they need to deliver the new curriculum. Features such as:

- A creative hands-on approach
- Cross-curricular work
- “a bank of ideas and resources to use”
- As a tool for engagement
- New ways to learn e.g. “gives the opportunity to broaden pupils’ experiences and knowledge through new ways of learning”
- New spaces in which to learn.

“visits to museums are invaluable for the new curriculum , helping children to lead their own learning”

Teachers are keen that this experience is not lost to their pupils, particularly where museum visits are not part of their family life:

“The New Curriculum encourages more visits and unfortunately, due to the area that the children come from, they do benefit with taking part in visits because they don’t get to visit many of the places with their family”

During an in-depth interview, one teacher said “we started looking at [the new curriculum] last night” and went on to describe a topic which they are beginning to design with the help of a museum because they had so enjoyed the work undertaken as part of the Making a Mark programme.

However, another school who responded to the on-line survey is already delivering the new curriculum. This respondent found that the programme activities which were offered worked well:

“We are already following the new curriculum and the activities offered fitted in perfectly. We are using Cornerstones and our ‘Engage’ week for our topic, ‘tremors’ wanted us to visit somewhere with interesting rocks and speak to geologists. [xx Museum] really inspired creative learning in a cross-curricular way”

Whilst the mechanics of delivering the new curriculum still need to be understood and planned in, a few teachers envisage that the extent to which museums have been “very accommodating”, “willing” and able to “tailor the days” bodes well:

“if the potential to do things collaboratively in the future exists, I am sure there will be some things we can do”

In addition, one teacher could foresee “possibly planning bespoke units of work with the Education Officers”.

Background information on the new curriculum

As already noted, the new curriculum will be delivered in all state maintained schools from September 2014. In practical terms, this is likely to include Academies. Whilst it is appreciated that museums will have a role to play in assisting with the delivery and resourcing of a broad range of curriculum subjects (e.g. science has already been explored with sessions on the beach looking at fossils and cliff formations), it is worth touching on the new history curriculum and the connections to the ‘Making a Mark’ programme.

The new history curriculum for KS1, KS2 and KS3 may be found at:

www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-history-programmes-of-study. Broadly, human history is split, chronologically between the three key stages. Hence, KS2 should be working on the stone age through to Edward the Confessor and KS3 from 1066 to 1901. KS1 are looking at changes in living memory, national or global events (including anniversaries) and the lives of significant individuals.

Each of these three key stages have a requirement for a local history study. This is an area in which the resources of museums, (physical resources, the knowledge of their staff, and the links which they have with local community groups) will be of direct benefit to teachers as they plan

the detail of new curriculum delivery over the next few months. Six teachers who responded to the on-line questionnaire had already picked up on this, as they stated that they would like to use “locally based topics” and “develop an understanding of local history” with their pupils.

For teachers teaching GCSE, there is less subject alteration, but due to changes in Government policy

(http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/performance/download/Statement_of_Intent_2013.pdf section 24) a secondary schools performance will now be based on a range of 8 subjects, rather than the 5 A-C grades of previous measures. Schools may wish to encourage students in a particular choice of subjects at GCSE in order to encourage a student’s best possible score to take forward for A’levels. As one teacher commented: “some students I would have expected to take Art, might not do so now.”

Summary

This is still relatively early days in relation to the new curriculum and schools will be responding to curriculum demands in different ways. For example one school talked about how, in the past, they have ‘bought in’ Schemes of Work rather than developed them internally; and they may do so again for the new curriculum. Part of a school’s response relates to their ethos, curriculum approach (e.g. using a ‘creative curriculum’) and the external demands on a school particularly in relation to previous and predicted achievements in literacy and numeracy.

Whilst the new history curriculum offers opportunities for museums to engage with schools, it should be remembered that other subject areas have topics which partnering with a museum would enhance curriculum delivery. One example, explored through ‘Making a Mark’, was the access to knowledge on rocks, fossils and soils which one museum was able to provide.

8: Participation in cultural activities

This section examines the practice of school visits in general, followed by feedback on school visits to museums. The final part reveals staff comments on why they participated in 'Making a Mark'.

School visits in general

The practice of school visits varies from school to school, as do the issues involved in the decision-making process. One respondent to the in-depth interview contrasted the situation in his current school, where there is a commitment that each class should have a visit to an external venue at least once a term, with a previous school where taking learning out of the classroom was more *ad hoc*.

Another respondent commented that as a three form entry, and due to the manner in which the timetable is constructed to support literacy and numeracy work, it can be very disruptive to take one form class on a trip at a time.

There is no doubt, however, that teachers consider there to be value to such excursions e.g.: "they are part of the broader experience of school"; and "they inspire and stimulate children's interest".

In the same way that attitudes to school trips vary, so do attitudes towards cost. Some headteachers will ask parents for half the cost of the school trip as a voluntary contribution; other headteachers are aware that such a request would be too much for their particular parents. For example, one teacher commented: "funding is a real issue to us particularly if transport is needed". Further feedback on funding issues is shown in section 9.

Visits to museums

Prior to their involvement in the 'Making a Mark' programme, the majority of schools (68%; of 35 respondents) only visited museums occasionally; i.e. less than once per year.

Regularly (at least once or twice per year)	9	25.7%
Occasionally (less than once per year)	24	68.6%
Not at all	2	5.7%
TOTAL	35	100%

Hence the programme increased the frequency of museum attendance – so that it was more than once per year – amongst the majority of schools.

According to some of those who completed the on-line survey (18 respondents), the decision to go on the trip to the museum had to consider a number of issues:

- Links to key topics/schemes of work to inspire pupils (8 teachers commented on this)
- Transport issues including costs (4 teachers said this)
- Cost/funding in general (2 teachers commented on this)
- The time factor (2 teachers said this)

There were 2 other unrelated comments: “as part of the broader experience of school”; and “for workshops and experiences that [the Education Officer] has put on in the museum”. The latter reveals that there is an existing relationship with this particular museum.

With the increasing pressures on schools to achieve improved results in literacy and numeracy, the question of ‘time to fit it in’ noted above, should not be underestimated.

Reason for participating in ‘Making a Mark’

There were a range of different reasons as to why schools participated in the programme (with multiple answers from 35 respondents). These can be grouped as follows:

Relevance and quality of content:

- The class was already studying a linked topic (14 comments about this)
- The local focus of the programme was of interest (3 comments)
- The quality of content (2 comments)
- The range of content e.g. workshops, activities, tour (1)
- The appropriateness of content to children’s age (1)
- The focus on writing (1)
- The hands-on nature of the programme (1)
- The idea of using the portraits was intriguing (1)

Funding support:

- Free sessions (9 comments about this)
- The support with the cost of transport (6 comments about this)

Museum location and staff attitude:

- How local the museum is to school (5 comments about this)
- Was planning to visit the museum anyway, and the programme was mentioned (2)
- How helpful and accommodating the museum was to our needs (1)

Existing relationship with the museum:

- A previous relationship with the museum (3 comments about this)

Other:

- Good feedback from others who had visited (2 comments about this)
- The school received an invitation from the museum (2)
- Others arranged it (1)

Summary

Schools exhibit different practice in relation to school visits, so there is not a ‘one size fits all’ policy that can act as a guide to museums. However, the ‘Making a Mark’ programme did increase the frequency of visits by the schools that participated.

With such a variance in practice from school to school, it is hard to effectively predict what schools' attitude to visits will be in the future.

However, it is fair to say that the degree to which the museum's offer:

- a) links to school topics
- b) is of quality and
- c) (for some schools) has at least partial support with costs

are all key issues. Further feedback on funding issues is shown in the next section.

9: Relationships between schools and the ‘Making a Mark’ museums

A number of different issues are discussed here regarding the relationship between the schools and the museums. Firstly, the extent to which museums were able to make their programme offer bespoke; secondly how participation in the programme has changed some teachers’ perceptions; and thirdly, how funding issues might impact on the further development of the relationship.

Making the programme bespoke to needs

Overall, 74.3% of teachers (26 from a total of 35 respondents) confirmed that the museum had made the programme bespoke. This was appreciated as, for example, shown by comments such as “sessions were adapted for our children’s needs” and:

“the education officer put a great deal of effort into designing the sessions around our needs”

Just 8.6% of teachers (3 out of 35 respondents) could not answer this question; and another 17.1% (6 out of 35 respondents) felt that the programme was not made bespoke to their needs. Only one school provided further feedback on this, commenting that the level was not quite right:

“the information on rocks was pitched quite high for the year 3 children and some failed to understand the information that was given”.

The table below provides the data from the on-line survey.

Yes	26	74.3%
No	6	17.1%
Don’t know	3	8.6%
TOTAL	35	100%

Changes in perceptions about museums

Within the in-depth interviews there was a range of views expressed when teachers were asked to reflect on whether involvement with the programme had changed their view of museums. Some respondents started from a strong position: “I was very positive in the first place and thought they were a vital local resource”. Yet others started from a different place:

“As a child I used to think museums were boring, and once as a teacher I had a loan box where things weren’t identified – there was one item we couldn’t work out what it was.”

Teachers commented that they were surprised by their experience of Making a Mark: “[Museums are] much more lively and much more accommodating than I thought.” This extended to a specific comment on a crucial aspect of the programme:

[I’m] more impressed at what is available locally. Why am I going to Newcastle – when there are resources here?

Notwithstanding the change in perception, funding issues remain a concern for schools.

Funding issues

Of the 35 respondents to the question of the relationship between the school and the museums, all of the schools (100%) stated that they would feel happy contacting the same Education Officers again – an overwhelmingly positive response. Similarly, there was a 100% positive response to the question of whether they would work with the same museum(s) again.

“we will return when we do the same topic again and plan related aspects into our work next time”

Whilst all schools (100%; of 35 respondents) stated that they would attend another 3 visit programme similar to ‘Making a Mark’, when the question of funding was brought into the equation this evoked a more mixed response. Teachers revealed a lot more uncertainty.

Table 9b: implications of funding issues				
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
Would you continue to attend a similar 3 visit programme	100% (35)	0	0	100% (35)
... even if there was a cost for this?	62.9% (22)	2.8% (1)	34.3% (12)	100% (35)
... even if travel subsidies were not offered?	48.5% (16)	6% (2)	45.5% (15)	100% (33)

Several teachers commented on how the low costs involved in participating in Making a Mark made a difference: “the low cost was the overriding reason that we attended the museum”; and “the travel subsidies were very beneficial”.

Obviously, for a handful of schools, the fact that they can walk to their (very) local museum means that travel costs are not an issue. Otherwise “it depends if parents could meet the cost of transport”.

Some schools will ask parents to contribute to the cost; for other schools this is something they will only do on odd occasions: “we do not like to ask parents for too much money and as a school we can only subsidise so much”.

However, for some schools they have to weigh up not just travel but any costs involved in visiting a museum, as this is likely to be one of several trips taking place in the year: “you have to make a choice between which ones you can do”.

Several schools didn't dismiss charges altogether, and responded that it depended on how high the cost was. For a few schools, they also saw this as linked to what was being offered: “if there was a cost, it depends on how much and what was being offered”; and:

“if the trip was relevant to topic and cost effective, we would take part again”.

Overall, the issue of frequency of attendance, bearing in mind that the Making a Mark programme involved 3 visits, is a key one: “it is expensive to attend the museum more than once if part of our journey is not subsidised”; and “without travel subsidies, I think it would be made very difficult for classes/year groups to come out for one and a half days each.”

The value of communications, e.g. “helpful staff” and an existing relationship with the museum, was highlighted: “we work closely with the xx Museum every year and they support us in getting the best out of our pupils”.

Summary

The majority of schools had found the museums were flexible to their specific needs. It is likely, but not proven, that this level of adaptability then had a positive influence on schools' perceptions of museums and what they, and the 'Making a Mark' programme could offer.

In terms of funding, schools' attitude to this varies with some able to ask parents for contributions and others much more reluctant. Cost of transport is an issue for schools with 17 out of 33 respondents saying that they would not be able to visit, or unsure whether they would be able to participate in museum visits, if the school was responsible for the entire cost of the trips. However, the educational value of the trip – i.e. the relevance to the curriculum – is a crucial point here that will help when trying to get leverage for funding. To date 'Marking a Mark' has predominantly worked with KS2 pupils however in the new curriculum from September not only KS2 but also KS1 have a local study requirement.

10: Marketing to schools

Detailed below, firstly, are those elements of the programme that the schools felt had been done well (and hence could be emphasised in marketing material); and, secondly, feedback from the teachers on the best way to approach schools.

Successful elements of the programme

In response to the simple question of what the programme had done well, there were multiple answers from 35 respondents. Included below are comments which could potentially be used by the museums for marketing purposes and can be grouped as follows:

- **Planning and communication**

There were 12 comments about the level of preparation, planning, communication and resourcing that had taken place, including: “an incredibly well organised day” and:

“even access to things out of the archive that we would generally not have access to”

- **Quality and range of activities**

There were 23 different comments about the content from the “very broad” range of activities to the mixture of “formal and informal photographs” and “the ‘round robin’ activities”. Four comments related to the level of interactivity that was incorporated into the sessions, including the questioning of the children. Another 8 comments referred to the hands-on nature of the activities, including “we loved the painting and dressing up sessions” and:

“our children benefit from practical experiences and this helped them to gain a greater understanding”

The quality of the exhibition, and even just the tour of the museum, were noted as real successes.

- **Skills of staff delivering the activities**

There were 14 comments about the people who delivered the activities; from “inspirational” and “excellent” to “very knowledgeable” staff. However it wasn’t just their own specialist knowledge that was noted, but the way in which they delivered, too, as “staff brought some quite complex subjects down to a level that they could understand” and:

“they related really well with the children and especially with the children in my class, catering for their particular needs”

- **Other**

Once more, the local focus of the programme was noted as was “good behaviour management”. Several teachers commented on how the whole programme offer caught their attention, and this is an important aspect of marketing to schools that shouldn’t be lost: it was “too good an opportunity to miss”; and we “always enjoy trying something new”.

Marketing approaches

The on-line survey asked for views on ways to market to schools with emailing/talking to staff in the school office and offering to deliver an assembly as the recommended approaches.

Table 10a: in general, what is the best way for museums to contact schools?		
Email/talk to staff in school office	22	75.8%
Offer to deliver an assembly	18	62.1%
Send in brochures/flyers	13	44.8%
Approach the headteacher	3	10.3%
TOTAL	<i>56 responses from 29 respondents</i>	<i>Multiple responses</i>

In interview, teachers tended to emphasise relationship elements, commenting that ‘getting to know’ the staff had been key, and that this should be built upon if museums were to market effectively to schools.

“Is it possible for museums to have a named contact, a ‘school liaison officer’ or an open evening ‘this is how we can support teachers come and have a look’. Somehow the key is in ‘relationship’.”

This was almost identical to another respondent who said:

“It costs money (i.e. in museum staff time) – but contact schools as much as possible to find the ‘topic’ or ‘history’ co-ordinator for each school. If someone books a visit, get their e-mail. Keep in touch with individual staff.”

Another said: “get the e-mail of teachers who do bring groups and keep in touch”. And, a home school teacher commented:

“Word of mouth is probably best with home schools. Have confidence in your product – it’s excellent”

Whereas in secondary education, in the on-line survey it was suggested that museums should be in touch with History Co-ordinators and Curriculum Leaders. Another teacher felt that maintaining a range of communication methods would be more likely to meet all the needs of different staff.

Summary

Schools who responded to the on-line survey felt that the programme had been successful in the way it was planned, communicated, resourced and designed with a broad range of activities on offer to stimulate and engage pupils. The level of skill of those who delivered the programme was noted too.

Teachers were again keen to praise the relationships which they had built with museum staff, emphasising it as a really significant element of the ‘Making a Mark’ programme. Direct approach and maintaining direct contact with teachers is crucial, too. Emphasising the support and the range of different resources available, particularly if it is not a ‘history’ topic, are also important.

11: Advocacy work

Impact of taking part on likely future involvement with cultural venues

“the importance of using museums etc. to supplement and complement classroom-based activities”

Whilst it shouldn't be forgotten that a few schools took part in 'Making a Mark' due to an existing relationship with the museum (at least 3 of those who responded to the on-line questionnaire mentioned this), there is some good feedback about the degree to which schools' involvement and positive experiences can generate further potential visits to the cultural sector as a whole.

“The expertise of the [museum] staff enhances the experience”

The 'Making a Mark' programme has had a strong impact on the schools; so much so that 94.3% of teachers (33 out of 35 respondents) said that they would now visit other local museums. The same figure, said that they would now visit other local cultural venues; and just slightly fewer at 91.4% (32 out of 35 respondents), said that they would now be happy contacting Education Officers in other cultural establishments. As mentioned at the start of the report, 2 of the individuals who responded had taken pupils to the Making a Mark programme in 2 different museums.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
Likely to visit other local museums	94.3% (33)	0	5.7% (2)	100% (35)
Likely to visit other local cultural venues	94.3% (33)	0	5.7% (2)	100% (35)
Be happy to contact Education Officers in other establishments	91.4% (32)	0	8.6% (3)	100% (35)

Teachers commented on how much the pupils gained and how valuable the trip to a museum is “which they may not usually visit with parents”. The teaching staff acknowledged that they have a role in this, too: “we try and encourage our children to be aware and involved in their heritage and local area”.

“A brilliant experience both for staff and pupils. Lots of new things learned, new experiences, and new connections made. Added depth and breadth to pupils' knowledge.”

There was an acknowledgement by one teacher of the need for their profession to have the confidence to ask for what they need:

“One of the problems is not knowing what is available from a museum...as a teacher you have to be able to say ‘this is what we are doing – what can you do to help us?’”

This teacher described the topic that they are beginning to plan for next year; this was identified and selected by the teaching staff because of the resources which they now realise that they can access through the museum.

Using what has been learnt to advocate for similar programmes

Bearing in mind the earlier comments about quality, relevant programmes that meet the schools’ needs, the 7 Teesside museum partners have the experience and plans in place to further enhance their programme. They also have the potential to share what they have learnt, expand on what they are doing, and to work with other cultural partners to do the same.

The Arts Council has regional ‘Bridge Organisations’ across the country; the local one is The Sage, Gateshead. Find out about their plans for working with cultural organisations and schools. E.g. their current work on developing arts apprenticeships. See <http://www.thejournal.co.uk/business/business-news/young-people-offered-arts-apprenticeships-6482715>

Groups of cultural organisations sometimes get together to decide on their ‘cultural offer’ to children, young people and schools. For example the cultural businesses in the Ouseburn Valley have set up a model for this – can museums learn from this and/or work with other local organisations in the Tees Valley in the same way?

12: Final conclusion

The 'Making a Mark' programme has provided a wide range of opportunities for the seven museums in the Tees Valley to engage with teachers and pupils.

The focus on local heritage has made a clear mark on teachers, increasing their knowledge of the local area and their awareness of highly relevant resources which – as one teacher remarked – “bring history to life”. There has been a breadth of impact which the programme has made on classroom practice. This ranges from exploring enquiry based learning and more active learning approaches, through to the teachers gaining more skill and ideas in incorporating artefacts in their delivery; all this reflects the variety of sessions which are being delivered as part of 'Making a Mark'.

Teachers have reported that there has been a clear impact on pupils' understanding of the heritage of their local area. In addition, teachers believe that there has been an impact on pupils' ability to make connections between subjects, and have seen their motivation for learning increase.

Many teachers believe that these have been invaluable opportunities for their pupils, particularly where museum visits are not a familiar pastime for pupils or their families.

Museum education staff can learn from the programme too. Teachers have suggested that they can help develop museum staffs' skills. Whilst many teachers did not see a need to improve on any aspect of 'Making a Mark', some made suggestions based on individual sessions. These comments, about being careful to get the balance of 'talk' and 'do' correct, or about understanding the learner, will form the basis of the initial 'teacher buddy' meetings over the next few months.

A new curriculum will be mandatory for all schools from September 2014 and it is likely that this will have some impact on the relationship between schools and museums. Whilst many schools are not beginning the planning process until after Easter, there are signs that there will be opportunities for schools and museums to build upon the relationships which have been started through 'Making a Mark'. The requirement for a 'local study' to be undertaken at each of the key stages in the new history curriculum is an example of one such prime opportunity.

The programme did increase the frequency of visits to museums by those schools who participated. Another point to highlight is that those museums seen to be trying to be adaptable to specific schools' needs was appreciated.

The issue of cost will continue to impact on schools ability to visit cultural venues. Looking at potential future visits, teachers were split between those who said that the ethos of the school would ensure that cultural visits continued, despite the cost, and those who said that either the visits would not continue, or that they were unsure whether they would. Schools who place a high value on the education experiences available from such visits will attempt to find a way to pay for the substantial cost of transport.

A key factor in a school visiting a museum is the relevance of the session or resources to the topic which is being studied. This is very individual to each school and each cohort. It is therefore unlikely that generic museum marketing will have much impact. Teachers have encouraged museums to make direct approaches to individual curriculum leads in schools.

Making a Mark has had a positive impact on teachers and pupils. It has raised the profile of the resources available in the Tees Valley and provided opportunities for teachers to develop their own knowledge of a range of subject areas. Teachers have appreciated this: “have confidence in your product – it’s excellent.”

13: Recommendations

The feedback gathered during this evaluation emphasises that schools – and the particular cohorts that they have at any one time – are all different. Hence, having a ‘one size fits all’ programme is not an option. The extent to which museum staff can be responsive and adaptable is significant. The fact that one teacher humorously suggested that an improvement would have been “not getting a call from OFSTED while being at the museum” highlights the different demands that a school faces. However it also emphasizes the fact that the museum’s influence is also, at times, limited.

Understanding and being responsive both to the learning needs of the pupils, and the learning outcomes of their teachers, will go a long way to making the programme experience successful.

Allied strongly to this, then, is the need for good communications with the school where possible, as follows:

- to ascertain what the pupils already know before coming on the museum visit;
- to account for the capabilities of the pupils who will attend;
- to determine what the teacher would like them to know by the end; and, finally,
- to outline the likely content and approach of the programme’s activities.

The following recommendations are made in the light of research undertaken in Spring 2014 and are specific to the five areas of impact mentioned earlier. Some of these will already be part of museums’ activities in Tees Valley but are included here for a broader audience. Above all, the relationship that the Education Officer is able to develop and maintain with a teacher is the most crucial aspect to the success of this – and other similar – programmes.

1. During the ‘teacher buddy’ sessions, find out teachers’ views on ways in which the costs of the programme can be minimised. To what extent can arrangements be made for one of the three programme sessions to be held back in school? Can transport costs be shared across two schools?
2. Relationship is key! The teacher occupies almost a ‘gatekeeper’ role. If the teacher is excited about coming to a museum session, the children will be too (and, potentially, other members of their extended family due to a knock-on effect). Taking the time to find out what the teacher’s experience of museums is, and what they like, will be rewarded.
3. Teachers participated in ‘Making a Mark’ because the topic offered by the museum was relevant and timely. Do not expect generic marketing (a standard museum leaflet) to be effective. Develop marketing materials which showcases the topics you have been supporting through ‘Making a Mark’. Include quotes from teachers which link museum resources to curriculum delivery.
4. Gather e-mails and maintain an accurate database of contacts, including those in adjoining counties. Do keep in regular contact (e.g. termly) as teachers focus on the key priorities immediately in front of them and your email can be forgotten amidst other demands on their time.
5. If they aren’t produced already, consider writing short e-newsletters (with pictures and quotes from teachers). Target these to be relevant to a particular group. For example, an e-

newsletter could be sent to science co-ordinators highlighting resources at different museums on 'rocks and fossils'.

6. Work with the teacher to explore the skills which could be developed amongst the children during a museum session. Perhaps it is looking at authenticating evidence, perhaps it is developing questioning skills. The impact of developing skills can be measured in the classroom long after the museum session.
7. Keep the sessions active and the links (and examples) local. Teachers have commented that local examples have motivated children to find out more.
8. Many teachers said that they would welcome museum staff coming into school to run an assembly. Could assemblies be offered with particular 'tie-ins' to national events (Museum week, environmental weeks), or to coincide with anniversaries?
9. Schools welcome introductions to community groups. If you are working with a community group (for example a local history society), would the school welcome their knowledge too?
10. Should they be relevant, ensure loan boxes have a sheet of pictures and annotations of the items (to help teachers identify objects quickly). Include in each loan box a sheet of suggested ways in which the objects might be used in different curriculum lessons to develop learning.
11. Take time to read the new curriculum (available at www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-curriculum#curriculum-by-key-stages). Could you hold an 'open evening' for teachers? This could include a brief presentations on, for example, 'how we can help with the new KS2 science curriculum' and a tour of the store with a prize for the most unusual item spotted.
12. Consider 'writing up' sessions which have been well received by teachers. This could be done simply, to take up no more than an A4 sheet. With headings such as 'What happened' 'The impact on learning' 'How we could help you', with pictures and quotes from teachers. This could become part of a mailing to schools, or given away at education events.

14: Appendices

Appendix 1: Methodology

Based on an initial meeting with the Education Officer of Kirkleatham Old Hall Museum, Jo Graham's December 2013 Teacher Feedback evaluation report, and the six bullet points from the brief, the questions for the on-line survey were constructed. These were a mixture of open and closed questions, some with multiple option answers, and text boxes for more in depth responses.

Desk research was undertaken, looking at various schedules for the new curriculum and seeking to establish whether organisations such as Museums Association, GEM (Group for Education in Museums) and Cultural Learning Alliance had published any relevant papers which might have informed either our own evaluation of the impact of working with museums on teaching practice or of any thinking on the impact of the new curriculum on cultural activities. Nothing was found to directly impact on this piece of evaluation.

Schools were contacted via e-mail with a request to participate in an on-line survey (Appendix 2). As an encouragement to complete the survey by a certain deadline, they were offered a prize draw of a Flip-camera for their school. Two cameras were offered (on different weeks) and these were won by Badger Hill Primary School and Breckon Hill Primary.

From the initial data supplied by the client, a total of 68 emails were sent out on 27th – 28th February. Of these, 11 emails bounced and correct addresses had to be sought from the schools concerned, one more email bounced with no alternative point of contact (this was a home school address); hence this point of contact was lost to the research. Other names supplied had also moved on, or were on long term leave. A reminder was sent on the 5th March.

A further 28 names were supplied, and an email sent to these teachers on 10th March, offering the second price draw. Those teachers who had not responded to the first round of emails were included in this mailing and offered another chance to be entered into the prize draw. Reminders were again sent out on the 17th March.

Therefore, the total number of individuals to whom emails were sent requesting participation in the on-line survey (once bounced emails and members of staff who had left the school were taken into consideration) was 96. This represented 62 different schools. The response rate (by individuals) for the survey was 36, therefore a return of 37.5%.

In the on-line survey teachers were asked whether they would be willing to be contacted for a follow up interview (Appendix 3). In total, 27 teachers expressed an interest in participating in the research further, however only 25 left a contact detail. From these responses, 6 in-depth interviews were conducted within the time frame; NB interviews were sought with more teachers, but unfortunately they were too busy to respond. This represented one Home School network, three local authorities and three different museums. The interviews were all conducted by telephone and took place during or at the end of the school day, in between various different staff commitments and meetings.

Appendix 2: On- line survey



Exploring our story with Tees Valley museums

Making a Mark, independent survey

Welcome

Thank you for taking the time to fill in our questionnaire. The information you give us will enable us to improve Making a Mark for the future.

1. Which Key Stage do you teach (and was involved in the Making a Mark programme)?

- Key Stage 1 Key Stage 2 Key Stage 3 Key Stage 4

2. In which Tees Valley borough is your school located?

- Darlington Hartlepool Middlesbrough Redcar & Cleveland Stockton on Tees

3. Before taking part in Making a Mark, did you and your class visit museums:

- Regularly (i.e.at least once or twice per academic year)
 Occasionally (i.e. less than once per academic year)
 Not at all

Why was that? (please specify)

4. What encouraged your school to take part in the Making a Mark programme?

5. As a result of taking part in Making a Mark, would you and your class now:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Visit other local museums?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit other local cultural venues?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Be happy to contact Education Officers in other establishments?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Any other comments about participation in cultural activities?

6. Which museum(s) did you work with on Making a Mark?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Captain Cook Birthplace Museum | <input type="checkbox"/> Hartlepool Museum & Art Gallery | <input type="checkbox"/> Preston Park Museum (Stockton) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleveland Ironstone Mining Museum | <input type="checkbox"/> Head of Steam (Darlington) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dorman Museum | <input type="checkbox"/> Kirkleatham Museum | |

7. As a result of working with the specific museum(s), would you now:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Feel happy contacting the same Education Officer(s) for further information?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with the same museum(s) again?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Continue to attend the same museum(s) for a 3 visit programme such as Making a Mark?

... and even if there was a cost for this?

... and even if travel subsidies were not offered?

Any other comments (particularly if you answered 'no' or 'don't know'

above)

8. In relation to the 3 sessions for Making a Mark, were they made bespoke to your own schools' needs?

Yes

No

Don't know

Additional comments

9. In relation to the 3 sessions, what was done particularly well?

10. What could have been done better?

11. What could the session leader learn from you, specifically, as a teacher?

12. Which three elements of Making a Mark, in rank order, had the most impact in general?

The greatest impact The second greatest impact The third greatest impact

The chance to work closely with a museum

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The focus on our local heritage and identity

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The use of national paintings to put our local achievements into context

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The time and space to learn and reflect over 3 sessions

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The opportunity to work with a skilled leader/creative practitioner

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The focus on active learning

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The focus on independent learning

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The focus on enquiry based learning

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The focus on social and collaborative learning

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The use of a creative approach

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

The cross-curricular approach

Why have you given it that impact rating? (please specify)

https://www.surveymonkey.net/MySurvey_EditPage.aspx?sm=P%2fQ0APBKtUsm79IjfN4KpcTkGTJ0PypA0pdoWKwwFuo3poLCgF0mmWYw3lomfs5U&TB_iframe=true&height=450&width=650

13. As a result of taking part in Making a Mark, what has been the MOST significant impact on your own classroom practice?

14. As a result of taking part in Making a Mark, what has been the SECOND most significant impact on your own classroom practice?

15. As a result of taking part in Making a Mark, what has been the THIRD most significant impact on your own classroom practice?

16. Does the new curriculum encourage your school to:

Yes

No

Don't know

Visit museums as frequently as you have due to Making a Mark?

Work with the museum Education Officers in the same way?

Ask museums to support delivery in a different way?

Additional comment (please specify)

17. Please describe ways in which Making a Mark may help you to deliver elements of the new curriculum (this may be skill or content related).

https://www.surveymonkey.net/MySurvey_EditPage.aspx?sm=P%2fQ0APBKtUsm79IjfN4KpcTkGTJ0PypA0pdoWKwwFurcEQ49qwVb0s0k%2bL7RjrXE&TB_iframe=true&height=450&width=650

18. What impact has Making a Mark had on your pupils? (select at least 3 of the answer options)

	No impact	Some impact	Significant impact
They know more about their local heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
They are prouder of their local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
They have visited other museums with their family/carers/frie	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

nds

They are more inquisitive and better able to ask questions

They are keener to put forward ideas

They work more collaboratively

Their analytical skills have improved

They are better able to make connections across subject areas

They are inspired to 'make a mark/difference' for themselves

They are more motivated in general

They are better able to make choices and take some responsibility

Their writing skills have improved

Their art and design skills have improved

Any additional comments

19. When did you take part in Making a Mark?

In this academic year (2013-14)

In the previous academic year (2012-13)

How has the impact on pupils been sustained since then?

https://www.surveymonkey.net/MySurvey_EditPage.aspx?sm=P%2fQ0APBKtUsm79IjfN4KpcTkGTJ0PypA0pdoWKvf1WbsbEyOgKKtu5Lgdc&TB_iframe=true&height=450&width=650

20. In general, what do you feel is the best way for museums to contact schools?

Email/talk to staff in the school office

Approach the Headteacher

Send in brochures/flyers

Offer to come in to deliver an assembly

Other (please specify)

21. Are you happy to be contacted for further feedback?

Yes

No

Any additional comments (please specify)

22. We are looking for a few teachers to 'buddy up' with museum staff to improve the Making a Ma programme, would you be willing to be contacted for further information on this? (some funding for cover time is available)

Yes

No

Any additional comments (please specify)

23. Please provide your contact details (these will remain confidential and will not be passed to an external organisation)

NAME

SCHOOL

EMAIL

Questionnaire designed by Dr Sarah Jackson
Email: skjvoronezh@yahoo.co.uk

Appendix 3: In-depth interview questions

MaM evaluation: in-depth question areas

Check through the teacher's on-line response – is there anything particular to follow up on?

Introduction to this discussion e.g. more detail about the impact of the project on you as a teacher, in particular; picking up on a few things you noted down in the on-line questionnaire.

1. **Impact on you as a teacher (check what they answered to Q13, Q14 & Q15)**
2. **Impact of the new curriculum (check what they answered to Q16 and Q17)**
3. **When is your school doing its planning in relation to the start of the new curriculum in September?**
4. You said that _____ and _____ and _____ were the most impactful elements to the programme (Q12), where is it missing a trick in relation to further impact / how do you think the MaM programme could best be improved for the future?
5. **What are your schools priorities for the next year or so, and where do you think there might be links with what the MaM programme can offer?**
6. **Likely pattern of museum visits from September – annual, twice per year, termly?**
7. **The vision for the programme was that it would be “an innovative, yet sustainable programme that encourages teachers and students to have pride in the past, ownership of the present and optimism for the future of their locality”. Discuss whether it is achieving this or not etc.**
8. **Has your view of museums changed in any way as a result of being involved in the MaM project?**
9. **Is there anything you want to add?**