## NOA F2 Specification Form for a commissioned activity

**GCSE English Resit Programme for Post 16 schools in the Norwich Opportunity Area**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Norwich Opportunity Area Priority** | 4. Give young people the information and support they need to move successfully between school, college, university and into work |
| **2. Strand** | 4.2 To provide the best possible support to those sixteen to nineteen year olds who are seeking to strengthen their crucial English and maths skills, we will work with key stage 4 providers and City College Norwich to develop new ways to support young people that didn’t achieve level two English and Maths while at secondary school. This will include exploring better data-sharing arrangements and sharing approaches to ensuring consistently high-quality teaching. We will robustly evaluate this activity so that we can share learning from these pilots with other schools and colleges across the country. |
| **3. Activity Name** | GCSE English resits – innovative schemes of learning and resources |
| **4. Background** | **Norwich Opportunity Area**  Young people in Norwich from disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely than their peers elsewhere in England to leave school with a good level of attainment, go on to study for a level 3 qualification (such as A levels), continue with education or employment from age nineteen, or go to university.  Norwich has been identified as an Opportunity Area by the Department for education to address this problem. This activity is part of the [delivery plan](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/658582/Social_Mobility_Delivery_Plan_Norwich_v6__FINAL_.pdf).  GCSE English attainment in the NOA area is not supporting high numbers of student progressing straight to Level 3 study post 16.  Some post 16 providers have the attainment of GCSE English high grades as a criteria of entry, thus reducing choice post 16 within the NOA.  Non-attainment of GCSE English high grades by age 19 is a significant barrier to study at L4 and above.  The key challenge for GCSE resit pedagogy is the ability to tailor the delivery to make significant progress with students within each single academic year.  There are a number of post 16 resit specific schemes of learning and resources that have been developed for the delivery of GCSE Maths, such as the AQA “one year roadmap” developed by Julia Smith (allaboutmaths.aqa.org.uk/1YearRouteMap). However, there is little equivalent work being done on GCSE English resits.  This project will commission that work to develop innovative and evidence based approaches to the delivery of GCSE English within 1 year in a post 16 resit setting. This will produce approaches for testing that can assist teachers and institutions in ensuring students and making strong progress and achieving a greater proportion of GCSE High grade outcomes. |
| **5. Targeted individuals/schools** | Post 16 providers in the Norwich Opportunity Area – City College Norwich + School Based 6th forms who offer GCSE English resits |
| **6. Price cap** | £20,000 |
| **7. Outputs** | * Teaching resources, scheme of work and admin/tracking resources for a one-year English GCSE resit programme that enables tutors to target areas of weakness given student level KS4 data on past performance and previous study. Electronic copy and 10 hard copy resources * Training for teachers in use of the programme inc delivery, venue and materials |
| **8. Short term outcomes** | * Improved student engagement and progress in post 16 English programmes * A network of local post 16 providers sharing good practice and mutually supporting each other to deliver a common programme |
| **9. Long term outcomes** | * The development of common evidence based approaches to the teaching of post 16 resit GCSE English between providers supporting progress of students throughout the NOA and beyond. * Improved GCSE English resit high grades for NAO students unlocking their potential for higher level study and progression to L4+ study |
| **10. Evidence base** | According to the EEF, there has been little research done about how to improve the English and Maths skills of older, lower-skilled learners. The EEF commissioned a [review](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Publications/16-18_Literature_Review.pdf) of the available literature before making their first grants in this area, and the Centre for Vocational Education Research published another [review](http://cver.lse.ac.uk/textonly/cver/pubs/cverdp005.pdf) in April 2017. Both identified a need for more research that uses rigorous methods such as randomised controlled trials, as there are very few of these available to guide teachers at the moment.  With the caveats about the security of the evidence in mind, research suggests that some features of effective English teaching include peer-mediated support that is sustained over time, and using a range of strategies rather than just focusing on one approach.  The EEF are currently trialling a programme through “Access for Success” working with Manchester College to assess incoming students’ English skills so that teachers can deliver a more targeted programme. However this does not include a specifically developed programme of learning. Another trial is currently focused on peer-mediated support through text messaging. |
| **11. Prospective providers should meet the following criteria:** | Expertise: Providers should have a clear track record of developing impactful teaching and learning resources and approaches for the post 16 sector, with particular reference to GCSE courses. They should demonstrate a clear understanding of both the student context, the staffing context and the place of GCSE resits within the wider post 16 Programme of Study.  Experience: Providers should have experience of working with managers and teaching staff in a co-design methodology to develop innovative and impactful teaching and learning initiatives, which have led to improved outcomes. They should have experience of successfully delivering CPD. Good knowledge of a range of exam boards. |
| **12. Prospective providers are invited to submit:** | 1. Evidence of expertise and experience stated in section 11 above (Weighting 35%) 2. Approach to this project (no more than 2 sides of A4). Including staffing and a description of any potential conflicts of interest and how you will deal with them (Weighting 35%) 3. Details of your time, fees and expenses required to meet the outcomes and price cap (Weighting 30%) |
| **13. Timetable** | Proposals should be submitted by: 23/2/18  Appointment will be notified by: 30/2/18  Project should be completed by: 8/6/18 with a training event for delivery staff late June. |
| **14. Additional information** | Alongside this project local post 16 providers, led by City College Norwich, are working with local schools on a data-sharing solution that will give tutors access to a “re-sit” students’ prior exam board, curriculum information, and areas of weakness. It is expected that this programme will enable tutors to use this information to deliver bespoke targeted English revision in the re-sit year rather than delivering a “back to basics/one size fits all” programme in a short period of time. The successful applicant will be briefed on the development of the data sharing project to facilitate a good synergy between the two projects.  The resources produced will become the intellectual property of the Norwich Opportunity Area.  If you would like any further information about the project in preparation of your application please contact Jacqueline Bircham, Programme Director for the Norwich Opportunity Area, [Jacqueline.bircham@newanglia.co.uk](mailto:Jacqueline.bircham@newanglia.co.uk) |

Application from providers on the quality questions (not including price) will be scored using the following descriptors.

| ***Descriptor*** | ***Mark awarded*** |
| --- | --- |
| Applicant fails to provide a response or provides a response of such a poor standard as to provide no confidence that the Applicant could successfully deliver the project.  **If the approach or credentials receive a score of ‘0’, the entire submission will be rejected.** | 0 |
| Applicant provides a response of such a poor standard as to provide little confidence that the Applicant meets the requirements. The response shows **many or all** of the following issues:   * The information requested is only partially provided * The response appears likely to only partially meet the project outcomes * The response does not reflect accepted good practice/ has a weak evidence base * The response is insufficiently specific * The response appears not to deliver expected levels of detail, performance, expertise, outcome, supporting resources or other relevant characteristics * Supporting documents (where requested) are of insufficient quality, depth or relevance. | 1 |
| A response with some **clear strengths** but demonstrating **some** of the issues above | 2 |
| An acceptable response, with **some degree of weakness** but where the weakness does not cause fundamental concerns and is **outweighed by the strengths.** | 3 |
| A good response where the strengths clearly outweigh any minor weakness(es), and the **majority** of aspects below apply:   * All information requested has been provided in full * The response clearly explains how outcomes will be met * The response reflects accepted good practice/has a strong evidence base * The response is well tailored to specific stakeholders and circumstances * The response offers good levels of detail, performance, expertise, outcome, supporting resources or other relevant characteristics * Supporting documents (where requested) are of good quality, relevant and of sufficient depth. | 4 |
| An excellent response with no weaknesses, that provides confidence that the project outcomes would be fully met | 5 |

Selection Process

1. The score for each question will be divided by the maximum possible score of five (5) and then multiplied by the individual weighting for that question to give a weighted score. For example, if a score of 3 out of 5 is given and the question is worth 10% of total marks (3/5\*10), then the weighted score will be 6.
2. The formula to be used to calculate the score for price is as follows:
   * The bid with the lowest total price will be allocated the maximum number of points, with other Bidders being awarded marks in proportion to this price, so that for example a total price that is 30% more expensive will receive 30% fewer marks, one that is 60% more expensive will receive 60% fewer marks etc.
   * A total of 30% of the overall score is allocated to Price.
3. The contract will be awarded to the person who scores the highest when combining the quality and price score.
4. Clarification questions should be sent to Sarah Hardy [sarah.hardy@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.hardy@norfolk.gov.uk)
5. Final bids should be submitted to Sarah Hardy sarah.hardy@norfolk.gov.uk