

# **London Schools Excellence Fund**

## **Self-Evaluation Toolkit**

### **Final report**

#### **Contact Details**

[educationprogramme@london.gov.uk](mailto:educationprogramme@london.gov.uk)

## Evaluation Final Report Template

### Introduction

The London Schools Excellence Fund (LSEF) is based on the hypothesis that investing in teaching, subject knowledge and subject-specific teaching methods and pedagogy will lead to improved outcomes for pupils in terms of attainment, subject participation and aspiration. The GLA is supporting London schools to continue to be the best in the country, with the best teachers and securing the best results for young Londoners. The evaluation will gather information on the impact of the Fund on teachers, students and the wider system.

This report is designed for you to demonstrate the impact of your project on teachers, pupils and the wider school system and reflect on lessons learnt. It allows you to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of your project methodology and could be used to secure future funding to sustain the project from other sources. All final reports will feed into the programme wide [meta-evaluation of the LSEF](#) being undertaken by SQW. Please read in conjunction with Project Oracle's '**Guidance to completing the Evaluation Final Report**'.

### **Project Oracle: Level 2**

**Report Submission Deadline:** English for Integration - 9 June 2015 / Round 1 and Round 2 - 30 September 2015 (*delete as appropriate*)

**Report Submission:** Rocket Science

**Project Name:** Promoting Literacy through reciprocal reading

**Lead Delivery Organisation:** Eastlea Community School

**London Schools Excellence Fund Reference:** LSEF177

**Author of the Self-Evaluation:** Carlene Rowe

**Total LSEF grant funding for project:** £68,480

**Total Lifetime cost of the project (inc. match funding):** £72,000

**Actual Project Start Date:** October 15, 2014

**Actual Project End Date:** December 2015

## 1. Executive Summary

*This should be a brief summary of what information is included in the report, the evaluation methods and analysis used and a summary of the key findings from your project evaluation. (maximum 500 words)*

*Reciprocal reading has been successful in enhancing teachers' knowledge of the reading comprehension process. Teachers are now more proficient in delivering guided reading sessions aimed at improving students' understanding of a range of texts. Lesson planning has been altered to include clear reference to the reciprocal reading process as a result teachers are better able to utilise new acquired skills. The impact of this has been a greater level of independence and resilience in students approach to the reading process. The methods used can be accessed by students across the ability range and this has resulted in all members of the sample making some progress. Originally the project was aimed at working with identified groups of students. However the decision was taken by partner schools to use reciprocal reading at whole school level.*

## 2. Project Description

*Much of the detail for this section can be drawn from your Stage 2 funding application. Please note that if you do copy this information from your original application, funding agreement, or interim report, be sure to update it as appropriate (e.g. including tense change).*

*Provide a full project description (approximately one side of A4), in particular:*

- *Why was the project set up? / What need was it seeking to address? (E.g. because teachers lacked confidence in their subject knowledge? Because pupil attainment was lower in this subject area in this borough/cluster/school/than in other boroughs/clusters/schools?).*
- *What were the circumstances into which it was introduced (e.g. existing networks of schools/ expert partner offering a new approach etc.)?*
- *What project activities have been put in place?*
- *Where has the project been delivered geographically?*
- *Who delivered the project?*
- *Who were the target beneficiary groups of the project and why?*

The project was established in order to support the transition from primary secondary school by developing a consistent approach to Guided Reading and Writing in Years 5, 6 and 7. In doing this students are allowed to develop the skills needed to engage with new types of texts in secondary school in the context of a familiar pedagogy.

Having well-developed literacy skills is centrally important to learning. If these skills are not in place it becomes difficult for children to access all subjects across the curriculum. The schools – primary and secondary – associated with this bid have noticed that a significant number of children experience literacy difficulties.

For these children the transition from primary to secondary education is especially difficult and often results in them not making three or more levels of progress at Key Stage 3 or more than expected progress at Key Stage 4. This is clearly evidenced by our school's Data

Dashboard which at the time of making this showed that at KS4 students at Eastlea had not made more than expected progress in English. The project was therefore be aimed at developing students' skills in reading and communication to ensure that they make three or more levels of progress at KS3 and develop the ability to confidently articulate their ideas in Standard English. In addition it was hoped that all students involved in the project would be better able to access the curriculum at whole school level because reading, which is a major barrier to literacy in all subjects, would have been rigorously addressed and monitored. Above all involvement in this project has served to enhance teachers' subject knowledge because they have developed existing partnerships and created new links with primary school by forming teaching and learning communities which have caused both specialist and non-specialist teachers of literacy to work together to research and develop a range of strategies with which to enhance literacy in across the curriculum.

***The project has been delivered through:***

Three demonstration lesson for staff. One demonstration lesson was held at Eastlea Community School the others were held within the premise of our primary partners

An additional four CPD sessions were delivered at primary school.

Monitoring visit and lesson observations were carried out by the project manager. This was in order to ascertain the extent to which the methodology was being embedding in lessons.

The project was set up in collaboration with or expert partners at the University of East London. The new approach that was offered by the UEL was for teaching and learning communities to be created in order to share best practice ideas and further assess the impact of reciprocal reading methodology. The project was delivered within Newham and the beneficiary group were KS2 (Primary Teachers) and KS 3 (Secondary Teachers). This group was selected because of the need to narrow the attainment gap which often appears during the transition for Key Stage 2 to 3. Furthermore Newham's EAL population is fast expanding and there is a chronic need for reading comprehension skills to be embedded with the vision of all schools.

**2.1 Does your project support transition to the new national curriculum? Yes/No**

If **Yes**, what does it address?

According to the Department of Education, the national curriculum for English(Key Stage 2)aims to ensure that all pupils: read easily, fluently and with good understanding, use discussion in order to learn; they should be able to elaborate and explain clearly their understanding and ideas." Additionally the programmes of study for reading at key stages 1 and 2 consist of two dimensions: word reading comprehension (both listening and reading)." Above all, "comprehension skills develop through pupils' experience of high-quality discussion with the teacher, as well as from reading and discussing a range of stories, poems and non-fiction." At Key Stage 3 the DFE states that the national curriculum for English aims to ensure that all pupils: read easily, fluently and with good understanding.

Reciprocal Reading can undoubtedly ensure the realisation of these aims because it aims to improve students' reading comprehension using four strategies: predicting questioning

clarifying and summarising. During this project teachers' subject knowledge was enhanced and they become more proficient in scaffolding the four strategies by modelling, guiding and helping students to apply strategies while reading; guide students to become reflective in their thinking; help students monitor their reading comprehension; strengthen instruction in a variety of settings (whole-class and guided reading) and locate these skills within a broader framework of comprehension strategies. In this way students develop reading skills that will engender, fluency, and understanding excellent comprehension.

**2.2** Please list any materials produced and/or web links and state where the materials can be found. Projects should promote and share resources and include them on the [LondonEd website](#).

Materials were produced by The University of Eastlea London. However they have not been made public because of possible copyright infringements.

### **3. Theory of Change and Evaluation Methodology**

Please attach a copy of your validated Theory of Change and Evaluation Framework.

*Throughout the report it would be useful if you make reference to these documents. Where appropriate we would also encourage you to include any assumptions you have made from previous research.*

*The information has been extracted from our theory of change.*

**3.1** Please list **all** outcomes from your evaluation framework in Table 1. If you have made any changes to your intended outcomes after your Theory of Change was validated please include revised outcomes and the reason for change.

Teachers to be trained in the use of RT and to develop subject knowledge of reading comprehension and dialogic teaching.

Teachers to develop subject knowledge of genre theory.

Teachers to develop both Guided Reading and Guided writing strategies to support this.

Teachers to begin dissemination of practice to colleagues in preparation for September 2014 term. This will be carried out through cross phase workshops as well as the IRIS video Training resource

Progress data on children to be collected and compared with pre-intervention data  
Recruit neighbouring schools for September 2014 term.

Recruit students in all schools to the project.

Data analysis to locate students who are underachieving. Further assess baseline data to be collected using York Assessment of Reading Comprehension, Accelerated Reader and the Communication Trust tool for assessing Spoken language.

Recruit students in all schools to the project.

Data analysis to locate students who are underachieving. Further assess baseline data to be collected using York Assessment of Reading Comprehension, Accelerated Reader and the Communication Trust tool for assessing Spoken language.

**Table 1- Outcomes**

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
Teacher Outcome 1	Teachers to be trained in the use of RT and to develop subject knowledge of reading comprehension and dialogic teaching.	The original outcome was not altered.	Not applicable
Teacher Outcome 2	Teachers to develop subject knowledge of genre theory. Teachers to develop both Guided Reading and Guided Writing strategies to support this.	Teachers to develop subject knowledge of genre theory. Teachers to develop proficiency in Guided Reading strategies.	Guided writing strategies were not introduced because the time frame for delivery of this project had to be altered.
Teacher Outcome 3	Teachers to begin dissemination of practice to colleagues in preparation for September 2014 term. This will be carried out through cross phase workshops as well as the IRIS video Training resource Progress data on children to be collected and compared with pre-intervention data Recruit neighbouring schools for September 2014 term.	Teachers disseminate best practice ideas within existing networks.	The original group of school had to be changed and permission given by Rocket Science for new school to re recruited. This had a significant impact on the depth of analysis which the lead organisation was able to carry out. Two neighbouring schools have expressed an interest in being part of this project.
Pupil outcome 1	Recruit students in all schools to the project.	Recruit students in all schools to the	Partner schools were preparing

	Data analysis to locate students who are underachieving. Further assess baseline data to be collected using York Assessment of Reading Comprehension, Accelerated Reader and the Communication Trust tool for assessing Spoken language.	project. Data analysis to locate students who are underachieving. Further assessment of data to be carried out with school and shared with participants.	for new methods of assessment with the new curriculum. As a result school were not able to participate in these assessment programmes.
Pupil outcome 2	Children entering secondary school working below national expectations maintain/ make improved progress	The original outcome was not altered.	
Pupil outcome 3			
Wider system outcome 1	Teachers secure an understanding of the reading comprehension process An understanding of how to use different text genres	The original outcome was not altered.	
Wider system outcome 2	Increase in number of students achieving Level 4 and above at the end of KS2	The original outcome was not altered. However this outcome will be become more measurable when more members of the sample move into secondary school.	
Wider system outcome 3	Good or better progress is sustained by the end of Year 7	The original outcome was not altered. However this outcome will be become more measurable when more members of the sample move into secondary school.	
Enter additional Outcome Name add extra lines as necessary	Not applicable	Not applicable	

**3.2** Did you make any changes to your project's activities after your Theory of Change was validated?

The theory of cage was only validated at standard 1; however no amendments have been made.

**If Yes, what were these changes (e.g. took on additional activities?)**

**3.3** Did you change your curriculum subject/s focus or key stage? No

If **Yes**, please explain what changes you made, why, and provide some commentary on how they affected delivery. Not applicable

**3.4** Did you evaluate your project in the way you had originally planned to, as reflected in your validated evaluation plan? Yes.

*Consider changes to evaluation tools/methods, sample sizes, and anticipated outcomes. If applicable, please explain what changes you made and why, and provide some commentary on how they affected your evaluation.*

*The original sample size of approximately 240 students was significantly altered and approximately twice the number was impacted by the underpinning methodology.*

*It was not possible for a comparison group to be identified and assessed. However trend data with participating groups has been used to evaluate the impact of this project.*

*Teachers were required to complete an online survey which assessed the extent to which their subject knowledge had improved as a result of being involved in CPD sessions that were directly linked to this project. They were required to*

*During monitoring visits students were also interviewed and asked to complete attitudinal surveys.*

## **4. Evaluation Methodological Limitations**

**4.1** What are the main methodological limitations, if any, of your evaluation?

*This can include data limitations or difficulty in identifying a comparison group. In order to get a realistic idea of the strength of your evaluation, and identify possible improvements, it is essential that you reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of your evaluation.*

**You should address limitations of the evaluation only, not the project itself - Every evaluation has limitations, so please be honest. This could include limitations relating to:**

- *The kinds of data you could/ could not collect (and the response rate for surveys)*
- *The size of the sample/ group you are evaluating*
- *The extent to which you felt able to assess the impact of activity on beneficiaries (what changes in attitudes/behaviours/attainment were caused by the intervention and what has been caused by other factors)*
- *Also include mitigating actions for methodological limitations where possible – e.g. alternative approaches or solutions and also how these limitations will affect the evaluation of the project (particularly pupil and teachers outcomes).*

*The main limitation is that I was unable to access data for comparison groups at KS2, because the primary schools involved decided to use the strategy across the whole school, having seen how successful the strategy had been in small classes. This changed the shape of the project, and impacted on the original project outcome. However at KS3, with*



*Eastlea Community School we continued to use the strategy with an identified target group, and we were better able to compare their progress with that of students not taking part in Reciprocal Reading.*

*Staff carrying out the intervention were very positive and proactive, and this is indicated in the survey they completed regarding improvement in their subject knowledge, and the impact it has had on the quality of First Teaching.*

**4.2** Are you planning to continue with the project, once this round of funding finishes? Yes

If **yes**, will you (and how will you) evaluate impact going forward?

Post project impact will be evaluated through tracking/monitoring of students' attainment levels across both Key Stages, surveys/questionnaires/interviews, staff lesson observation data.

## 5. Project Costs and Funding

5.1 Please fill in Table 2 and Table 3 below:

**Table 2 - Project Income**

	Original <sup>1</sup> Budget	Additional Funding	Revised Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Actual Spend	Variance [Revised budget – Actual]
Total LSEF Funding	68480	N/A	N/A	56695	11785
Other Public Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Private Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
In-kind support (e.g. by schools)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Project Funding</b>	68480	N/A	N/A	56695	11785

List details in-kind support below and estimate value.

**Table 3 - Project Expenditure**

	Original Budget	Additional Funding	Revised Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Actual Spend	Variance Revised budget – Actual]
Direct Staff Costs (salaries/on costs)	8225	N/A	N/A	7,860	365
Direct delivery costs e.g. consultants/HE (specify)	1500	N/A	N/A	5500	4000
Management and Administration Costs	28000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Training Costs	0	0	0	0	0
Participant Costs (e.g. Expenses for travelling to venues, etc.)	1000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to the budget in your grant agreement

Publicity and Marketing Costs	0	N/A	N/A	0	0
Teacher Supply / Cover Costs	3900	N/A	N/A	7,860	3960
Other Participant Costs	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluation Costs	0	0	0	0	0
Others as Required – Please detail in full	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total Costs</b>					

## 5.2 Please provide a commentary on Project Expenditure

*This section should include:*

- *commentary on the spend profile*
- *budget changes that have occurred, including the rationale for any changes*

*(Maximum 300 words)*

*The project was under budget for the following reasons: unable to recruit primary schools as the original participants decided not to go ahead with the project. The GLA then gave the go-ahead to use to recruit. Additionally*

## 6. Project Outputs

Please use the following table to report against agreed output indicators, these should be the same outputs that were agreed in schedule 3 of your Funding Agreement and those that were outlined in your evaluation framework.

**Table 4 – Outputs**

Description	Original Target Outputs	Revised Target Outputs <i>[Original + any Additional Funding/GLA agreed reduction]</i>	Actual Outputs	Variance <i>[Revised Target - Actual]</i>
No. of schools	5	3		2
No. of teachers	17	44		27
No. of pupils	240	833		593
Enter additional output name <i>add extra lines as necessary</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## 7. Key Beneficiary Data

Please use this section to provide a breakdown of teacher and pupil sub-groups involved in your project.

*Data must be provided at project level. However, if you wish to disaggregate data by school then please add additional rows to the tables below. Please also confirm at what point this data was collected.*

***Please add columns to the tables if necessary but do not remove any. N.B. If your project is benefitting additional groups of teachers e.g. teaching assistants please add relevant columns to reflect this.***

### 7.1 Teacher Sub-Groups (teachers directly benefitting counted once during the project)

Please provide your definition for number of benefitting teachers and when this was collected below (*maximum 100 words*).

**Table 5 – Teachers benefitting from the programme**

	<b>No. teachers</b>	<b>% NQTs (in their 1<sup>st</sup> year of teaching when they became involved)</b>	<b>% Teaching 2 – 3 yrs (in their 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years of teaching when they became involved)</b>	<b>% Teaching 4 yrs + (teaching over 4 years when they became involved)</b>	<b>% Primary (KS1 &amp; 2)</b>	<b>% Secondary (KS3 - 5)</b>
<b>Project Total</b>						
School 1	5	20%	20%	60%	0	100%
School 2	24	8%	4%	88%	100%	0
School 3	15	15%	7%	78%	100%	0
School 4						

7.1.2 Please provide written commentary on teacher sub-groups e.g. how this compares to the wider school context or benchmark (*maximum 250 words*)

### 7.2 Pupil Sub-Groups (these should be pupils who directly benefit from teachers trained)

Please provide your definition for number of benefitting pupils and when this data was collected below (*maximum 100 words*)

**Tables 6-8 – Pupil Sub-Groups benefitting from the programme**

	<b>No. pupils</b>	<b>% LAC</b>	<b>% FSM</b>	<b>% FSM last 6 yrs</b>	<b>% EAL</b>	<b>% SEN</b>
<b>Project Total</b>						
School 1	35	0%	20%	100%	90%	2%
School 2	413	Less than 1% (2 ch)	21%	N/A	84%	18%
School 3	390	3%	27%	N/A	87%	16%
School 4						

	<b>No. Male pupils</b>	<b>No. Female pupils</b>	<b>% Lower attaining</b>	<b>% Middle attaining</b>	<b>% Higher attaining</b>
<b>Project Total</b>					
School 1	16	19	0	100%	0
School 2	218	195	-	-	-
School 3	182	208	-	-	-

School 4					
----------	--	--	--	--	--

	% Asian Indian	% Asian Pakistani	% Asian Bangladeshi	% Asian Any Other background	% Black Caribbean	% Black African	% Black Any Other Background	% Mixed White & Black Caribbean	% Mixed White & Black African	% Mixed White & Asian	% Mixed Any Other Background	% Chinese	% Any other ethnic group
<b>Project Total</b>													
School 1	0%	2%	5%	6%	2	3%	2%	0%	1%	1%	4%	0	2%
School 2	5%	3%	23%	2%	4%	9%	22%	3%	3%	2%	5%	1%	5%
School 3	2%	3%	10%	5%	4%	5%	5%	0	0	0	5%	2%	18%
School 4													

	% White British	% White Irish	% White Traveller of Irish heritage	% White Gypsy/Roma	% White Any Other Background
<b>Project Total</b>					
School 1	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
School 2	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
School 3	7%	1%	0%	0%	0%
School 4					

**7.2.1** Please provide a written commentary on your pupil data e.g. a comparison between the targeted groups and school level data, borough average and London average (*maximum 500 words*)

*The number of students with English as an additional language who were involved in this project is higher than the national average*

*Nationally 51% of students in a similar context are entitled to FSM. In this project the number of students who are entitled to FSM is higher than the national in one school alone the total number of FSM students is 84%.*

*Information related to students' ability bands was not submitted by two of the schools; as a result the final results have been skewed.*

*The proportion of White British was lower than national and this is because their weak literacy skills tend to become more apparent at KS 4 (Year 9). Whereas the need to narrow the attainment gap for EAL student whose parents are not speaker of English is often the focus at KS2.*

*More female students were involved in the project but the difference between gender groups was not significant because the difference was less than 5%.*

Useful links: [London Data Store](#), [DfE Schools Performance](#), [DfE statistical releases](#)

## 8. Project Impact

You should reflect on the project's performance and impact and use **qualitative and quantitative** data to illustrate this.

- Please complete the tables below before providing a narrative explanation of the impact of your project.
- Please state how you have measured your outcomes (e.g. surveys) and if you are using scales please include details.
- Please add graphical analysis (e.g. bar charts) to further demonstrate project impact on each teachers, pupils, wider system outcomes etc. If you use graphs, please ensure that all charts are explained and have clear labels for the axes (numeric data or percentages, for example) and legends for the data.

***Please add columns to the tables if necessary but do not remove any. N.B. If your project is collecting data at more than two points and may want to add additional data collection points.***

### 8.1 Teacher Outcomes

Date teacher intervention started: January 2015

**Table 9 – Teacher Outcomes: teachers benefitting from the project**

*The 1<sup>st</sup> Return will either be your baseline data collected before the start of your project, or may be historical trend data for the intervention group. Please specify what the data relates to.*

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 <sup>st</sup> Return and date of collection	2 <sup>nd</sup> Return and date of collection
<i>e.g. Increased Teacher confidence</i>	<i>e.g. E-survey</i>	<i>e.g. 100 respondents from a total of 200 invites.  The profile of respondents was broadly representative of the population as a whole.</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score based on a 1-5 scale (1 – very confident, 2 – quite confident, 3 neither confident nor unconfident, 4 - quite unconfident, 5 – very unconfident)</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 3.7, collected September 2015</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 4.5, collected June 2015</i>
<i>Teachers to be trained in the use of RT and to develop subject knowledge of reading comprehension and dialogic teaching.</i>	<i>Questionnaire(Survey Monkey)</i>	<i>16 from a total of 20 invites</i>	<i>Mean score based on a 1-4 scale: 1 To a great extent 2 Somewhat 3. Very little 4. Not at all</i>	<i>Mean score 43.7% Collected January 2015 (Pre intervention survey)</i>	<i>73.3% Collected September 2015 (Post intervention survey)</i>
<i>Teachers to develop subject knowledge of genre theory.</i>	<i>Questionnaire(Survey Monkey)</i>	<i>15 from a total of 20 invites</i>	<i>Mean score based on a 1-4 scale: 1 To a great extent 2 Somewhat 3. Very little</i>	<i>Mean score 25% Collected Jan 2015 (Pre</i>	<i>73.3% Collected September 2015 (Post</i>

<i>Teachers to develop proficiency in Guided Reading strategies.</i>			<i>4. Not at all</i>	<i>intervention survey)</i>	<i>intervention survey)</i>

**Table 10 – Comparison data outcomes for Teachers [if available]**

***The data requested is unavailable this is because the time span of the project was affected by schools that withdrew from the project. This meant that re-recruitment had to be undertaken by the lead organisation.***

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 <sup>st</sup> Return and date of collection	2 <sup>nd</sup> Return and date of collection
<i>e.g. Increased</i>	<i>e.g. E-</i>	<i>e.g. 100 respondents</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score based</i>	<i>e.g. Mean</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score</i>

Teacher confidence	survey	from a total of 200 invites.  The profile of respondents was broadly representative of the population as a whole.	on a 1-5 scale (1 – very confident, 2 – quite confident, 3 neither confident nor unconfident, 4 - quite unconfident, 5 – very unconfident)	score	

**8.1.1** Please provide information (for both the intervention group and comparison group where you have one) on:

- Sample size, sampling method, and whether the sample was representative or not
- Commentary on teacher impact (please also refer to table 5 re impact on different groups of teachers)
- Qualitative data to support quantitative evidence.
- Projects can also provide additional appendices where appropriate.

*(Minimum 500 words)*

## **8.2 Pupil Outcomes**

Date pupil intervention started: **January 2015.**

***Pupil outcome data is not available.***

### *Findings from students' interviews and lesson observations*

*Show better comprehension skills. At first they were able to pronounce words on a page now they can discuss deeper meanings.*

*Students are able to independently explore texts*

*When ideas from the text are offered by groups, teachers use them in a variety of ways such as sentence construction or opening sentences for whole class construction of stories.*

*Teachers now feel they can delve into a text and this facilitates a greater level of comprehension*

*The method of questioning used in Reciprocal Reading allows students to decode challenging vocabulary and this enhances their literacy skills across the curriculum.*

## **Table 11 – Pupil Outcomes for pupils benefitting from the project**

*The 1<sup>st</sup> Return will either be your baseline data collected before the start of your project, or may be historical trend data for the intervention group. Please specify what the data relates to.*



Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 <sup>st</sup> Return and date of collection	2 <sup>nd</sup> Return and date of collection
<i>e.g. Increased educational attainment and progress in Writing</i>	<i>e.g. Pupil assessment data</i>	<i>e.g. Characteristics and assessment data collected for 97 of 100. The profile of respondents matches that initially targeted in the Theory of Change.</i>	<i>e.g. mean score or percentage at diff National Curriculum Levels or GCSE grades</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 3.7, collected September 2015</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 4.5, collected June 2015</i>

**Table 12 - Pupil Outcomes for pupil comparison groups [if available]**

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 <sup>st</sup> Return and date of collection	2 <sup>nd</sup> Return and date of collection
<i>e.g. Increased educational attainment and progress in Writing</i>	<i>e.g. Pupil assessment data</i>	<i>e.g. Characteristics and assessment data collected for 97 of 100. The profile of respondents matches that initially targeted in the Theory of Change.</i>  <i>Please find detailed analysis of the profile of respondents in Section 7.2</i>	<i>e.g. mean score or percentage at diff National Curriculum Levels or GCSE grades</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 3.7, collected September 2015</i>	<i>e.g. Mean score- 4.5, collected June 2015</i>

**8.2.1** Please provide information (for both the intervention group and comparison group where you have one) on:

- Sample size, sampling method, and whether the sample was representative or not  
Commentary on pupil impact (please also refer to table 6-8 re impact on different groups of pupils)
- Qualitative data to support quantitative evidence.
- Projects can also provide additional appendices where appropriate.

*(minimum 500 words)*

### 8.3 Wider System Outcomes

**Table 13 – Wider System Outcomes**

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric	1 <sup>st</sup> Return and date of collection	2 <sup>nd</sup> Return and date of collection
<i>e.g. Teachers/schools involved in intervention making greater use of networks, other schools and colleagues to improve subject knowledge and teaching practice</i>	<i>e.g. Paper survey</i>	<i>e.g. Surveys completed by all participating teachers</i>	<i>e.g. average number of events attended per teacher per year before the project and over the course of the project</i>	<i>e.g. Average number of events attended in the academic year 2012-2013: 3.2</i>	<i>e.g. Average number of events attended in the academic year 2013-2014: 4.3</i>  <i>Average number of events attended in the academic year 2014-2015: 4.5</i>
<i>Teachers secure an understanding of the reading comprehension process An understanding of how to use different text genres</i>	<i>Online Survey</i>	<i>Survey completed by 20% of all participating teachers</i>	<i>Before this project less than two events of this nature per year were held</i>	<i>Average number of events during this project- 5.</i>	<i>Average number of events that allowed cross-phase discussions 4.</i>
<i>Increase in number of students achieving Level 4 and above at the end of KS2</i>	<i>This outcome will be partially realised at the end of the next academic year.</i>				
<i>Good or better progress is sustained by the end of Year 7</i>	<i>This outcome will be partially realised at the end of the next academic year.</i>				

#### 8.3.1 Please provide information on (*minimum 500 words*):

- Sample size, sampling method, and whether the sample was representative or not
- Commentary on wider system impact qualitative data to support quantitative evidence.
- Projects can also provide additional appendices where appropriate.

## 8.4 Impact Timelines

Please provide information on impact timelines:

- At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on teachers? Did this happen as expected?
- At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on pupils? Did this happen as expected?
- At what point did you expect to see wider school outcomes? Did this happen as expected?
- Reflect on any continuing impact anticipated.

Information on expected impact

The impact on teachers and the quality of first teaching was expected to be seen within a term. However the impact became apparent within a month of training. Arguably this was because of the support given by members of the Leadership Team and more importantly the detailed level of research and practical strategies that teachers were exposed to via the UEL's representative.

Pupils were expected to make measureable progress at the end of an academic year. However changes in the projects' timeline affected this but attitudinal progress was apparent within a half term.

Wider school outcomes were expected within the second year of the project. However the timeline for this project was changed, but initial steps have been taken towards adding other schools to the Reading Champions Network within Newham.

## 9. Reflection on overall project impact (maximum 1,500 words)

In this section we would like you to reflect on:

- The overall impact of your project
- The extent to which your theory of change proved accurate
- How your project has contributed to the overall aims of LSEF
- Whether your findings support the hypothesis of the LSEF
- What your findings say about the meta-evaluation [theme](#) that is most relevant to you

Please illustrate using the key points from the previous detailed analysis.

All the evidence should be brought together here (achievement of outputs and outcomes, and the assessment of project impact) to produce well informed findings, which can be used to inform policy development in a specific area as well as the meta-evaluation of the LSEF.

*The London Schools Excellence Fund (LSEF) is based on the hypothesis that investing in teaching, subject knowledge and subject-specific teaching methods and pedagogy will lead to improved outcomes for pupils in terms of attainment, subject participation and aspiration.*

*The aims of the Fund:*

- I. Cultivate teaching excellence through investment in teaching and teachers so that attention is re-focused on knowledge-led teaching and curriculum.*
- II. Support self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity, plus the creation of new resources and support for teachers, to raise achievement in priority subjects in primary and secondary schools (English, mathematics, biology, chemistry, computer science, physics, history, geography, languages).*
- III. Support the development of activity which has already been tested and has some evaluation (either internal or external), where further support is needed to develop the activity, take it to scale and undertake additional evaluation.*
- IV. In the longer term, create cultural change and raise expectations in the London school system, so that London is acknowledged as a centre of teaching excellence and its state schools are among the best in the world.*

## 10. Value for Money

A value for money assessment considers whether the project has brought about benefits at a reasonable cost. Section 5 brings together the information on cost of delivery which will be used in this section.

### 10.1 Apportionment of the costs across the activity

Please provide an estimate of the percentage of project activity and budget that was allocated to each of the broad activity areas below. Please include the time and costs associated with planning and evaluating those activity areas in your estimates.

Broad type of activity	Estimated % project activity	£ Estimated cost, including in kind
Producing/Disseminating Materials/Resources	12%	£1000
Teacher CPD (face to face/online etc)	65%	£ 6,000
Events/Networks for Teachers	15%	£ 1000
Teacher 1:1 support	5%	£ 200
Events/Networks for Pupils	3%	£ 0
Others as Required – Please detail in full		
TOTAL	100%	£ 68480

Please provide some commentary reflecting on the balance of activity and costs incurred: Would more or less of some aspects have been better?

The costing was adequate especially in light of the changes that were made to the project's timeline as well the reduction in the number of school that participated. On the other hand because the project is not part of a whole school approach to reading in our partner schools some activities were carried out based on goodwill.

### 10.2 Commentary of value for money

Please provide some commentary reflecting on the project's overall cost based on the extent to which aims/objectives and targets were met. If possible, draw on insight into similar programmes to comment on whether the programme delivers better or worse value for money than alternatives.

### 10.3 Value for money calculations

Note: This section is only required for projects with control or comparison groups. (Not Applicable)

In order to demonstrate the cost effectiveness of the project we would like those projects who had control or comparison groups to provide some value for money calculations. Further guidance will be issued to support projects with this.

## 11. Reflection on project delivery

*This section is designed to allow for a discussion of wider issues relating to the project. (maximum 1,500 words)*

Please include reflection on the following:

### 11.1 Key Enablers and Barriers to Achievement

- *Were there internal and/or external factors which appear to have had an effect on project success, and how were these responded to (if applicable)?*
- *What factors need to be in place in order to improve teacher subject knowledge?*

#### **Key Enablers/Barriers**

*There were no barriers within the lead organisation which militated against the project's success. However external factors such as the revision of the National Curriculum and related methods of assessment (Removing of NC Levels) affected the data collation and analysis process. The project's success was also thwarted by changes in the leadership team within primary schools, this resulted in them opting not to participate in the project despite having expressed an interest before the bid was submitted.*

*A key enabler was the approach taken by the UEL who conducted demonstration lesson which caused teachers to participate in a practical show of how the methodology can be applied within their lessons. The positive attitude of the teachers and leadership within all schools also helped to move the project forward.*

### 11.2 Management and Delivery Processes

- *How effective were the management and delivery processes used?*
- *Were there any innovative delivery mechanisms and what was the effect of those?*
- *Did the management or delivery mechanisms change during the lifetime of the project and what were the before or after effects?*

#### **Management and Delivery Processes**

*The delivery mechanism was changed during the project because the original method of cascading the methodology through lead teachers was found to be ineffective after the decision was taken to use Reciprocal Reading at whole school level rather than with a target group. This had a positive impact because more teachers and students became involved in the project. The management of projected risks and challenges was not altered.*

### 11.3 Future Sustainability and Forward Planning

- *Do you have any plans for the future sustainability of your projects?*
- *What factors or elements are essential for the sustainability of your project?*
- *How have you/will you share your project knowledge and resources?*

#### **Future Sustainability and Forward Planning**

*In early post project era the sustainability of this project will be determined by the extent to which the UEL is able to offer further training to teachers. However areas of expertise will be shared among schools. Other factors related to sustainability are staff turnover which at the moment is not high. Knowledge about this project will be disseminated at the end of this academic the target audience will be primary schools in Newham.*

## 12. Final Report Conclusion

Please provide key conclusions regarding your findings and any lessons learnt (*maximum 1,500 words*).

Alongside overarching key conclusions, headings for this section should include:

### **Key findings for assessment of project impact**

- *What outcomes does the evaluation suggest were achieved?*
- *What outcomes, if any, does the evaluation suggest were not achieved or partly achieved?*
- *What outcomes, if any, is there too little evidence to state whether they were achieved or not?*

### **Key lessons learnt for assessment of project delivery**

- *What activities/approaches worked well?*
- *What activities/approaches worked less well?*
- *What difficulties were encountered in delivery and how could they be mitigated in the future?*
- *Were there any additional or unintended benefits (e.g. increases in student attendance as a result of an intervention aimed at teachers)?*

### **Informing future delivery**

- *What should the project have done more of?*
- *What should the project have done less of?*
- *What recommendations would you have for other projects regarding scaling up and/or replicating your project?*