

London Schools Excellence Fund Self-Evaluation Toolkit Final report

Contact Details

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: Final Report to the GLA

Project Name: 'From Transition to Transformation': Upskilling Year 6 and Year 7 teachers of English and literacy

Lead Delivery Organisation: The Compton School

London Schools Excellence Fund Reference: LSEFR1034

Author of the Self-Evaluation: Michael O'Leary

Total LSEF grant funding for project: £99.200 (with additional approved funding of £11.800)

Total Lifetime cost of the project (inc. match funding): £111.000

Actual Project Start Date: September 2013

Actual Project End Date: July 2015

1. Executive Summary

- This final report is based on an evaluation of a **cross-phase literacy project** which comprised of eight primary and three secondary schools in the London Borough of Barnet

- The **rationale** for this project was based on the view that sharing and developing teacher understanding of common approaches and strategies supporting literacy skills would lead to improved teacher confidence and improved outcomes for level 5-6 pupils in Year 6 and level 3-4 pupils in Year 7

- The **evidence** was gathered by the following approaches:
 - Pupil data drop to show baseline performance levels at beginning of the year and updated termly

 - Teacher confidence self-assessment survey against specific national curriculum skill domains linked to English at levels 3-4 and 5-6

 - Impact evaluations from project participants linked to specific training sessions

 - Impact evaluations from staff attending literacy training sessions delivered as part of the project

 - Impact evaluations from level 5-6 pupils attending literacy masterclasses delivered by secondary specialists

 - Comparative performance data for project primary schools over a three year period

- The evaluation of the project demonstrated the following **findings**:
 - CPD projects across multiple partners need an overarching framework in order to drive forward coherent and systematic improvements in classroom practice. With access to tried and tested evidence based research, the use of an external national expert/trainer to deliver CPD sessions on reading comprehension strategies provided a joined-up approach to support sustainable improvements in literacy for all pupils

 - Teachers valued input and specific training from specialist classroom practitioners who were able to draw upon current, effective classroom practice (e.g. secondary teachers sharing practice re: level 6 teaching and learning strategies, lesson observations of other practitioners, book sampling, exemplification of practice through masterclasses)

 - Whilst ever mindful of pupil outcomes, participating teachers valued the intellectual breathing space and opportunities to focus on developing subject knowledge and pedagogy through a structured meeting cycle based on dialogue and collaboration leading to tangible classroom resources

 - Cross-phase joint practice developments/lesson study collaboration across clusters of schools – whilst endorsed in principle by participants - was difficult to deliver in

practice due to timetabling constraints and organisational logistics. However, the lesson study approach does lend itself to a powerful model for teacher CPD where organised internally by schools

- There are no quick fixes in education! Teacher articulated learning gains do not translate quickly or evenly into improved levels of progress for pupils. Given the many variables involved in the complex dynamic between research project participation, individual teacher and school based contexts, attribution for improvement in pupil outcomes is problematic. Moreover, given the absence of randomised control groups (difficult in one form entry primary schools), it is difficult to know whether or not the majority of targeted pupils would have made similar levels of progress if their schools were not involved in the project
- However, using historical trend data at national and local level in conjunction with DfE research data, we can suggest that the project has contributed positively to Yr. 6 pupils making outstanding progress in level 5-6 Writing; Yr. 7 pupils making outstanding progress in level 3-4 Reading and good progress in level 3-4 Writing
- Translating level 5 progress in Reading into level 6 performance is difficult and appears to involve a more sophisticated set of intellectual challenges for 11 year olds than the more technical and coachable skills required to enable level 5 pupils to progress to level 6 in Writing
- Many project teachers commented that, whilst progress in Reading was less evident overall for our targeted level 5-6 pupils, the approaches to reading shared and developed for level 5-6 pupils during the project had helped improve motivation and engagement in reading amongst pupils across the ability range
- As a result of completing this evaluation we would make the following **recommendations** for future delivery of such projects:
 - In terms of driving forward evidence based research to support school performance and outcomes for students, there needs to be a closer fit between the methodological requirements by external agencies for objective data and the practical demands of everyday teaching
 - As we move towards a more school-led system of education, with Teaching School Alliances playing a pivotal role, we need a more flexible and less bureaucratic approach to sustaining practitioner research into improving classroom practice and pupil outcomes
 - This would entail a practical and realistic “code of conduct” governing requirements for evidence that more realistically mirrors the demands of everyday school life on practising teachers. In particular, following the model of the National College for Leadership and Teaching, the GLA should seek to pre-populate all comparative data sections (e.g. pupil ethnicity across London schools) and sharpen the focus on reporting outcomes by avoiding overlapping questions (e.g. sections 8.4/9/11/12)
 - As a London wide development, we need also to balance a project based approach to CPD across multiple schools with the identification of short-term core programmes

based on specific areas of classroom practice (e.g. Assessment for Learning) and/or development of subject expertise. Based on the Outstanding Teacher Programme (Challenge Partners/OLEVI) these core programmes could be delivered by expert practitioners across the London network of schools. This would potentially offer a knowledge mobilisation framework that could support and sustain coherent improvements across London's schools.

2. Project Description

- The aim of the project was to improve teacher subject knowledge in the teaching of English/literacy through systematic CPD collaboration across 8 primary and 3 secondary schools. Schools were organised into three distinctive geographical clusters across Barnet, using a model of 1 secondary and 2-4 primaries per cluster. The project built upon staff training developments in 2012-13 in which primary and secondary colleagues engaged in joint classroom observations of Yr. 6 and Yr. 7 English and literacy lessons, culminating in a literacy masterclass for 40 level 5-6 pupils delivered by secondary specialists
- This development grew out of a concern raised by primary Heads that classroom teachers lacked confidence and subject knowledge to stretch and challenge pupils at high level 5 and level 6 work in reading and writing. Equally, secondary Heads within our Teaching School Alliance had identified developing literacy skills of low ability Yr. 7 pupils as a major challenge in boosting overall school performance standards
- Seven of the eleven project schools were from within our Teaching School Alliance. In their role of National Leaders of Education, four of the partner Heads encouraged the inclusion of four additional primary schools where achievement at level 5-6 had been identified as a school improvement priority
- Year 1 of the project focused on embedding consistency around level 5-6 assessment and using secondary specialists to facilitate with primary colleagues shared planning, modelling and review of practices in English/literacy
- The core activities used to improve and embed teachers' subject knowledge included: using existing expertise of 2 English/Literacy SLEs within our Teaching School Alliance to lead and coordinate the planning and delivery of a structured and sequential training programme linked to English/literacy development for our targeted groups of level 5-6 pupils in Yr. 6 and level 3-4 pupils in Yr. 7
- Programme delivery was the equivalent of 3 days face-to-face training per year for all 22 participating teachers across the project schools. The focus was on developing teacher knowledge and understanding of key transition themes linked to curriculum continuity and assessment and developing a cross phase common resource for literacy teaching
- Year 2 of the project, whilst maintain the focus on level 5-6 pupils in Year 6, emphasised the development of a common framework and key teaching strategies in boosting the literacy skills of level 3-4 pupils in Years 6 and 7

- This development was delivered to project participants by a national trainer in reading comprehension strategies and formed the basis of ongoing review of practices in literacy not only for level 3-4 pupils but also for level 5-6 pupils
- The promotion of a reading comprehension strategy, linked to the development of pupils' writing skills, formed the core message of the project's wider dissemination through a school based training day for 120 staff (around 40 staff from schools within our Teaching School Alliance as well as project schools).

Context of schools involved in project at the beginning of the project

- Pupils within the 8 **partner** primary schools cover a wide socio-economic demographic. Historically, performance standards have varied between the schools
- Based on the 2013 Barnet performance table (DfE) for **reading**, out of 124 primaries, partner schools ranged from the 8th to the 51st highest performing school in terms of % of pupils achieving level 5+
- As a cohort of schools, partner primaries would rank 29/124 for % of pupils achieving level 5+ in reading
- For 2013 only 16/124 Barnet primary schools had any of their level 5+ pupils achieve a level 6 in reading. No partner school was in this group of 16
- In terms of % of pupils achieving level 5+ in **writing**, out of 124 primaries, partner schools ranged from the 4th to the 66th highest performing school
- As a cohort of schools, partners would rank 26/124 for % of pupils achieving level 5+ in writing
- For 2013 only 22/124 Barnet primary schools had any of their level 5+ pupils achieve a level 6 in writing. The average performance of these 22 schools was 5% of their level 5+ pupils achieved level 6
- Three partner schools were in this group of 22 with an average performance of 6% of their level 5 pupils achieving level 6. In terms of overall ranking, the 3 schools were ranked 2nd, 8th and joint 13th-17th respectively
- In terms of the 3 **secondary** schools participating in the project, the DfE 2013 performance table shows these schools have an excellent track record in achieving pupil progress in English.

	3 year average % for 5 A*-C (inc. Eng & Ma)	3 year average for % pupils making expected progress in English
England – state funded schools only	59.2%	70.1%
Local authority	69.2%	82%
Partner School 1	73%	89%
Partner School 2	81%	88%

Partner School 3	72%	87%
-------------------------	-----	-----

2.2 Please list any materials produced and/or web links and state where the materials can be found.

[Cross-phase Literacy Handbook–electronic copy available on: www.thecompton.org.uk/Teaching_School/ Research and Development/Literacy Handbook](http://www.thecompton.org.uk/Teaching_School/Research_and_Development/Literacy_Handbook)

2.1 Does your project support transition to the new national curriculum?

No

3. Theory of Change and Evaluation Methodology

See Table 1 below on Outcomes

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
Teacher Outcome 1	Improved understanding and confidence in developing literacy for level 5/6 pupils in Yr. 6 and level 3-4 in Yr. 7	n/a	
Pupil outcome 1	Increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A		
Pupil outcome 2	Increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers		
Pupil outcome 3	A more systematic approach to literacy leads to an increase in the % of all Yr. 6/7 pupils making expected/more than expected levels of progress (by end of Yr. 2)		
Wider system outcome 1	Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom focused practice – using empirically tested collaborative models such as		

	triads/JPD to support the effective development of skills and knowledge		
Wider system outcome 2	Increased teacher awareness and access to transition resources and effective literacy strategies for target groups		
Wider system outcome 3	Teachers outside the project group have opportunity to increase knowledge on effective literacy strategies through accessing training provision developed by LSEF participants		

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

No

3.3 Did you change your curriculum subject/s focus or key stage?

No

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

- I used Professor Gordon Stobart (Institute of Education) in an advisory capacity at the beginning of the project in order to clarify my approach to collecting and analysing project data. However, owing to time constraints, I was unable to use Professor Stobart to conduct a sample review of participating teachers. Nevertheless, following guidance from Professor Stobart and from Project Oracle, I believe I was able to collect and triangulate appropriate data sources to reach an objective evaluation of the project.

4. Evaluation Methodological Limitations

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

- Given the size of the participating group, and as most schools were one form entry primaries, I did not have any internal control groups and therefore no randomised comparisons to support evidence of impact
- Due to teacher turnover in roles/moving to other schools/maternity leave, around a third of participating teachers were new to the project in year 2. This meant consistency of approach to attending training and implementing learning from the project was very variable between schools. In addition, the limited sample size of participating teachers and number and range of schools makes it problematic to offer meaningful recommendations in terms of transferability and upscaling of project content, delivery and impact. However, on the basis of the evidence data from the project, it is possible to

make general recommendations based on the effectiveness and success of specific strands within the project

- Pupils selected to be part of the target group varied from one school to the next. High ability pupils in one school were middle attainers in another school so no standardisation of the types of pupils targeted to benefit most directly from the training
- In some schools teacher assessment of pupil performance in reading and writing at the beginning of the year may have been aspirational rather than evidence based. This over-optimistic view of pupil progress in some schools affected the validity of the data in terms of the overall analysis of impact. However, historical trend data provided a useful overview of level 5-6 outcomes and the comparison of KS2 target grades (generated by KS1 assessment and not the year 6 classroom teacher) provided an objective view of how effectively participating teachers had met expected outcomes for targeted pupils
- Whilst offering evidence of pupil progress across the year, any claims resting on data for level 3-4 target pupils in Yr. 7 is limited by the fact that there were no comparison groups and the data is based on one year only. In addition, many of the key literacy strategies for level 3-4 pupils were developed from the 2015 spring term onwards and require a more extended period to become fully embedded as practice
- In terms of attribution, I am able to make only limited objective judgments on the specific impact of the project due to the many variables influencing performance outcomes for targeted pupils. For example, in some schools pupils were taught only by the classroom teacher and in others they were part of specific intervention groups; teacher quality and experience varied greatly between schools as did the level of commitment to the project by participating schools. For level 3-4 pupils in Yr. 7, the "teacher effect", whilst not defined statistically, would be quite considerable given the quality and commitment of the individual teachers assigned to these groups within the 3 secondary schools
- Teacher confidence (self-assessment) questionnaires were redesigned for all year 2 participants to attempt a more accurate baseline than the questionnaire format used during year 1. In addition, the specific impact questions provided a framework for teachers to reflect upon how participation in the project has shaped their practice
- However, despite a high rate of return, the validity of the questionnaires was limited by the sample size and the absence of supporting evidence provided by classroom observation
- The questionnaire completed by Headteachers provided objective feedback of the impact of the project on individual participants and pupil outcomes. Teacher evaluation of specific training sessions also offered validation that the content of training sessions was meeting their CPD needs. However, teacher's confidence surveys were not aligned with outcomes for pupils or linked to specific feedback from peers as part of the JPD/lesson study observations. Moreover, due to competing priorities and time constraints on my role, there was insufficient scrutiny and validation of how learning from the project's training sessions was actually being translated into everyday classroom practice. Thus, no real triangulation of teacher self-reporting with objective data.

4.2 Are you planning to continue with the project, once this round of funding finishes? If **yes**, will you (and how will you) evaluate impact going forward?

See section 11.3 for possible further areas of development. Impact evaluation will very much depend on discussions with partners on key priorities for their schools emerging from the project.

5. Project Costs and Funding

Table 2 - Project Income

	Original ¹ Budget	Additional Funding	Revised Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Actual Spend	Variance [Revised budget – Actual]
Total LSEF Funding	£99,200	£11,800	£111,000	£111,000	n/a
Other Public Funding	n/a				
Other Private Funding	n/a				
In-kind support (e.g. by schools)	n/a				
Total Project Funding	£110,000	£11,800	£111,000	£111,000	n/a

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)	£67,200	£11,800	£79,000	£77,600	-£1400
Direct delivery costs e.g. consultants/HE (specify)	£4000		£4000	£4,882	+£882
Management and Administration Costs	£6000		£6000	£4,800	-£1200
Training Costs	£1200		£1200	£16,195	+£4195
Participant Costs (e.g. Expenses for travelling to venues, etc.)	n/a				
Publicity and Marketing Costs	n/a				
Teacher Supply / Cover Costs	n/a				
Other Participant Costs	£5,100		£5,100	£2623	-£2447
Evaluation Costs	£4900		£4900	£4900	£0
Others as Required – Please detail in full					
Total Costs	£99,200	£11,800	£111,000	£111,000	

¹ Please refer to the budget in your grant agreement

5.2 Please provide a commentary on Project Expenditure

- Role of SLEs in delivering training included in Training Costs and overspend under this category is balanced against Other Participant Costs
- Evaluation Costs reflect the time allocated to the project coordinator for ongoing evaluation and completion of interim and final report as well as ongoing analysis by SLE Performance Data
- Was very useful to have flexibility to shift funding from one category to another during the lifetime of the project to reflect changes in need. However, would have easier to complete this section if categories in table 3 corresponded to the budget headings used as part of the original application.

6. Project Outputs

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	10	11	11	
No. of teachers	20-24	22	30	
No. of pupils	1440	1320	1320	

7. Key Beneficiary Data

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

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

- The total number of 30 teachers shown in table 5 represents the number of teachers designated by partner schools as school representatives, and who were core participants/regularly, attended training sessions/meetings over the two year period (typically Yr. 6 teachers/Yr. 7 intervention teachers and literacy coordinators).

Table 5 – Teachers benefitting from the programme

	No. teachers	% NQTs <i>(in their 1st year of teaching when they became involved)</i>	% Teaching 2 – 3 yrs <i>(in their 2nd and 3rd years of teaching when they became involved)</i>	% Teaching 4 yrs + <i>(teaching over 4 years when they became involved)</i>	% Primary <i>(KS1 & 2)</i>	% Secondary <i>(KS3 - 5)</i>

Project Total	30	3%	24%	73%	77%	23%
----------------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

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*)

- The total number reflects the changing pattern of staff involvement between year 1 and 2 of the project due to changes in role/maternity leave/new school. 14 teachers out of the original 22 starting in year 1 continued into year 2 with 8 new participants joining the project during 2014-15
- Given the nature of the project, I would expect to see an under-representation of NQTs and teachers with 4+ years experience forming the majority participants
- Section 8.3 (wider system outcomes) provides an overview of teachers directly benefiting from the programme in terms of participation in training sessions delivered as part of the project/access to resources developed and provided by the project.

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*)

- The figures for primary pupils represent the combined two year total of the level 5-6 pupils in Yr. 6 selected as the target group by individual Yr. 6 teachers/literacy coordinators (eight schools). The figures for secondary pupils are based on one year only in accordance with the focus/priorities of year 2 of the project (3 schools)
- Data for primary pupils collected July 2014 and July 2015; data for secondary pupils collected July 2015.

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

	No. pupils	% LAC	% FSM	% FSM last 6 yrs	% EAL	% SEN
Project Total						
Primary pupils – combined for years 1 and 2	163		8%	8%	18%	1%
Secondary pupils – year 2 only	50		36%	36%	40%	48%

	No. Male pupils	No. Female pupils	% Lower attaining	% Middle attaining	% Higher attaining
Project					

Total					
Primary pupils – combined for years 1 and 2	72	91		87%	13%
Secondary pupils – year 2 only	33	17	100%		

	% A s i a n I n d i a n	% A s i a n P a k i s t a n i	% A s i a n B a n g l a d e s h i	% A s i a n A n y O t h e r b a c k g r o u n d	% B l a c k C a r i b b e a n	% B l a c k A f r i c a n	% B l a c k A n y O t h e r B a c k g r o u n d	% M i x e d W h i t e & B l a c k C a r i b b e a n	% M i x e d W h i t e & B l a c k A f r i c a n	% M i x e d W h i t e & A s i a n	% M i x e d A n y O t h e r B a c k g r o u n d	% C h i n e s e	% A n y o t h e r e t h n i c g r o u p
Project Total													
Primary pupils – combined for years 1 and 2	2%			6%	2%	9%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	1%	2%
Secondary pupils – year 2 only				2%	2%	8%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%		14%

	% White British	% White Irish	% White Travelle r of Irish heritage	% White Gypsy/ Roma	% White Any Other Backgr ound
Project Total					
Primary pupils – combined for years 1 and 2	31%	9%			25%
Secondary pupils – year 2 only	18%	8%			26%

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*)

- Comparison between different groups is statistically insignificant given the small sample size and not a fruitful area of analysis given the time constraints (see recommendation on the use of pre-populated data in section 1). However, whilst not surprising, it is worth noting the higher % of FSM/EAL/SEN pupils in the level 3-4 cohort compared to level 5-6 pupils. The inverse number of White British pupils in the level 5-6 and level 3-4 cohorts is also worth noting as is the comparative % of Any Other ethnic group for both cohorts.

8. Project Impact

8.1 Teacher Outcomes

Date teacher intervention started: **September 2013**

Table 9 – Teacher Outcomes: teachers benefitting from the project

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return and date of collection	2 nd Return and date of collection
Improved teacher understanding and confidence in developing literacy for level 3-4 in Yr7 & for level 5/6 pupils in Yr. 6	Questionnaire	Primary teachers directly participating in project 14/16 returns from teachers participating at end of project (non-returns on maternity leave)	e.g. Mean score based on a 1-5 scale (1-2 not at all confident; 3 moderately confident; 4-5 very confident)	Mean score- 2.2 for level 5-6 Mean score- 3.8 for level 3-4 collected July 2015 (see below)	Mean score- 4.2 for level 5-6 Mean score- 4.8 for level 3-4 collected July 2015
As above	Questionnaire	Secondary teachers directly participating in project 6/6 returns from teachers participating at end of project	As above (with focus on L3-4 only)	Mean score- 3.0 for level 3-4 collected July 2015	Mean score- 4.3 for level 3-4 collected July 2015
As above	Questionnaire	Headteachers of participating schools 11/11 returns	Impact on the professional development participating staff ranked as 1 very positive impact; 2 positive impact; 3 some impact; 4 minimal impact	5/11 rated impact on participating staff as very positive; 5/11 rated impact as positive and 1/11 rated participation as having some impact Collected July 2015	N/A

Table 10 – Comparison data outcomes for Teachers [N/A]

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return and date of collection	2 nd Return and date of collection
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

- Table 9 shows teacher self-assessment at the end of the project of their confidence in teaching against 14 skills for levels 3-4 and 12 skills for levels 5-6. The skill domains were based on the National Curriculum Assessment Framework (2013). I amended the questionnaire used in the interim report in order that participants had the opportunity to reflect on their learning and professional development over the course of their participation in the project. The questionnaires were completed electronically over the course of a week in July - hence the same dates for returns 1 and 2 (*see appendix 3 for a copy of the questionnaire and results across all skill domains*).
- The response rate provided a representative sample of the group as a whole. Unsurprisingly, teachers having a sustained involvement in the project tended to report a higher degree of confidence in teaching literacy skills than those only involved in Yr. 2
- With secondary colleagues there were issues in year 1 with staff turn-over impacting on the validity of the level 3-4 data in terms of consistency. Subsequently, I decided to use baseline data only from September 2014 onwards and to evaluate the impact of the project on level 3-4 pupils over one year only (2014-15). This approach at least had the virtue of delivering consistent data and to provide the basis for being able to offer evidence of impact and to comment on generalised findings with greater confidence.

Commentary on teacher impact (please also refer to table 5 re: impact on different groups of teachers)

- The quantitative evidence from the teacher questionnaires shows a marked improvement in teacher confidence taken across all the skill domains. It is worth noting that for primary participants the largest gains in confidence were shown in the following areas:
 - Teaching level 6 reading skills: inference (mean score confidence rating of **4.4 at end of project compared to 1.7 at beginning**)
 - Teaching level 6 writing skills: paragraphs, linking sentences, connectives (mean score confidence rating of **4.2 at end of project compared to 1.7 at beginning**)
 - Teaching level 6 reading skills: commenting on writer's purposes and viewpoints and the overall effect on the reader (mean score confidence rating of **4.4 at end of project compared to 1.8 at beginning**)
- For secondary participants, the largest gains in confidence were shown in the following areas
 - Teaching level 3-4 reading skills: Inference (mean score confidence rating of **4.8 at end of project compared to 1.8 at beginning**)

- Assessing level 3- 4 work (mean score confidence rating of **4.4 at end of project compared to 2.6 at beginning**)
- Giving written feedback on level 3- 4 work (mean score confidence rating of **4.8 at end of project compared to 3 at beginning**).
- The only skills/domain in which teachers expressed minimal improvement in confidence was for secondary participants teaching handwriting skills (mean score confidence rating of **2.8 at end of project compared to 2 at the beginning**).

Qualitative data to support quantitative evidence:

- Qualitative feedback from individual participants supports the improved confidence shown by teachers. This was captured through 3 outcomes based questions linked to the confidence questionnaire:
 - What have you done differently as a result of this project?
 - What impact has this had on pupils?
 - How do you know?

The following quotes offer a representative view of how teachers benefited from participation in the project:

“This project has been a fantastic way to learn and develop professionally with the help and guidance of the secondary school teachers and other primary teachers. As a result I have completely changed my teaching of reading; I now separate the strands and teach them individually, before joining them all together. From September I will be using the Inference training we received to support this style. Also, I now also ask more targeted questions to my pupils which helps move them on. In writing, I have used a range of strategies shown to me by my secondary colleagues (e.g. PEE – Point, Evidence, Explain) to push my higher ability writers” (Yr. 6 teacher)

“ Working with primary colleagues on the project has been invaluable learning for me as I have been able to build on a range of Year 6 strategies to ensure our L3/4 students can build on what they know rather have to learn a whole new set of techniques etc.” (Yr. 7 teacher)

- The qualitative feedback provided by headteachers on the professional development impact on participating staff reflects the significance of staff turnover as a crucial factor impacting on the school's commitment to the project. Heads of schools, where the same teachers were involved in the project for two years, tended to rank the impact on participating staff as very positive. The following quotes offer a representative view of how teachers benefited from participation in the project:

“This programme has been an invaluable opportunity for teachers to share professional skills and knowledge across phases. As a school, our participating staff have gained a great deal from working with primary colleagues in their understanding of how to teach L3 students for accelerated progress.” (Secondary Head)

“The whole programme has benefited the class teachers involved but more importantly supported the teaching of reading and writing across the school by providing opportunities

for more than just the class teachers to be involved. This has helped us disseminate learning around other year groups. Also, the fact that we could also pass on training to our TAs has been invaluable.” (Primary Head)

8.2 Pupil Outcomes

Date pupil intervention started: **September 2013**

Table 11 – Pupil Outcomes for pupils benefitting from the project

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return and date of collection YEAR 1	2nd Return and date of collection YEAR 1	3rd Return and date of collection YEAR 2	4th Return and date of collection YEAR 2
Increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A	Pupil assessment data	Termly data drop from 8 primary schools showing 163 targeted pupils (Yrs. 1&2) The profile of respondents matches that initially targeted in the Theory of Change.	Total average points score for individual schools based on 2 points per NC sublevel per pupil - ranging from 25 points for 4c, 27 for 4b, 29 for 4a, 31 for 5c, 33 for 5b, 35 for 5a, 37 for L6	30.9 aps for Reading 29.9 aps for Writing collected Sept 2013	33.4 aps for Reading 34.3 aps for Writing <i>collected July 2014</i>	30.6 aps for Reading 29.3 aps for Writing <i>collected Sept 2014</i>	32.9 aps for Reading 34.1 aps for Writing <i>collected July 2015</i>
Increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers	Pupil assessment data	Termly data drop from 3 secondary schools showing 50 targeted pupils (Yr. 2 only)	Total average points score for individual schools based on 2 points per NC sublevel per pupil - ranging from 19 for 3c up to 31 for 5c	22.2 aps for Reading 23.4 aps for Writing collected Sept 2014	27.1 aps for Reading 26.9 aps for Writing	n/a	n/a
<i>As above</i>	Head's questionnaire	Headteachers of participating schools 11/11 returns	Impact on pupils - ranked as 1 very positive impact; 2 positive impact; 3	4/11 rated impact on pupils as very positive; 6/11 rated impact as	n/a	n/a	n/a

			some impact; 4 minimal impact	positive and 1/11 rated participation as having some impact Collected July 2015			
--	--	--	-------------------------------	---	--	--	--

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

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return and date of collection	2 nd Return and date of collection
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

- The termly data drop, with the baseline assessment of pupil performance at the beginning of the academic year, provided an appropriate research method for evaluating the contribution of the project to positive outcomes in literacy for targeted pupils. Feedback from Heads also provided a useful element of “triangulation.” The sample size for pupils, whilst large enough to generate broad generalisations, was somewhat skewed by the larger size of cohorts in individual schools (**see tables A and B in commentary section below**)

Commentary on pupil impact (please also refer to table 6-8 re impact on different groups of pupils)

By way of overall commentary on the impact on pupils, it is worth noting the historical trend of the generally positive outcomes for **primary** partner schools in terms of the local and national context

READING	2015 (project)	2014 (project)	2013	2012
% of pupils achieving 5+	National:48.1 Barnet 54.6 Partners: 55.94	National:50.0 Barnet LA:55.8 Partners: 54.9	National:45.0 Barnet LA: 49.9 Partners: 50.5	National: 48.0 Barnet LA: 53.9 Partners: 46.0
(of whom)% of pupils achieving L6	National: n/a Barnet LA:0.3 Partners: 0.7	National: 0 Barnet LA: 0.3 Partners: 1.3	National: 0 Barnet LA: 0.8 Partners: 0	National: no test Barnet LA: 0.3 Partners: 0
WRITING				
% of pupils achieving 5+	National:35.8 Barnet :36.9 Partners:	National:33.0 Barnet LA:35.3 Partners:42.4	National:30.0 Barnet LA: 32.7 Partners: 28.3	National:28.0 Barnet LA: 30.9 Partners: 33.4

	47.23			
of whom)% of pupils achieving L6	National: no data Barnet LA:2.5 Partners: 3.16	National: no data Barnet LA:2.5 Partners: 4.3	National: no data Barnet LA:1.6 Partners: 1.38	National: no data Barnet LA:1.00 Partners: 0.68

In terms of impact, the historical trend data shows partner schools performing well against other Barnet schools in the context of an ambitious focus on increasing level 5 performance and translating level 5 performances into level 6 outcomes. This remains an area of challenge for primary partners, although it is pleasing to note 3 partners achieving level 6 results for the first time in 2015. However, there is considerable variation between primary schools as shown in the breakdown of results for individual partner schools during the two years of the project.

TABLE A: READING 2014 (%rounded to nearest decimal point)

Schools	TARGET Group	5C TOTALS & %	5B TOTALS & %	5A TOTALS & %	6 TOTALS & %	NO. ACHIEVING L5+ FROM TARGET Group
1	7	0	6	0	0	6/7 (1 L4)
2	9	1	2	6	0	9/9
3	5	1	1	3	0	5/5
4	14	0	9	5	0	14/14
5	11	3	8	0	0	11/11
6	7	1	4	1	1	7/7
7	9	0	4	5	0	9/9
8	12	2	7	3	0	12/12
	74	8 11%	41 56%	23 31%	1 1%	73/99%

TABLE A2: WRITING 2014 (%rounded to nearest decimal point)

Schools	TARGET Group	5C TOTALS & %	5B TOTALS & %	5A TOTALS & %	6 TOTALS & %	NO. ACHIEVING L5+ FROM TARGET Group
1	7	1	6	0	0	7/7
2	9	0	3	3	1	7/9 (2 L4)
3	5	0	2	2	1	5/5
4	14	0	0	9	5	14/14
5	11	0	3	7	1	11/11
6	7	0	1	1	5	7/7
7	9	0	6	3	0	9/9
8	12	4	1	7	0	12/12
	74	5/7%	22/ 31%	32/44%	13/18%	72/97%

TABLE B: READING 2015 (%rounded to nearest decimal point)

Schools	TARGET Group	5C TOTALS & %	5B TOTALS & %	5A TOTALS & %	6 TOTALS & %	NO. ACHIEVING L5+ FROM TARGET Group
1	11	5	4	0		9/11 (2 L4)
2	6	0	3	3		6/6
3	7	1	2	4		7/7

4	23	2	14	6	1	23/23
5	11	4	2	2		8/11 (3 L4)
6	10	3	1	6		10/10
7	8	0	6	2		8/8
8	13	3	7	1	1	12/13 (1L4)
	89	18/20%	39/44%	24/27%	2/2%	83/93%

TABLE B2: WRITING 2015 (% rounded to nearest decimal point)

Schools	TARGET Group	5C TOTALS & %	5B TOTALS & %	5A TOTALS & %	6 TOTALS & %	NO. ACHIEVING L5+ FROM TARGET Group
1	11	1	10	0		11/11
2	6	2	3	1		6/6
3	7	1	3	2	1	7/7
4	23	0	17	3	3	23/23
5	11	0	10		1	10/11 (1L4)
6	10	3	0	4	2	9/10 (1L4)
7	8	0	3	4	1	8/8
8	13	2	5	4	2	13/13
	89	9/10%	51/57%	18/20%	9/10%	87/98%

- In overall terms, taken across both years of the project we can see in **table 11** an average points score (APS) gain of **+2.4 for Reading** and **+4.6 for Writing (Primary); +4.9 for Reading and + 3.5 for Writing (Secondary)**. Following Ofsted guidance that 3.5 APS progress annually can be judged as making ‘Good’ progress and around 4 points progress annually to be making “Outstanding” progress, then we can make the following observations on positive impact

 - The training input and emphasis given to level 5-6 writing skills during the lifetime of the project contributed to the outstanding progress made by pupils
 - The early adoption of structured reading comprehension strategies by teachers of the largest cohort of Yr. 7 pupils also contributed to the outstanding progress shown in Yr. 7 reading skills (see below for commentary on progress made by L5-6 pupils in Reading)
- In addition to looking to understand the impact on pupils through historical trend data and benchmarking pupil progress against average point scores, we can also consider the progress of targeted pupils in terms of exceeding, meeting or not meeting expected National Curriculum sub-levels of progress. Columns 2 and 3 below show the % of targeted pupils in terms of progress against the sub-levels. By way of comparison, the performance of our targeted cohort can be considered favourably alongside data taken from 10 Local Authorities and involving an analysis of sub-levels of progress based on around 70000 pupils across the ability range (How Do Pupils Progress during Key Stages 2 and 3?, DfE Research Report, March 2011).

Primary (Yr. 6)	2014	2015	DfE research data
Reading: exceeding 2 sub-levels of progress	9%	11%	8%
Reading: meeting 2 sub-levels of progress	32%	46%	23%
Reading: not meeting	68%	54%	69%

2 sub-levels of expected progress			
Writing: exceeding 2 sub-levels of progress	31%	38%	4%
Writing: meeting 2 sub-levels of progress	85%	83%	35%
Writing: not meeting 2 sub-levels of expected progress	15%	17%	61%

For secondary partners we note the following

Secondary (Yr. 7)	2015
Reading: exceeding 2 sub-levels of progress	40%
Reading: meeting 2 sub-levels of progress	32%
Reading: not meeting 2 sub-levels of expected progress	28%
Writing: exceeding 2 sub-levels of progress	48%
Writing: meeting 2 sub-levels of progress	28%
Writing: not meeting 2 levels of expected progress	24%

- In comparison with primary pupils, the significantly higher % of secondary pupils exceeding 2 levels of progress for reading and writing may well reflect the fact that the Yr. 7 targeted pupils were taught as specific intervention groups by project participants who are subject specialists. In addition to adopting and implementing strategies emerging for the project, teachers were able to tap into a broader package of support linked to, for example other intervention strategies such as Accelerated Reader and Challenge the Gap
- It is also worth noting that the “threshold” for achieving 3 levels of progress was far higher for the primary target group with many pupils starting the year on 5c and needing to achieve a level 6 to make 3 levels progress – an especially difficult age related challenge in Reading as we can see from national performance data
- In relation to Reading, as a further indication of this challenge, the DfE research mentioned above notes that *“almost 30% of pupils begin the Key Stage at the expected level (L5), but only around 20% have reached the next level (L6) after two more years of schooling.”*
- By contrast, the secondary cohort started at a much lower base level with a relatively easier age related threshold to cross in terms of meeting 3 levels of progress. This is particularly true of EAL pupils (40% of the cohort) who as a subgroup will often make rapid progress within the 3 secondary partner schools
- In relation to specific subgroups, there was little discernible difference in outcomes for targeted pupils from different ethnic groups. At secondary, where the % of FSM/SEN/EAL pupils is noticeable, **EAL pupils made in Reading a +5.0 APS gain; FSM pupils a +4.6**

APS gain; SEN pupils a +4.9 gain. This compares positively to an increase of + 4.96 APS in Reading for the whole cohort

- The corresponding figures for **Writing were + 5.4 for EAL pupils; +4.5 for FSM pupils and +4.1 for SEN pupils.** This compares very positively to an increase of + 3.5 APS in writing for the whole cohort.

Qualitative data to support quantitative evidence

- Qualitative feedback from individual teacher participants endorses improved and positive learning outcomes for pupils. This was captured through 3 outcomes based questions linked to the confidence questionnaire:
 - What have you done differently as a result of this project?
 - What impact has this had on pupils?
 - How do you know?

The following quotes offer a representative view of how teachers viewed the impact of their involvement in the project on pupils:

“Students in the intervention sessions have demonstrated impressive results and have – in some cases - overachieved and are heading towards a level 5. This is as a result of changes in my teaching inspired by the skills that have been transferred across from the project” (Yr. 7 teacher).

“The most obvious factor is of course the results, with level 6s in writing last year and this year, along with a large number of level 6s in grammar which includes a writing task in the SATs, and of course the coveted level 6 in reading which we achieved for the first time this year” (Yr. 6 teacher).

It is worth noting that a number of participants noted pupil’s improved attitudes to learning

“(We have) happy, confident year 7s who enjoy learning and frequently comment on how much they love English and, especially, writing where in previous years writing has become weighted down with technical vocabulary and demonstrations of embedded clauses. These are still useful, but students from this year seem more positive about negotiating between creativity and technical accuracy” (Yr. 7 teacher).

“The children have embraced my new teaching approach and have thrived.... by using engaging texts suggested by colleagues on the project, even the reluctant readers have begun to pick up books more often. This, in turn with the breaking down of the reading strands, has ensured progress across all ability levels. My children now love to read and understand a variety of texts” (Yr. 6 teacher).

- The qualitative feedback provided by headteachers on the project’s impact on pupils tends to be more variable than feedback from the participating teachers. Arguably, this reflects the understandable core focus of Heads with current results (the “so what?” factor following CPD provision). This might be contrasted with a classroom teacher’s perception of his/her skills development resulting in greater self-confidence and pupil motivation, but needing time to become embedded as transformational practice leading to improved results. However, even where schools did not achieve expected levels of

progress for targeted pupils, Heads noted the positive impact of the project on overall pupil progress. For example:

“In both reading and writing the targeted L5/6 children made at least 2 levels of progress but none made 3 levels of progress as were predicted. On the other hand the number making 3 levels of progress from L3/L4 was huge! 70% in reading and 50% in writing” (Primary Head).

“In writing 92% of the targeted pupils achieved their targets and 36% exceeded them- the programme worked well in this area as it has fed into our overall measure for more than expected progress. Reading has not been so successful with only 24% achieving their targets; however we did get a level 6 which is more than we got last year! We are also getting more children up to high level 5s, which does help our value added” (Primary Head).

Five of the 8 primary Heads explicitly referred to the positive impact of the cluster-based literacy masterclasses on the learning and motivation of level 5/6 pupils:

“The pupils LOVE the master classes and come back buzzing from them. It works on so many different levels as it gives the children specialist teaching and the opportunity to work with children from other schools and gives a real importance to their work by it being hosted in a secondary school” (Primary Head).

To this we can add the views of pupils. For example, evaluation feedback from the 57 pupils participating in the year 2 masterclasses, showed that **80%** of pupils expressed the view that masterclass activities across a range of skills had a **high** impact on their learning and **20 % a medium impact**. Impressive figures from a highly discerning audience.

8.3 Wider System Outcomes

Table 13 – Wider System Outcomes

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric	1 st and 2 nd returns and date of collection	3 rd return and date of collection
Teachers outside the project group have opportunity to increase knowledge on effective literacy strategies through accessing training provision developed by LSEF participants	Evaluation forms at end of training sessions	<i>Evaluations completed by all participants</i>	Number of teachers outside of the project group attending the training offered by our programme <i>(see below for details)</i>	Two sessions to Barnet teachers - Spring term 2015	Teaching School Alliance inset day – July 2015
Increased teacher awareness and access to transition resources and effective literacy strategies for target groups	Focus group	Members of project	Number of resources (specifically developed for this programme) downloaded from school website/requested by other schools <i>(see below for details)</i>		
Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom	Focus group	Members of project	3 triads/quads involving 11 schools in 3 separate clusters	<i>May 2014</i>	<i>June 2015</i>

focused practice – using empirically tested collaborative models such as triads/JPD to support the effective development of skills and knowledge			Participant evaluations as part of the JPD cycle over 2 years (see below for details)		
--	--	--	---	--	--

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

Sample size, sampling method, and whether the sample was representative or not

- As part of our commitment to wider dissemination of good practice emerging from the project, our two English SLEs delivered two literacy training sessions through the agency of Barnet Local Authority. The first session (02/02/15) “assessing L6 Writing and giving feedback to improve” was attended by **25 staff from 24** different schools. **20** evaluations were completed with **90% of participants rating the session as high quality training** across 8 skill domains
- The second session (09/03/15) “assessing L6 Reading skills” was delivered to **11 staff from 11 schools**. **10** evaluations were returned with **85%** of participants rating the training as **high quality across all 9 skill domains**
- The third training activity linked to wider dissemination of effective literacy strategies was linked to a Teaching School Alliance based inset day (July 2015) on inference training/reading comprehension led by Tony Whatmuff (national inference trainer). 119 participating teachers (our own teachers and around 40 external teachers) were asked to evaluate their training across a range of 5 key strategies. Total evaluations returned was **110**
- **Prior** to the training, **17%** of the staff attending ranked their confidence in teaching literacy and learning strategies at between levels **2-4** (with 1 indicating a lack of confidence and 10 very confident); **67%** between **5-7** and **16%** between **8-10**. By the end of the session, **84% rated** themselves between levels **8-10** with **16%** between **5-7**
- Following the training, **53%** of participants **strongly agreed** and **47% agreed** that the training helped their understanding and implementation of the strategies
- In comparison to the training session delivered by Tony Whatmuff to project participants in December 2015, this was a much larger set of teachers with a greater range of experienced teachers, including a higher % of secondary specialists. This possibly explains that for a significant minority (e.g. 16%) their confidence rating showed little or no actual increase. However the widespread range of positive written feedback comments highlighted the **high impact of the training on individual participants** (see below)
- The development of a cross-phase **transition literacy handbook** was based on group ideas emerging from our ongoing cycle of planning meetings/training sessions, joint practice lesson observations/lesson study and book sampling. The handbook, continually evaluated and updated by a focus group of project participants and coordinated by a

secondary specialist (SLE English), was completed to coincide with the July training day. Each project partner school (11 schools) and members of our wider Teaching School Alliance (10 schools) have each been provided with 10 paper copies of the booklet and access to an electronic copy so that ideas can be adapted and tailored to year-on-year developmental and curriculum needs. In addition to the literacy handbook, all 21 schools within our Teaching School Alliance have been provided with an electronic copy of the core ideas and strategies presented by Tony Whatmuff at the inset day

- Feedback on the joint practice development (JPD) and lesson study (LS) model of collaborative CPD was part of ongoing review/progress update within our meetings/training cycle. A formal review took place in May 2014 involving a focus group of 10 project participants

<p>For primary colleagues only: Please underline/circle as appropriate to indicate how your involvement in the JPD/Lesson Study cycle has had an impact on:</p> <p>L5/6 target group students Marked impact x 4 Some impact x 2 Limited impact x1 No impact</p> <p>The teaching strategies you use in relation to L5/6 target group students Marked impact x 3 Some impact x 3 Limited impact x 1 No impact</p> <p>Other colleagues in your team? Marked impact x 4 Some impact x2 Limited impact x 1 No impact</p>	<p>For secondary colleagues only: Please underline/circle as appropriate to indicate how your involvement in the JPD/Lesson Study cycle has had an impact on your approach to teaching English/literacy to more able students in Yr. 7</p> <p>Marked impact x 2 Some impact Limited impact No impact *</p> <p>*N/A as teacher of bottom set only in Yr. 7</p>
---	--

- The overall feedback from the JPD/LS focus group was that, whilst an excellent idea in both principle and practice, the organisational and logistical difficulties to arranging a cluster based and cross-phase approach to JPD/LS severely impacted on the effectiveness of this approach to support the effective development of skills and knowledge across multiple numbers of teachers and schools (**see appendix 4 for details of focus group feedback**)
- In practice most clusters were only able to organise one complete JPD/LS cycle rather than the two envisaged for year 1 of the project. Subsequently, for year 2 of the project we limited JPD/LS to secondary partner only whilst still providing primary partners with the opportunity to observe lessons and attend department meetings and book sampling session at the project lead school. Even here the model was difficult to apply across three secondary schools due to changes in staffing.

Commentary on wider system impact qualitative data to support quantitative evidence

- Typical comments from the first of the Barnet training sessions (Writing) included: *“really, really helpful with lots of useful resources & teaching strategies...” ...“fantastic”... “extremely relevant & informative. I’ve got lots of ideas & strategies to try out”*
- And from the second session (Reading) typical comments included: *“thank you for the great resources..... great to have concrete examples of L5 and L6 reading activities and marking”*
- What was important about both these sessions is that it provided us with the opportunity to share key L5/6 strategies developed within the project with a range of schools beyond our Teaching School network
- The feedback from the July inset is worth covering in some detail as it brought together key aspects of the project (for example, the cross-phase literacy handbook showing effective literacy practices for pupils of all ability) alongside an overarching approach to reading comprehension aimed at level 3-4 pupils but relevant to all KS2-3 pupils and across all curriculum areas:
 - *“Found it really helpful to have the LSEF cross-phase literacy handbook and The Compton T&L journal on literacy. Shows me how best practice can be captured and described for other teachers to apply in their classrooms”*
 - *“Really useful set of literacy strategies to help me coordinate a whole school approach”*
 - *“Was great to have the opportunity to discuss implementation of literacy strategies with colleagues from different schools”*
 - *“What a great day – focused, well presented with energy and passion. Loved the section on the moral case for all teachers being teachers of literacy”*
 - *“Brilliantly presented – feel inspired to try an improve literacy in my subject”*
 - *“Thank you for such a wealth of resources and ideas to take away”*
 - *“Have already got Tony’s contact details for him to come and do literacy training at my school”*
 - *“I was aware of the barriers and literacy problems experienced by pupil – now feel I have the strategies to do something about it”*
 - *“Best inset day this year! Fantastic classroom strategies”*
 - *“Tony Whatmuff was incredibly inspirational and has opened my eyes to practical and pupil-friendly literacy techniques”*

- *“Felt like real training and exploration of idea, not a repetition of stuff we already knew”*
- **More importantly, on the expected impact on practice back at school, participants’ typically commented:**
 - *“Was great to have literacy placed in context of wider learning strategies. I feel I have ideas that will really drive forward literacy across all subjects in my school”*
 - *“Will look to adapt Yr. 7 SOW to include Tony Whatmuff’s key strategies”*
 - *“Feel really inspired to use these strategies as part of a whole school drive to improve literacy, starting in Yr. 4 so pupils are more confident when texts get more difficult”*
 - *“As literacy coordinator I’m intending to provide all KS1 and KS2 teachers with posters using symbols showing Tony’s 8 key reading comprehension strategies”*
 - *“Amend my Dept. Development Plan to take account of Tony’s ideas”*
 - *“I intend to be far more explicit in identifying subject vocab and be clearer about meaning and assessing student understanding of key words”*
 - *“Use the resources and practical advice to aid immediate implementation of the strategies”*
- As noted above the JPD/LS proved difficult to implement in practice as a cross-phase, cluster based collaborative model of CPD. However, this development may have suffered by not being fully integrated at whole school level and supported by senior staff in order that organisational planning facilitates the time needed for the JPD/LS cycle of joint planning, lesson observation and feedback. Certainly, even given the time constraints, some participating schools recognised the benefits of the model. As one Primary Head noted in feeding back on the impact of the project on teachers:

“Lesson studies worked well and benefited the staff who participated. Teachers used practice that they knew worked well in their own class as well as experimented with strategies brought to the table at some of the training sessions. This allowed the observing teachers to take away something new. Questioning the children about the lessons that were observed gave the children a sense of ownership over their learning but informed the teacher about individual learning through the lesson. Although all children self-evaluate every lesson in their books, teachers began to question individuals more thoroughly about the content of lessons and the impact they felt particular tasks had on their learning. Tasks were then tailored to suit the particular learning styles most likely to develop the child.”

8.4 Impact Timelines

At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on teachers? Did this happen as expected?

- The different context of schools and range of experience of teachers, combined with the content and format of the CPD provided, meant that I had no set impact timeline. Following the initial needs audit in Sept 2013, my expectation was that different parts of the project would tap into the specific development needs of individual teachers and this would be reflected in the commentary provided by teachers as a part of the teacher confidence questionnaire.

At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on pupils? Did this happen as expected?

- The summer term data drops in Yr. 1 and Yr. 2 provided an expected overview of impact on pupils and this happened as expected (albeit with the caveat that attribution is problematic). The literacy masterclasses also provided fixed points when “stretch” strategies for the more able could be modelled and feedback from pupils evaluated. Other strategies (for example linked to the Literacy handbook and reading comprehension) were very much conceived as a contribution to longer term literacy developments with impact beyond the 2 year timescale of the project.

At what point did you expect to see wider school outcomes? Did this happen as expected?

- I expected to see wider school outcomes in the final term of the project in relation to the reading comprehension/inference training day in July 2015 with materials and resources emerging from the project being provided to participants from our wider Teaching School Alliance. This certainly happened as expected with all partner schools having an electronic copy of the literacy transition handbook and guidance and exemplification materials linked to reading comprehension
- My expectations of outcomes linked to the use of lesson study/joint practice development as a cross-phase CPD model to support the development of subject knowledge was tied into review and evaluation at the end of Yr.1. The approach to this model, in the context of cross-phase collaboration, was very much in the spirit of exploring enablers and barriers to implementation with expected outcomes linked to the development of appropriate modifications to the model in Yr. 2.

Reflect on any continuing impact anticipated.

- The key area here is the impact of Tony Whatmuff’s reading comprehension framework of strategies. Following the 2 training days for project and Teaching School partner schools and provision of resources, we would expect schools to incorporate aspects of Tony’s work into improvement planning for literacy. We will continue to work with Tony Whatmuff to embed his ideas within our own school and our wider alliance of schools. Individual schools (two to date) have planned to involve Tony in ongoing training for their staff
- The cross-phase literacy handbook provides the electronic basis for annually updating relevant teaching and learning strategies at school level and the involvement of project partners in a termly Teaching School Journal will serve to keep literacy strategies as a high profile.

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

The overall impact of your project

- A clear message emerging from the project has been the value of collaboration between classroom practitioners in a process based on their development needs and within the context of delivering improved outcomes for pupils. Such bottom up, organic collaboration has created a culture of trust leading to participants wishing to continue to collaborate on shared areas of interest. For example, literacy masterclasses, changes in the assessment system, shared projects between Yr. 6 and Yr. 7 pupils, continuation of shared peer observations
- The development of a shared learning culture among participants meant that progress outcomes for pupils was never solely about teaching to the test but rather how to create effective learning habits and attitudes amongst **all** pupils. For example, reading for pleasure was seen as an essential step in reading successfully for test results and not the other way round
- The use of baseline data and termly data drop provided a useful accountability framework for all participants and facilitated the collection of empirical evidence to support claims of the project's overall impact on pupils. Whilst cautious over attribution, the qualitative feedback from teachers and Heads does lend itself to the view that the project made a positive contribution to pupil progress. For example, an average points score gain of **+4.6 for Writing (Primary); +4.9 for Reading and + 3.5 for Writing (Secondary)**
- Qualitative and quantitative evidence support the view of gains in teacher confidence in subject knowledge and pedagogy as a result of participation in the project. We have also seen participants engaged in or leading a range of TSA activities such as Senior and Middle leadership programmes, Developing Outstanding Practice Programme, research and development bursaries, sessions on assessment and Singapore maths
- The use of an external expert in a key aspect of literacy development provided the “big idea” in year 2 and an evidence based framework for developing teaching and learning strategies within and indeed beyond the lifetime of the project
- One common refrain from teachers, Heads and indeed pupils was the success of the literacy masterclasses. The sessions were described as being motivational for pupils and useful preparation for SATs. In addition, the use of teachers modelling real learning activities with level 5-6 pupils, with a focused follow-up discussion and review with observing teachers, was a very powerful CPD tool
- On a more holistic level, the work undertaken as part of the project has served to deepen and strengthen our wider Teaching School Alliance (TSA). Four partner schools have joined the TSA during the time of their participation in the project. The involvement of classroom practitioners and the training sessions delivered to partner schools has moved the TSA out of the domain of senior leadership teams and into areas of teaching and learning relevant to classroom practitioners.

The extent to which your theory of change proved accurate

- *Improved teacher effectiveness and quality of teaching in relation to targeted pupil groups, leading to increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A; increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers. **Outcome fully met***

- *A more systematic approach to literacy leads to an upward trend in attainment for all KS2/3 pupils in the project schools. **Met to a limited extent** (in hindsight this intended outcome was far too ambitious and unrealistic in the timescale available. However, the reading comprehension strategies and framework provided to all partners following the July 2015 inset day has established the basis for future development*
- *Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom focused practice will provide an effective and transferrable model of professional development. **Outcome met** (as discussed elsewhere in this report, the JPD/LS cluster based approach proving difficult in practice, However, project participants were able to test out the model and 5 partner schools have/will develop their own internal LS model to support future school based CPD*
- *Dissemination of outcomes/resources from project (end of Yr. 1 and end of Yr. 2) and use by other schools beyond the project. **Outcome fully met***

How your project has contributed to the overall aims of LSEF/whether your findings support the hypothesis 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.*

- Without doubt the project has supported the hypothesis of the LSEF
- In terms of contributing to the overall aims of LSEF, with the demise of Local Authority advisory services and subject advisors, there has been a severe loss of coordinated practitioner led networks. By using the framework provided by LSEF funding, the theory for change and evaluation templates, our project has been able to cultivate teaching excellence and rekindle a subject/ theme based approach to enhancing teacher subject knowledge and curriculum development
- The project has extended the scope and scale of school-to-school support and peer led activity provided by our Teaching School Alliance. Resources and teaching and learning strategies have been developed and provided to support pupil achievement in literacy/English. Moreover, with the work undertaken around reading comprehension

providing a transferrable, ongoing approach across all partner schools, the project has set in place a self-sustaining model for improving literacy and raising pupil achievement

- The project has supported the development and evaluation of previously tested approaches to classroom based CPD by contextualising JPD/LS within a cross-phase and cluster based model
- The message that London state schools are among the best in the world was a core introductory message at our July 2015 inset day and used to support the view that collaboration, peer to peer review and openness to challenge and innovation are key components to this success. Participants in the project have seen in many ways how this culture of collaboration lead to teachers taking ownership of their professional development and raise the performance standards of pupils.

**What your findings say about the meta-evaluation theme that is most relevant to you:
Work across phase - between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3**

Benefits

- Shared knowledge and expertise between Yr. 6 and Yr. 7 teachers provided a common approach to literacy transferable across the key stages
- Shared lesson observations provided a model for linking theory to practice and evaluating the effectiveness of particular teaching and learning strategies
- Use of secondary specialists to reinforce core aspects of level 6 work helped develop a shared understanding and clarity around assessment levels
- Addressing the Yr. 7/8 dip – opportunities for secondary colleagues to witness the high quality work undertaken in Yr. 6 has raised expectations of pupils on entry to KS3
- Made the transition experience for pupils at secondary project schools less daunting and more consistent in terms of curriculum experiences

Challenges

- Disjuncture in resources and capacity of secondary and primary schools made it difficult to follow an agreed timeline of activities – planning and deadlines needed to be constantly readjusted to fit in with competing priorities upon the time of KS2 teachers
- Having a common approach to data collection in order to reach consistent judgements about pupil progress across different cohorts
- Ensuring a mutual climate of professional respect – secondary teachers may be subject specialists in terms of knowledge but need to be open to what primary teachers can bring in terms of pedagogy and insights into pupil motivation and engagement.

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	20	22,200
Teacher CPD (face to face/online etc.)	50	55,500
Events/Networks for Teachers	20	22,200
Teacher 1:1 support	n/a	
Events/Networks for Pupils	2	2,220
Others as Required – Please detail in full	8 (admin)	8,880
TOTAL	100%	£ 111,000

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

- Whilst recognising the need for accountability and external scrutiny for public funded projects, I have found the reporting requirements of the project to be excessive. In practice, this has meant a disproportionate amount of my time spent on monitoring and recording outcomes rather than leading the strategic drive to improve outcomes. For example, at a crude estimate, this report (including all data analysis) has taking me around 100 hours to complete (the bulk of it during the summer holidays). Admittedly a good deal of this time would have been reduced if I had access to a data person to crunch the numbers in a more efficient way. However, the fact remains that the balance between delivering outcomes and recording outcomes needs to be recalibrated for future projects
- Certainly one way forward would be to simplify the content of this final report. Sections 8.4/9/11/12 involve too much repetition and the 27 bullet points within these sections need to be streamlined and condensed within one overall section on impact.

10.2 Commentary of value for money

- The above sections provide a clear indication that the funding for the project has been used effectively to support the direct training of 30 project participants teaching and around 1320 pupils over a 2 year period. A further 160 teachers have been trained by teachers and an external specialist funded by the project. Around 110 Yr. 6 pupils have attended literacy masterclasses at two secondary schools. High quality resources have been created and shared with all 21 schools within our TSA and these resources will help form the basis for future developments in literacy
- Arguably the above outcomes represent good value for money. Even better value for money would result from a more streamlined approach to recording and reporting outcomes (see above). For example, following National College models of research and

development funding, it would be useful for a thematic area (e.g. literacy) to have a common overarching evaluation framework with no more than one designated outcome for each key category of pupils, teachers and the wider school system. This would provide a common focus across schools and ensure that schools do not dissipate time and resources across a multiplicity of outcomes.

10.3 Value for money calculations

Note: This section is only required for projects with control or comparison groups: **N/A**

11. Reflection on project delivery

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)?

Enablers

- The use of high quality subject specialists was a powerful factor in promoting the credibility of the project in terms of securing participants' engagement and a tangible return on their time
- The use of an external expert able to provide an evidence based framework and set of strategies accessible to all teachers and transferrable to all school within our partnership
- Building on previous work between partner schools so the project tapped into whole school development priorities as well as pre-existing culture of trust
- Teacher audits of needs and pupil interviews at start of the project – provided basis for devising the skill domains used in the teacher confidence survey
- Experienced project coordinator to “oil the wheels” and provide strategic direction.

Barriers

- Staff turnover impacting on continuity and competing school priorities (e.g. Ofsted, introduction of new policy requirements) introduced an additional level of complexity in delivering outcomes within an agreed timeframe. Response to this was to listen to schools and amend their contributions accordingly
- Due to school budget reductions, not having a designated person responsible for chasing up, collating and analysing data. Response to this was to build time into my coordination role – not ideal but a pragmatic solution.

What factors need to be in place in order to improve teacher subject knowledge?

- See above comment on the role of subject specialists
- There needs to be affordable, high quality subject knowledge based programmes using the model of the Outstanding Teacher Programme (Challenge Partners/OLEVI). These programmes would be around 6-8 sessions of around 5 days across a term (mixture of twilights and school days). They would be based around centrally developed high quality resources and online activities and delivered by current expert practitioners across the London network of schools. This would potentially offer a knowledge mobilisation framework that could support and sustain coherent improvements across London's schools.

11.2 Management and Delivery Processes

How effective were the management and delivery processes used?

- Not having different people with a designated role and responsibilities for operational and strategic matters impacted on the efficient time management of the project but, in overall terms, did not affect the effectiveness of the delivery process (the latter was due to the quality of the various staff delivering aspects of the programmes and to the quality of the participants).

Were there any innovative delivery mechanisms and what was the effect of those?

- Nothing I would characterise as innovative in terms of making use of new technology/social media. But standard delivery mechanisms (e.g. face-to-face training, peer observations, professional dialogue and review of practice) were of a high standard.

Did the management or delivery mechanisms change during the lifetime of the project and what were the before or after effects?

- N/A

11.3 Future Sustainability and Forward Planning

Do you have any plans for the future sustainability of your projects?

- As we move into a new assessment framework (“Life Beyond Levels”) there will a clear need to develop a shared understanding of performance levels between schools and cross-phase. We will also work with our Teaching School partners to roll-out the learning and changes in practice following the reading comprehension strategies provided by Tony Whatmuff
- Continuation of literacy masterclasses
- Publication of a termly TSA teaching and learning journal – articles from participants updating progress on literacy strategies linked to the project
- R&D bursaries (funding from Challenge Partners) to promote short term action research projects into literacy developments in Yrs. 6 and 7
- Incorporation of a literacy strand as part of the TSA’s Developing Outstanding Practice programme (4 primary partners hosting an annual learning visit and overview of an area of expertise for around 15 teachers per visit).

What factors or elements are essential for the sustainability of your project?

- To a large extent our Teaching School Alliance provides the framework for ongoing sustainability as we have regular opportunities to revisit the ideas and approaches emanating from the literacy project
- We will work with partners to ensure that key ideas around reading comprehension strategies are part of a wider approach to literacy and learning across all subject areas and that these key ideas become embedded into school and team development plans.

How have you/will you share your project knowledge and resources?

- Presentation and interactive discussion at the Mayor’s annual conference in November 2015
- Showcase reading comprehension strategies as framework for improving literacy and learning across all subject areas (Securing Good conference programme, spring 2016 – London Leadership strategy)
- Summary of key findings to Heads/Senior Staff at autumn term Teaching School Alliance meeting
- Provision of 10 copies of literacy handbook to all TSA partner schools and electronic copy on school website; LondonEd website

- CD with all resources and reading comprehension strategies from July inset day sent to all TSA partner schools.

12. Final Report Conclusion

Key findings for assessment of project impact

What outcomes does the evaluation suggest were achieved?

- See section 9.

What outcomes, if any, does the evaluation suggest were not achieved or partly achieved?

- See section 9.

What outcomes, if any, is there too little evidence to state whether they were achieved or not?

- Link between self-assessed statements by individual teachers of improved confidence in subject knowledge and pedagogic skills and the extent to which this was translated into improved progress outcomes for pupils.

Key lessons learnt for assessment of project delivery

What activities/approaches worked well?

- Being able to build on established TSA network and relationships of trust
- Having a designated project lead with access/good relationships with Heads of project schools – important in “oiling the wheels”/addressing issues etc.
- Participants completing a professional development needs audit linked to literacy skills – provided basis for training sessions and teacher confidence survey
- Use of high quality subject specialists from within the project to deliver training
- Focused visits to primary partners by secondary cluster leads at start of project to gain insight into current practice
- Use of an external expert to deliver training – provided an evidence based framework of strategies relevant and tangible to all teachers in project schools
- Termly data drop establishing autumn baseline and mechanism for assessing progress outcomes across the year
- Use of 3 year historical trend data for KS2 as contextual basis for evaluation of pupil outcomes
- Having literacy masterclasses for level 5-6 pupils - ensured that participating teachers able to see the practical application of literacy strategies
- Having a regular meeting/training cycle with agendas and minutes provided a record and timeline for actions.

What activities/approaches worked less well?

- Pupil interviews at beginning of programme. Time consuming and did not add to our knowledge base
- JPD/LS cycle worked less well than anticipated as a classroom model for cluster based CPD.

What difficulties were encountered in delivery and how could they be mitigated in the future?

- Staff turnover impacting on continuity. This could be mitigated by each school having a named senior staff member as designated project link in order that knowledge of the project is not “lost” and momentum and engagement preserved.

Were there any additional or unintended benefits (e.g. increases in student attendance as a result of an intervention aimed at teachers)?

- N/A

Informing future delivery

What should the project have done more of?

- Drill down at the level of the individual teacher. For example, to analyse if there were a broad correlation between teacher engagement in the project, increase in self-reported confidence levels and the % of pupils meeting/exceeding 2 levels of progress
- Clearer guidance and clarification on pupil baseline data for targeted Yr. 6 pupils, including sub-level data across year 5 in order to make a broader evaluation of progress.

What should the project have done less of?

- Overreliance on questionnaires as a quick, easy and efficient method to collect data. Would have been useful to balance with sampled interviews with participants, although the latter has to be weighed against demands on teacher time.

What recommendations would you have for other projects regarding scaling up and/ or replicating your project?

- Need to ensure a clear demarcation of role in terms of a named operational lead (data person, organising logistics of meetings and training sessions, issuing reminders about deadlines) and a strategic lead responsible for project development and outcomes.

Appendix 1: Theory of Change Template (attached)

Appendix 2: Evaluation Plan (attached)

Appendix 3: Results of teacher confidence survey (attached)

Appendix 4: Focus group feedback on Joint Practice Development/Lesson Study model of CPD (attached).

Appendix 1: Theory of Change Template

1. What is the problem that you are trying to address?

- Developing teachers' subject knowledge in English/literacy in order to enhance attainment for level 5/6 primary and level 3 secondary pupils

2. What is the long term goal that you are working towards?

- Improved teacher confidence and more effective teaching of targeted cohort groups
- Improved pupil attainment of targeted cohort groups
- Sharing of a literacy transition unit of work and development of a cross-phase common language for literacy across partners
- Development of a more systematic approach to the teaching of literacy to support progress and attainment of all KS2/3 pupils
- Developing an effective and transferrable model of teacher CPD that is classroom based and focused on improving the quality of teaching and learning in literacy/English

3. What are the project activities that contribute to the project outcomes? Please list all of your activities below.

1. Training for teachers of Yr. 5-7

6 CPD training sessions in literacy/English over 2 years for a minimum of 20-24 teachers of Yr. 5-7 from 10 schools.

2. Literacy Masterclasses

Literacy Masterclasses for 120 Yr5/6 pupils (May 2014 and 2015) delivered by secondary specialists following joint planning with Yr. 6 teachers

3. Literacy transition unit of work

Embedding a literacy transition unit of work as the basis for sustaining curriculum continuity, assessment, and common practices between Yr. 6-7 (June 2014 and 2015/Sept 2014 and Sept 2015). All 10 participating schools.

4. Whole staff training

2 whole staff twilight training sessions on literacy (Oct 2014/Feb2015); 1 cluster based whole school inset day on literacy (April 2015) organised by the school and cluster leads. All 10 participating schools.

5. Joint Practice Development (JPD)

Implementation of triads/quads – planning, observation, feedback cycle x 6 across 2 years – minimum of 10 staff.

4. What are the measurable outcomes that, if achieved, will help meet the long term goal?

- Participating teachers have improved understanding and confidence in developing literacy for level 3 and below & for level 5/6 pupils in Yr. 6
- Increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A; increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers

- A more systematic approach to literacy leads to an upward trend in attainment for all KS2/3 pupils in the 10 schools
- Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom focused practice will provide an effective and transferrable model of professional development
- Dissemination of outcomes/resources from project (end of Yr. 1 and end of Yr. 2) and use by other schools beyond the project

5. Please specify which outcomes each of your activities will affect and describe why you think the activities affect that outcome.

- *Improved teacher effectiveness and quality of teaching in relation to targeted pupil groups, leading to Increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A; increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers*

Activity 1 (Training for teachers Yr. 5-7) will impact of the above outcomes by providing high quality training rooted in practitioner experience and tightly focused on learning issues and challenges linked to target pupils.

Activity 2 (Literacy Masterclasses for approx. 120 Yr5/6 pupils) will model effective strategies for delivering a set of learning activities and approaches supporting the development of more able pupils in Yr. 6

- *A more systematic approach to literacy leads to an upward trend in attainment for all KS2/3 pupils in the 10 schools*

Activity 3 (embedding a literacy transition unit of work) and Activity 4 (whole staff training) will extend the numbers of staff involved in strategies developed during Yr. 1 of the project and provide a holistic, whole school approach to supporting and sustaining an upward trend in attainment.

- *Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom focused practice will provide an effective and transferrable model of professional development*

Activity5: The use of a JPD/Lesson Study approach will provide an empirical basis and set of champions able to demonstrate how JPD/Lesson Study can be successfully implemented and delivered to make a difference the professional development of teachers and outcomes for pupils

- *Dissemination of outcomes/resources from project (end of Yr. 1 and end of Yr. 2) and use by other schools beyond the project*

All the above activities will lead to a coherent set of approaches, strategies and resources that we will develop, advertise and showcase through our TSA and wider Teaching School and Challenge Partners national networks.

6. For each target group, how are these individuals/groups recruited/referred?

- All 10 project partner schools are already part of our Teaching School/Challenge Partners networks so mechanisms such as shared staff training/joint inset/shared resources/shared lesson planning and observations already in place to provide a platform for ensuring impact in schools

- 5 of the 10 partners have worked together in 2012-13 on a literacy project linked to improving the transition process and developing a literacy masterclass for Yr. 6 pupils.
- Participating teachers in the LSEF project are willing volunteers with an active engagement with literacy/English teaching of our target pupils

Participating staff have designated roles proportionate to individual responsibilities. For example, two SLEs are involved as cluster leads and have capacity to support operational delivery

7. For each target group, what happens to them at the end of the project?

- As a Teaching School, and in conjunction with the London Borough of Barnet's LSEF project, we would look to use the expertise of those Yr. 5-7 teachers participating in the project to support the delivery of training within and beyond our Alliance.
- We would look to tailor CPD opportunities within our teaching school provision to enhance the professional development of participants. For example, access to the Outstanding Teacher Programme, the new leadership curriculum (NPQML, NPQSL), designation as a Specialist Leader of Education or a Challenge Partner Subject Leader

Appendix 2: Template Evaluation Plan/Framework.

<u>Outputs</u>	<u>Indicators of Outputs</u>	<u>Baseline data collection</u>	<u>Impact data collection</u>
6 CPD training sessions in literacy/English over 2 years for a minimum of 20-24 teachers of Yr. 6/7 from 11 schools	Continuity of attendance by all 20-24 teachers from the 11 project schools Active involvement of all teacher participants - input into the on-going training programme	Attendance records/record of individual training sessions Minuted feedback/reflections from participant's learning logs – sample per training session	Evaluations from teachers showing provision of a sequential, systematic high quality training programme
Implementation of JPD triads/quads – planning, observation, feedback cycle x 3-4 across 2 years	All participating teachers complete annual JPD cycle	Cluster leads/project coordinator attend at least 1 planning, observation, feedback session per triads/quads during each of the 3-4 cycles	All teachers complete individual JPD pro forma and contribute to group pro forma highlighting impact of the JPD on classroom practices in literacy/English and pupil progress
2 whole staff twilight training sessions on literacy(Oct 2014/Feb2015; 1 cluster based whole school inset day on literacy April 2015)	Training materials/resources developed to support the twilight/joint inset day individual school	Evaluation pro forma providing comparison of staff knowledge and skills at beginning and end points of the 3 combined training sessions	Feedback sample from classroom observations at end of Yr1 and Yr2 of intervention
Embedding a literacy transition unit of work as basis for sustaining curriculum continuity, assessment, common practices between Yr. 6-7 (June 2014 and 2015/Sept 2014 and Sept 2015)	Transition unit in place	Audit/sample of existing transition resources	Review by Headteachers of participating schools on effectiveness of new resources
Literacy masterclass for approx. 120 Yr5/6 pupils (May 2014 and 2015)	Attendance by approx. 120 Yr5/6 pupils	Trend data: actual attainment (levels/grades) for the 3 previous year groups not attending literacy masterclass	Evaluations from pupils and attending staff End of year KS2 assessments for target group pupils
Teacher Outcomes	<u>Indicators of Outcomes</u>	Baseline data collection	Impact data collection
Improved understanding and confidence in developing literacy for level 3 and below & for level	Development of literacy subject knowledge and skills demonstrated through observed classroom practice	Scores collected for individual teachers from pre-intervention survey in Sept/October 2013	Scores collected for individual teachers from post intervention confidence surveys after Yr1 and Yr2 of intervention

5/6 pupils in Yr. 6	by SLE cluster leads and teacher self- assessment against the skills and knowledge areas they identified as part of the pre-intervention needs audit	.	Professor Gordon Stobart (IOE) to interview a sample and/or focus group of survey respondents to evaluate impact of training and JPD on teachers' literacy subject knowledge and skills re: target groups July 2014 & May 2015
Pupil Outcomes	Indicators of Outcomes	Baseline data collection	Impact data collection
Increased number of Yr. 6 pupils achieving/working towards level 6/achieving 5A; Increase in rate of progress of level 3 pupils and below in Yr. 7 taught by participating teachers	Improvement in exam results/ progress levels of target groups against baseline data and compared to progress made by previous cohorts (July 2012-July 2015)	Trend data: actual attainment (levels/grades) for the 3 previous year groups as well as intervention group Use of benchmark data showing performance levels at start of academic years 2013 and 2014, termly data drops and end of year summative analysis for target groups	Improvement in levels of progress/attainment across all schools for target pupils and in context of 3 year trend Summative review to be completed: Sept 2014 & Sept 2015
A more systematic approach to literacy leads to an increase in the % of all Yr. 6/7 pupils making expected/more than expected levels of progress (by end of Yr. 2)	Increase in the % of all Yr. 6/7 pupils making expected/more than expected levels of progress in comparison to the 3 years prior to the intervention	Data showing % of all Yr. 6/7 pupils making expected/more than expected levels of progress for the 3 years prior to the intervention Sept 2014	Increase in % of all Yr. 6/7 pupils making expected/more than expected levels of progress for all Yr. 6/7 pupils and in context of 3 year trend Sept 2015
School System / 'Culture Change' Outcomes	Indicators of Outcomes	Baseline data collection	Impact data collection
Greater teacher ownership of CPD through classroom focused practice – using empirically tested collaborative models such as triads/JPD to support the effective development of skills and knowledge	Triads/quads established as the operational unit for JPD for individual clusters with all participating teachers involved in a termly cycle of shared planning, observation and feedback	Identification of areas of classroom practice requiring improvement as a collaborative focus for JPD Cycle 1 of triads/quads in operation Spring 2014	Participant evaluations/learning logs as part of the JPD cycle over 2 years 3 triads/quads involving 11 schools in 3 separate clusters – to run over 2 years Individual school development plans show JPD embedded as an effective

			approach to delivering CPD priorities
Increased teacher awareness and access to transition resources and effective literacy strategies for target groups	Dissemination of electronic toolkit of transition resources and staff training guidance on literacy (end of Yr. 1 and end of Yr. 2) and feedback on use by other schools beyond project partners	In current absence of existing transition resources between partner schools, audit of transition teachers to establish core content and skills supporting a common transition framework	User feedback on quality of resources through online survey Number of resources (specifically developed for this programme) downloaded from school website/requested by other schools (including number of unique teachers and unique schools downloading/requesting resources)
Teachers outside the project group have opportunity to increase knowledge on effective literacy strategies through accessing training provision developed by LSEF participants	Evaluations and feedback from teachers outside of the project group attending 2 twilight training sessions (Oct 2014/Feb2015) Evaluations and feedback from teachers within the project group attending 2 twilight training sessions (Oct 2014/Feb2015) and whole school inset on literacy (summer term 2015)	Number of teachers outside of the project group attending the training offered by our programme Completion by participants of a skills audit prior to individual training sessions	Completion of a teacher confidence survey by participants after attending individual training sessions Follow-up sample survey (summer 2015) of Headteachers to evaluate how training has impacted on the classroom practice of teachers attending the training

NB. Please add more rows or further detail as necessary

Appendix 3: London Schools Excellence Fund Literacy Project: **Teacher Self- Assessment at end of Yr. 2**

The aim of the survey was to evaluate **teacher confidence at the end of the project**. Using a scale **from 1 to 5 where 1 is “not at all” and 5 is “very much so,”** teachers were asked to indicate their level of **confidence** in the teaching skills below.

Table 1 below represents the responses of primary teachers participating in the project and involved in teaching level 5-6 literacy skills

The response rate from primary partners was 62% (10/16)

Table 2 represents the combined responses of primary and secondary teachers participating in the project and involved in teaching level 3-4 literacy skills

The response rate from primary partners was 62% (10/16) and for secondary partners it was 83% (9/6).

As well as the quantitative response to the questionnaire, participants were also asked to respond to the following: *In terms of capturing the general impact of your participation in the project, it would be very helpful if you could take some time to answer the 3 questions below in as much detail as you can:*

1. What impact has this had on pupils? (you might refer to pupil engagement/motivation, quality of work)
2. How do you know? (you might refer to feedback from peer or Headteacher observations, test scores and progress in literacy levels).
3. How do you know? (you might refer to feedback from peer or Headteacher observations, test scores and progress in literacy levels).

Table 1: Primary only

Name of School:		Your Name:		
Number of Years Teaching:		Role and/or Responsibility:		
First or second year involved in the project				
	Not at all 1-2	Moderately 3	Very much so 4-5	How would you have ranked yourself at <u>the beginning</u> of your participation in the project?
Assessing high level 5 / level 6 work			4.14	2.28
Giving written feedback on high level 5 / level 6 work			4.14	2.8
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Text-type, audience and purpose.			4.14	2.28
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Whole text structure			4.28	2.14
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Paragraphs, linking sentences, connectives			4.28	1.71
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Sentences			4.28	2.28
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Punctuation			4.28	2.28
Teaching level 6 writing skills: Vocabulary			4.14	2.28
Teaching level 6 reading skills: Inference			4.2	1.85
Teaching level 6 reading skills: Commenting on the structure and organisation of texts			4.14	1.71
Teaching level 6 reading skills: Writer's use of language			4.28	2.0
Teaching level 6 reading skills: Commenting on writer's purposes and viewpoints and the overall effect on the reader			4.42	1.85
Overall response across all skill domains			4.19	2.17

Table 2: Primary (in bold) and secondary participants combined

	Not at all 1-2	Moderately 3	Very much so 4-5	How would you have ranked yourself at the beginning of your participation in the project?
Assessing level 3 / level 4 work			4.85 (4.4)	4 (2.6)
Giving written feedback on level 3/ level 4 work			5 (4.8)	4.1 (3)
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Text-type, audience and purpose.			4.71 4.4)	4 3.2
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Whole text structure			4.85 4.4	4 3.2
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Paragraphs, linking sentences, connectives			4.71 4	3.8 3.2
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Sentences			4.71 5	3.8 3.2
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Punctuation			4.71 4.4	3.8 3
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Vocabulary			4.71 4.8	4.3 3.6
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Spelling instruction and phonics			4.86 4	4 2.8
Teaching level 3/4 writing skills: Handwriting			4.86 2.8	4 2
Teaching level 3/4 reading skills: Inference			5 4.8	3.8 2.6
Teaching level 3/4 reading skills: Commenting on the structure and organisation of texts			4.86 4.2	3.8 3

Teaching level 3/4 reading skills: Writer's use of language			4.86 4.4	4 3.6
Teaching level 3/4 reading skills: Commenting on writer's purposes and viewpoints and the overall effect on the reader			4.86 4.2	4 3.2
Overall response across all skill domains			4.82 4.32	3.84 3.01



LSEF training session on Joint Practice Development/ Lesson Study approach to teacher CPD – cycle 1

Provisional analysis based on 10 responses (nb: individuals may have made more than 1 comment per question).

Questions	Comments
<p>1. What have been some of the key CPD benefits of being able to share and develop classroom practice collaboratively across schools/phases?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to explore/observe/discuss different T& L methods/activities with teachers beyond own school x 10 • Applying new ideas into own practice x 4 • Developing a deeper understanding of key features of L6 work x 2 • Exposure to different resources x 2
<p>2. What features of the suggested framework (e.g. <i>joint planning/ focus on 3 case study pupils/pro forma observation sheet/post-lesson interview with pupils/post lesson discussion record</i>) did you use?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on 3 case study pupils x 10 • Post lesson discussion record x 9 • Pro forma observation sheet x 5 • Post-lesson interview with pupils x 3 • Joint planning x 3 <p>I cluster used a more fluid model of information gathering focused on L6 students' books and classwork</p> <p>I cluster adapted the post-discussion record</p>
<p>3. Which of the above features were <u>particularly effective</u>? And why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on 3 case study pupils (enabled evaluation of progress & development by looking at their work and questions they asked) x 7 • Post lesson discussion record x 3 • Joint planning x 2 • Post-lesson interview with pupils (good to hear what pupils felt worked well for them) x 2
<p>4. What was problematic or difficult about the lesson study approach/format?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding the time to plan together x 10 • Point in the year was difficult (run-up to SATs) x 4 • Agreeing dates in crowded diaries x 2 • Finding time to interview pupils after the lesson x1
<p>5. In relation to the observation cycle, what adaptations did you personally make to the lesson study approach/format (what did you do differently from the suggested format)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to time constraints, planned lessons individually & all had a different lesson focus (although linked to L6 writing) x 5 • Just focused on observation and post lesson discussion x 4

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretty much followed the plan x 2 • Did not use the pro formas as not able to joint plan x 2 • Wanted a more fluid approach in cycle 1 to establish understanding/context of a different school x 1
<p>6. Summarise up to 3 changes you would make to the JPD/Lesson Study approach that would make it a sustainable CPD model within:</p>	<p>Your own school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater degree of advance planning/joint planning x 5 • Use of a whole day so time available to plan together for next jointly observed lesson x 2 • Extend numbers involved and wider focus (e.g. Yr. 5) x 2 <p>Between a cluster of primary and secondary schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater degree of advance & joint planning/ fixed in school calendars x 7 • Having a clear focus in lessons x 3 • Use of a whole day so time available to plan together for next lesson in cycle x 1 • Focus on moderation of ideas/feedback between primary and secondary colleagues x 1 • Involve pairs of schools rather than cluster – will minimise time constraints etc x 1 • Having a range of practical examples of pupils' work prior to observations x 1
<p>7. Please describe (or attach your notes) of 3-5 “nuggets” of good practice you have experienced during shared JPD/Lesson Study observations/discussions. What made each individual nugget effective/work as good practice?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEE strategies x 4 • Exposure to a range of resources x 4 • Use of Alan Peat programme/ teaching a systematic approach to sentence structures x 4 • Redrafting carousels – where pupils visited info stations with a piece of work & completed a range of grammar activities to improve the writing x 3 • Pupils learning through each other - having “teachers” round the room for different definitions etc x 2 • Use of rotating/swapping sentences allowed pupils to take risks x 2 • YouTube Butterfly clip on the value of peer assessment x 1 • Strategies for redrafting/editing work (“uplevelling” in a different colour pen) x 1 • Use of scaffolding to support and structure learning x 1 • Use of common and familiar terminology x 1 • Effectiveness of joint planning and a focus on pupils learning to support teacher understanding of pupil needs x 1

8. For primary colleagues only:	8. For secondary colleagues only:
<p>Please underline/circle as appropriate to indicate how your involvement in the JPD/Lesson Study cycle has had an impact on</p> <p>a) L5/6 target group students</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Marked impact x 4 Some impact x 2 Limited impact x1 No impact</p> <p>b) The teaching strategies you use in relation to L5/6 target group students</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Marked impact x 3 Some impact x 3 Limited impact x 1 No impact</p> <p>c) Other colleagues in your team?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Marked impact x 4 Some impact x2 Limited impact x 1 No impact</p>	<p>Please underline/circle as appropriate to indicate how your involvement in the JPD/Lesson Study cycle has had an impact on your approach to teaching English/literacy to more able students in Yr. 7</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Marked impact x 2 Some impact Limited impact No impact *</p> <p>*N/A as teacher of bottom set only in Yr. 7</p>
<p>9. For all colleagues: any other comments?</p> <p>1 teacher commented how the training sessions provided by secondary teachers have been “fantastic in helping support JPD/Lesson Study and through providing lots of ideas/help/advice.”</p> <p>1 teacher commented that JPD/Lesson Study was “a fantastic process & second time round we can.... get even more out of it.”</p> <p>1 teacher commented that “the lesson study programme will have a much bigger impact next year when we implement it on a larger scale at our school.”</p>	

