

London Schools Excellence Fund

Self-Evaluation Toolkit

Final report

Contact Details

educationprogramme@london.gov.uk

Evaluation Final Report

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 2/3

Report Submission Deadline: 30 September 2015

Report Submission: Final Report to the GLA

Project Name: Professional Language Networks

Lead Delivery Organisation: University of Westminster

London Schools Excellence Fund Reference: LSEFR1099

Author of the Self-Evaluation: Dr. Alan Dobson, Chief Evaluator

(Dr. Jessica G. Briggs, Data Analyst & Evaluator and Miss Domini Stone, Project Manager)

Total LSEF grant funding for project: £650,000

Total Lifetime cost of the project (inc. match funding): £740,000

Actual Project Start Date: March 2014

Actual Project End Date: September 2015 extended to December 2015

Final Report

1. Executive Summary

The “Professional Language Networks” project was set up to allow the language teachers involved to share ideas and approaches to teaching and to increase their confidence; this in turn would help to boost their pupils’ motivation and engagement and lead to improved attainment in the subject. The project began as schools were facing the challenge of modern foreign languages (MFL) as a compulsory subject in the Key Stage 2 curriculum for the first time.

In achieving its outcomes, the project met the aims of LSEF because it refocused the teaching of the teachers involved and through them began to influence the practice of their colleagues. The project has set in train rethinking that can lead to cultural change and raised expectations.

The bespoke mentoring model was a key feature. This opportunity for one-to-one dialogue was complemented by the use of reflective logs by teachers to focus their thinking and by teachers learning from their peers through observations, involvement in local workshops and participation in London-wide events.

The self-evaluation sample involved 189 teachers and 2,943 pupils. Primary schools accounted for 145 of the teachers and 2,660 of the pupils. Most of the London boroughs worked with were represented in the sample. Owing to the limited number of secondary schools, it was not possible to achieve the outcome to bring about ‘better coordination between primary and secondary teaching’.

A self-report methodology was employed: to ensure that teachers knew they would not be subject to external evaluation and were therefore more likely to participate; to yield a larger pupil sample size; and because self-report data provides evidence of reflection, which was encouraged by the study design and the mentors’ intervention. A range of variables was analysed: 12 for Teacher Outcomes and 8 for Pupil Outcomes (a detailed Quantitative Data Report appears at Appendix 1). The quantitative evidence was complemented by qualitative evidence including teachers’ reflective logs, lesson observations and feedback from teachers on events.

The quantitative evidence indicates that the teachers who participated in the project made significant self-reported gains in Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge, in self-efficacy, and in confidence.

It also shows that the participating teachers in primary schools experienced significant perceived increase in their pupils’ second language proficiency overall. The qualitative evidence is consistent with these findings.

In secondary schools, the quantitative evidence indicates there were large perceived increases in pupils’ writing ability, and tentative evidence to suggest that if a larger number of comparable secondary cases were available, similar gains in reading, listening and speaking might be observed. There is insufficient qualitative evidence to confirm the findings about pupils’ writing and tentative evidence that they made progress in their reading, listening and speaking skills.

2. Project Description

The following is an updated version of the text in the Interim Report and is followed by specific notes on three changes which have occurred.

- *Why was the project set up? What need was it seeking to address?*

The LSEF project “**Professional Language Networks**” (PLN) was set up to allow language teachers involved to share ideas and approaches to teaching. It provided them with the opportunity to update their professional skills as well as their subject knowledge in languages, linguistics and language teaching methodology. This is in line with the Mayor of London’s policy on raising the quality of teaching in primary and secondary schools and improving pupils’ attainment in core subjects, including languages. Furthermore, the project set out to increase confidence amongst language teachers, which in turn would help boost their pupils’ motivation and engagement in the subject. Both primary and secondary schools were involved in the project and networking between teachers and schools was facilitated. From September 2014 languages became a compulsory part of the Key Stage (KS) 2 curriculum and the project came at a crucial time as it sought to address the implementation of a new primary languages curriculum.

- What were the circumstances into which it was introduced?

Network for Languages London had an established infrastructure, relationships, human resources and a track record of effective collaboration with schools in place. The project built on these attributes and enabled professional language networks to be set up across London.

- *What project activities have been put in place?*

The project delivered borough-specific Learning Cycles (LC), of which there were a maximum of four for teachers who joined at the beginning of the project. Each LC lasted for one term and the project was initiated by an audit/needs analysis carried out by a project mentor, to define priority themes for each teacher and school participating in the project. The support delivered included:

- One-to-one mentoring with school visits to provide bespoke help at the point where the language co-ordinator/teacher/school needed it. This included lesson observations and feedback, in order to help move practice forward.
- A learning focus decided and acted upon by the teacher who kept a reflective log to record progress. Teachers benefited from the chance to reflect on their practice and share this with their mentor. There was an opportunity to report this ‘learning journey’ in an action research project with MA credits awarded by the University of Westminster.
- Peer lesson observations so teachers could observe colleagues in other schools in their own and other boroughs.
- Borough workshops held regularly to provide a “hub” for teachers to meet, led by a project mentor involving discussion around relevant themes and areas of interest to improve practice.
- The opportunity to improve language skills and gain confidence in the language through language upskilling classes at the university and in the local borough where there was a demand.

- Two summer schools of 3 days each, including a portfolio of specialist courses such as pedagogical seminars and language upskilling classes.
- Access to a languages conference every 6 months held at the University of Westminster.
- Four local workshops in each borough during the lifespan of the project.
- Access to all CPD courses for teachers run by Network for Languages London.

- *Where has the project been delivered geographically?*

The project has been delivered across 8 boroughs in London, comprising Bexley & Bromley, Brent, Havering, Lambeth, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest, Wandsworth and the Tri-Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham, and Westminster.

- *Who delivered the project?*

The project was delivered by the Network for Languages London based at the University of Westminster. The project team comprised a team of eleven highly skilled project mentors with a wealth of experience in the primary and secondary sectors.

- *Who were the target beneficiary groups of the project and why?*

The target groups of the project were languages teachers in KS 2 - 5. As the project developed, far more primary schools than secondary schools came on board; this is likely to be due to the introduction of the new KS2 Curriculum in languages.

Notes on changes

In response to demand from other boroughs, two further clusters were formed, Central North and Central South. The Central North group covered some schools in Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon, Islington and Redbridge. The Central South group covered some schools in Croydon, Kingston, Richmond and Southwark.

Although both primary and secondary schools were involved, participants in the project came overwhelmingly from primary schools. The project initially set out to facilitate networking between phases, in order to address transition from the primary into the secondary school phase but, as stated in the Interim Report (Section 2), this has not been possible owing to the small number of secondary schools involved in the project.

In May 2015 and in response to the GLA's request to offer some additional mentoring support to teachers, a new borough, Newham, came on board with 10 teachers benefiting from a local workshop, mentoring and access to the Network for Languages London conference and Summer School. In addition to this, 8 new colleagues from our LSEF schools joined a professional network group specifically set up for teachers requiring additional support in working with learners who have English as an additional language (EAL). Colleagues completed an initial needs analysis questionnaire and were able to gain the support of two EAL specialists/mentors. Support provided by the project included workshops, an EAL course and mentoring.

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

The project supports teachers in adjusting to the new Programmes of Study (PoS) for MFL for primary and secondary, and particularly teachers across KS2 who are facing compulsory MFL for the first time.

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

Resources are currently being developed, particularly videoed and written case studies, and will be available on the Network for Languages London website (www.networkforlanguageslondon.org.uk) in Autumn 2015.

One of the video case studies is about the LSEF project as a whole, demonstrating the key aspects of the project and the impact the project and its activities have had on the teachers.

Four further case studies illustrate good practice and different approaches to teaching languages in four schools (Chalkhill Primary School, St Stephen's Primary School, Shaftesbury Park Primary and Westminster Academy) to help inspire other teachers.

Many teachers participating in the LSEF project have developed an interest in CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) where aspects of other curricular subjects may be taught through the medium of an MFL. Many teachers have begun to use the CLIL methodology and have written some teaching materials. Samples of those materials will be disseminated via the Network for Languages London website as written case studies and three teachers have been filmed teaching a full CLIL lesson. Teachers participating in the project have also been invited to write blog posts, which will be posted on to the website, in which their findings and insights will be shared with others.

3. Theory of Change and Evaluation Methodology

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

3.1 Please list **all** outcomes from your evaluation framework in Table 1.

Table 1- Outcomes

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
Teacher Outcome 1: Better coordination between primary and secondary teaching in foreign languages	Increased reporting on questionnaire of coordination between primary and secondary teaching.		Due to the small number of secondary teachers participating in the project, a questionnaire was not distributed to schools on this occasion. This is an area we would like to work on going forwards.

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
<p>Teacher Outcome 2:</p> <p>More relevant teaching that addresses the needs and interests of all pupils in the focus class for each Learning Cycle.</p>	<p>Teachers report they are able to provide lessons that are more relevant to the whole class.</p>	<p>Teachers report on the self-efficacy questionnaire that they are able to provide lessons that are more relevant to the whole class and cater to the needs of all students.</p>	
<p>Teacher Outcome 3: Better quality of teaching in foreign languages and across all Key Stages.</p>	<p>Teachers report on questionnaire that they are providing better quality lessons.</p>	<p>Teachers report on the self-efficacy questionnaire that they are providing better quality lessons. An Evaluation of Teacher Development grid (ETD) completed by the teacher in discussion with their project mentor, measures their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Language Skill & Knowledge B) Language Teaching Skill & Knowledge 	
<p>Teacher Outcome 4:</p> <p>Increased knowledge of subject and teaching methodologies in foreign languages and across all Key Stages.</p>	<p>Increased teachers confidence scores on questionnaire in how much they know about subject and teaching methodologies.</p>	<p>An Evaluation of Teacher Development grid (ETD) completed by the teacher in discussion with their project mentor, measures their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Language Skill & Knowledge B) Language Teaching Skill & Knowledge 	

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
<p>Teacher Outcome 5:</p> <p>Teachers have increased confidence in teaching languages</p>	<p>Increased teacher scores on confidence about teaching languages</p>	<p>Increase in teacher confidence scores on a Teacher Questionnaire Qualitative Assessment (TSSQ) questionnaire, completed in September 2014 and July 2015.</p>	
<p>Teacher Outcome 6:</p> <p>Teachers have increased enthusiasm for teaching languages</p>	<p>Increased teacher scores on enthusiasm for teaching languages</p>	<p>Increased teacher scores on enthusiasm for teaching languages on the Teacher Questionnaire Qualitative Assessment (TSSQ) questionnaire, completed in September 2014 and July 2015.</p>	
<p>Pupil Outcome 1:</p> <p>Increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages (in the four skill areas and at primary and secondary level).</p>	<p>Increased attainment at secondary school (KS3 & 4) compared with comparison group</p> <p>Increased levels of progress compared to a comparison group</p> <p>As there is no accepted way to monitor attainment and progress in languages at primary school level, we will ask teachers to report how they feel attainment has improved.</p>	<p>An increase in primary and secondary pupils' attainment and progress shown in the four skills via the comparison of the mean baseline and final data collected using the Primary and Secondary Evaluation grids.</p>	<p>The pupil attainment data referred to under Baseline data collection are not kept nationally for MFL. The baseline data and all subsequent data collected in September 2014, January 2015, April 2015 and July 2015 were provided by teachers' assessments of their pupils using a pupil evaluation tool developed specifically for this project. This change was discussed with the GLA and noted in the Interim Report in October 2014. Furthermore and as agreed with the GLA, it was not possible to have a comparison group, due to the lack of nationally held data for MFL and lack of assessment procedures for MFL in place in schools. Teachers not</p>

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
<p>Pupil Outcome 1 Cont'd:</p> <p>Increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages (in the four skill areas and at primary and secondary level.</p>			<p>engaging in the project and using the assessment tool would have required training and support on using the assessment tool for valid comparisons to be made.</p>
<p>School System/'Culture Change' Outcome 1:</p> <p>An increase in networking opportunities allows the teachers to learn from their peers.</p>	<p>Teachers report that they learn from their peers at the conferences.</p>		
<p>School System/'Culture Change' Outcome 2:</p> <p>Subject knowledge is enhanced and teachers have more ideas for the MFL classroom in and beyond the six boroughs.</p>	<p>Teachers from outside of the six boroughs attend the conferences. Resources are being used by teachers beyond the six boroughs.</p>		

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

The change affects one of the outcomes, 'Better coordination between primary and secondary teaching'. Owing to the low uptake of secondary schools to the project, and given the short lifespan of the project delivered in 20 months, it was not possible to deliver this outcome.

As noted in Section 2 above, the project has engaged with far more boroughs than the six anticipated in the Theory of Change document.

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?

Yes. It is noted, however, that the data about pupil attainment referred to in the Evaluation Plan under Pupil Outcomes are not kept nationally for MFL. As noted in 3.1 above, the baseline data were therefore provided by teachers' assessments of their pupils using criteria and instruments agreed by the mentors in consultation with the evaluator for use across the project schools in the boroughs. This change was discussed with the GLA and noted in the Interim Report.

4. Evaluation Methodological Limitations

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

The size of the sample for pupil outcomes in secondary schools is much smaller than that for primary and does not offer a reliable basis for evaluating most of the secondary outcomes. The take-up of KS4 and KS5 in the project was negligible.

As MFL was a new compulsory subject in KS2 from September 2014, there were no prior in-school data for the subject. In MFL there are no national end of key stage data for KS3. Even if national data were available, it would be difficult to assess impact on pupil progress on a project lasting barely four terms. It is common practice to expect at least three consecutive years of external assessment results in order to arrive at a secure judgment about impact on progress.

The removal of the requirement to report by levels in attainment targets in the revised National Curriculum means that there is no common basis for schools to record pupil attainment and trace progress. Consequently, an assessment system based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages was developed by the group of mentors during the summer of 2014. This was implemented from the beginning of LC2 but, given the short duration of the project, it was not possible to run a pilot of the assessment system/tool.

Project teachers received training on the assessment system from the mentors in each borough. It is based on self-reporting and resources do not permit systematic moderation of the assessments [across boroughs]. A few teachers found it difficult to interpret/apply the criteria and to record the outcomes consistently and subsequently some returns had to be resubmitted and a few discarded.

The quantitative evidence yielded by the project is based on self-report data as opposed to production data. A self-report methodology was employed for a number of reasons: (1) to ensure that teachers knew they would not be subject to external evaluation and were therefore more likely to participate; (2) to yield a larger pupil sample size (because in avoiding the requirement for written consent from pupils' parents, a greater number of pupils participated and pupil recruitment time was diminished); and (3) because self-report data provides evidence of introspection and reflection on the part of the teachers, which was encouraged by the study design and the mentors' intervention.

A similar self-reporting system was developed for the teacher outcomes; contacts with mentors helped to explain the assessment criteria and their interpretation.

The total project sample is $n=3,132$. Of this number $n=189$ are teachers and $n=2,943$ are pupils. There are $n=2,660$ primary pupils and $n=283$ secondary pupils. Response rate to the teacher evaluation measures was moderate to high: 46% of teachers responded to the

Evaluation of Teacher Development Grid; 70% responded to the Self-Efficacy measure; and 52% to the Confidence measure. Response rate to the pupil evaluation measures were also high: 91% of participating teachers provided data about their pupils.

It was not possible to identify reliable comparison groups for reasons provided in table 1, pupil outcome 1 (see Appendix 4).

Two of the strengths of the evaluation were (a) the amount of quantitative data gathered on teacher and student outcomes (see 8.1 and 8.2 below and Appendix 1) collected between September 2014 and July 2015 and (b) the availability of qualitative evidence to complement these data collected by experienced mentors collected between the start of the project (April 2014) onwards.

The mentors have been in direct contact with teachers throughout the year through observations of classes plus feedback to teachers, through discussions related to the teachers' self-reflective logs and as workshop leaders. The mentors have met regularly as a group during the school year in order to share findings and identify emerging issues. The sharing of experiences and judgments has been an important means of identifying good practice across the boroughs

Impact of activity on beneficiaries

When MFL became a compulsory subject in September 2014, most primary schools had little (if any) prior experience of MFL and very limited contact with specialists in the subject. In the absence of support from local authorities and other agencies, the only sources of advice and CPD available were via mentors and attendance at PLN workshops and other project events. The participating teachers made it very clear, particularly via evaluation returns and reflective logs, that they were indebted to the intervention via the PLN programme. It is reasonable to attribute the progress made during the life of PLN to the intervention.

Mitigating actions

There were considerable variations in the degree of headteacher support and enthusiasm for MFL. In primary the extent to which pupils were receiving their statutory entitlement to MFL in KS2 varies considerably, for example in the amount of time allocated to the subject and its distribution.

Some schools joined the project late (in LC3 or LC4 in some cases), others dropped out completely or skipped a LC. Other pressures on schools (e.g. SATS, Ofsted inspections, competing in-school CPD priorities) were significant factors leading to the loss from, or reduced participation in, the project of some schools. As a result of this shifting population, the number of schools providing data on teacher and student outcomes over more than two LC was reduced.

Some boroughs have local networks of language teachers, others do not.

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

The University of Westminster is currently exploring ways to continue with and expand the project and the mentoring support for schools beyond September 2015. Impact going forward will be evaluated by the University of Westminster based on key questions addressed.

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	£600,000	£50,000	£650,000	£599,790	£50,210
Other Public Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Private Funding	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
In-kind support (e.g. by schools)	£90,000	N/A	£90,000	£90,000	N/A
Total Project Funding	£690,000	£50,000	£740,000	£599,790	£50,210

List details in-kind support below and estimate value.

Senior Academic 1 - £12,000

Online and Technical Support - £18,000

Business Development Support - £20,000

Workshop Places - £30,000

Conference Places - £10,000

Estimated value - £90,000

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) Teacher trainers/Learning Cycles Academics/Summer School Courses Senior Academic 1 Senior Academic 2	269,600	50,000		229,816	89,784
Direct delivery costs e.g. consultants/HE (specify) General consultancy costs Technical Design and Delivery Summer School – Consultancy Costs Learning Cycles – Consultancy Costs Other Catering Costs	50,700			25, 596	25,104

¹ Please refer to the budget in your grant agreement

	Original Budget	Additional Funding	Revised Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Actual Spend	Variance Revised budget – Actual]
Management and Administration Costs Project Manager Project Administrator Online and technical support Business Development Support	171,500			276,619	-105,119
Training Costs (Indirect Costs) Facilities Costs –Summer School Catering Costs-Summer School Development of case studies and project resources	108,200			56,158	52,042
Participant Costs (e.g. Expenses for travelling to venues, etc.) Evening Language & module costs				£11,600	-11,600
Publicity and Marketing Costs	Not applicable				
Teacher Supply / Cover Costs	Not applicable				
Other Participant Costs	Not applicable				
Evaluation Costs (These have been included in the management and administration costs)	Not applicable				
Others as Required – Please detail in full	Not applicable				
Total Costs	£600,000	£50,000	£650,000	£599,790	£50,210

5.2 Please provide a commentary on Project Expenditure

The bespoke mentoring model was a key feature of our project and subsequently a large proportion of the budget was spent on this activity. The bespoke model although labour intensive as it requires one-to-one contact to be effective has enabled CPD and support to be taken out to the schools, which meant no funding was required for teacher supply and cover costs. Furthermore, the project covered more boroughs and provided mentoring to more schools than initially anticipated.

At the start of the project we had designated a proportion (£36,000) to the Lead School Budgets. As reported in GLA claim form 3, the lead school budget was not designated to individual schools, as those schools originally identified to act as lead schools did not play as significant a role as originally anticipated, and due to limited involvement from secondary schools. We therefore (in consultation with the GLA) designated the lead school budgets to the development of case studies and project resources, which will be made available to the public on the Network for Languages London website via a Resources page in the Autumn 2015 term. This is important for the legacy of a project of this nature, as it enables even more schools to gain benefit from the practice and resources developed. In April 2015, we were offered a further £50,000 to work with up to 20 additional schools. We recruited one project mentor to work with 10 schools in Newham and two EAL specialists to work with project schools which had identified supporting EAL learners as an area of focus. Although the schools joined the project at a later stage, they could access mentoring support, a local workshop and the summer school.

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 [Revised Target - Actual]
No. of schools	25	N/A	87	+62
No. of teachers	150	170	171	+1
No. of pupils	4500		Actual data collected & returned on 2943 pupils although significantly more pupils have benefited from the interventions.	
Learning cycles comprising workshops, observations and reflective logs	Actual attendance of 150 teachers at training workshops: completion of 150 observation protocols; submission of 150 reflective logs		<p>Cumulative number of attendees across all four LCs: 401</p> <p>Attendance at LC 1 Workshops: 42 teachers Attendance at LC2 Workshops: 143 teachers Attendance at LC 3 Workshops: 102 teachers Attendance at LC 4 Workshops: 114 teachers</p> <p>121 observation protocols received</p> <p>217 reflective logs received across all four LCs</p>	

Table 5 – Teachers benefiting from the programme

<i>Professional Language Network</i>	No. teachers	% NQTs (in their 1 st year of teaching when they joined the network)	% Teaching 2 – 3 yrs (in their 2 nd and 3 rd years of teaching)	% Teaching 4 yrs + (teaching over 4 years when they joined the network)	% Primary (KS1 & 2)	% Secondary (KS3 - 5)	Other (TA/unqualified/EAL)
Project Total	170	7%	19%	53%	85%	15%	21%
Bexley/Bromley	8	0	0	0	7	1	0
Brent Primary	20	0	1	8	20	0	11
Brent Secondary	8	3	0	4	0	8	1
Central North	18	2	4	10	10	8	1
Central South	5	0	0	4	5	0	1
Havering	22	2	12	8	18	4	0
Kensington & Chelsea/Hammersmith and Fulham	19	2	4	8	19	0	5
Lambeth	18	0	2	9	18	0	4
Newham	11	0	1	9	11	0	1
Tower Hamlets	4	0	0	0	1	3	0
Waltham Forest	18	1	0	9	17	1	0
Wandsworth	14	1	2	6	14	0	5
Westminster	7	0	1	4	6	1	2

7.1.2 Please provide written commentary on teacher sub-groups e.g. how this compares to the wider school context or benchmark

The project was suitable for all practitioners at any stage of their careers, including NQTs, newly appointed MFL co-ordinators and also those working towards QTS. It is difficult to compare the project's profile of teacher sub-groups to those in the wider school context and beyond, as there is not a 'one model fits all' approach to teaching MFL in schools, especially in the primary phase. This very much depends on the resources available to each individual school. The teachers involved in this project have ranged from subject specialists and qualified teachers with a vast amount of teaching experience (and in cases minimal or no experience of teaching languages), to unqualified native teachers or teaching assistants, with minimal teaching experience, but with fluency in the language.

7.2 Pupil Sub-Groups

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

	No. pupils	% FSM	% FSM last 6 yrs	% EAL	% SEN
Project Total	41,868	27%	39%	54%	9.7%
School 1	439	5.3	8.2	8.5	2.5
School 2	634	7.9	13.7	3.4	3.9
School 3	236	31.5	40.3	12.6	6.4
School 4	242	5.4	8.7	16.5	3.3
School 5	311	3.9	5.8	6.4	4.8
School 6	624	12.5	17.1	68.2	3.7
School 7	537	42.6	53.6	83.8	7.6
School 8	480	32.5	46.0	41.6	5.6
School 9	650	21.2	28.2	36.8	12.2
School 10	900	18.9	26.9	82.8	4.7
School 11	468	18.1	24.8	82.2	4.7
School 12	1591	14.8	24.6	29.9	3.3
School 13	1220	32.0	50.6	76.5	5.7
School 14	1957	21.2	37.6	62.6	7.7
School 15	420	13.8	21.1	5.6	8.1
School 16	287	19.2	27.9	8.9	8.7
School 17	261	35.2	43.7	29.9	4.6
School 18	1283	9.2	19.3	6.1	4.4
School 19	188	45.7	62.6	70.9	4.8
School 20	332	44.0	62.3	59.5	9.3
School 21	330	8.8	13.9	38.7	7.6
School 22	338	31.7	43.0	55.6	9.2
School 23	216	42.1	53.2	83.1	9.3
School 24	338	31.7	48.2	51.7	9.2
School 25	262	11.1	21.1	23.7	3.1
School 26	228	51.3	62.4	46.5	9.2
School 27	236	38.6	59.7	66.9	8.1
School 28	248	42.7	59.6	66.3	21.0
School 29	708	52.3	66.1	95.6	21.8
School 30	445	40.4	52.5	77.5	14.2
School 31	47	59.6	59.6	55.6	6.4
School 32	231	28.1	42.4	69.3	6.1
School 33	233	9.7	15.9	55.4	5.6
School 34	992	54.7	73.6	87.4	40.0
School 35	496	43.9	62.2	52.1	21.6
School 36	458	38.6	51.2	53.9	12.4
School 37	337	46.8	66.9	54.9	13.4
School 38	563	34.3	43.4	42.9	13.1
School 39	242	25.2	52.5	56.6	21.5
School 40	236	43.7	58.9	48.8	15.3
School 41	203	14.8	21.7	27.4	4.9
School 42	752	51.6	78.2	61.2	10.9

	No. pupils	% FSM	% FSM last 6 yrs	% EAL	% SEN
School 43	253	32.9	44.1	63.8	22.1
School 44	1415	29.5	48.4	62.3	12.6
School 45	527	18.1	24.6	60.5	12.3
School 46	777	21.2	30.6	76.8	6.6
School 47	249	45.1	58.3	27.7	10.4
School 48	462	25.5	33.8	69.4	14.7
School 49	422	47	64	64.1	9.5
School 50	21	<i>New school opened in Sept' 2013 – not included in 2013 KS 2 Performance Tables</i>			
School 51	493	25.9	37.8	41.5	8.5
School 52	440	8.8	13.2	10.3	14.8
School 53	362	38.5	48.2	44.2	7.7
School 54	359	16.7	25.1	37.9	9.7
School 55	922	33.3	40.6	55.6	6.6
School 56	383	28.3	47.4	44.3	7
School 57	535	22.2	34.6	88.8	4.9
School 58	497	21.3	26.1	58.2	10.7
School 59	672	53.5	76.7	48.8	13.8
School 60	766	23.2	40.1	24.7	12.5
School 61	200	14.5	20.0	33.5	8.5
School 62	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
School 63	585	3.8	7.1	32.3	3.8
School 64	600	28.3	46.2	51.1	5.7
School 65	467	40.9	66.3	56.1	6.2
School 66	233	41.5	61.3	87.6	8.6
School 67	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
School 68	770	17.3	28.0	47.1	6.2
School 69	422	8.1	10.0	7.7	4.7
School 70	383	14.1	23.2	10.8	14.9
School 71	517	19.8	31.8	38.8	6.2
School 72	289	7.6	8.9	44.0	4.2
School 73	56	7.1	7.3	0.0	5.4
School 74	448	12.7	23.7	59.1	5.6
School 75	653	25.4	42.8	77.6	9.3
School 76	596	15.3	39.6	54.4	5.9
School 77	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
School 78	585	48.4	53.3	73.9	9.4
School 79	474	51.9	79.8	64.2	4.6
School 80	956	22.2	35.5	95.9	15.2
School 81	884	19.2	32.6	82.0	11.2
School 82	552	29.4	29.6	63.6	10.5
School 83	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
School 84	476	53.4	61.3	95.2	4.4
School 85	238	33.9	45.7	44.1	4.2
School 86	730	15.5	27.6	47.8	7.3

	No. Male pupils	No. Female pupils	% Achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Maths
Project Total	51%	49%	14%
School 1	236	203	95
School 2	326	308	88
School 3	119	117	76
School 4	118	124	96
School 5	141	170	88
School 6	317	307	80
School 7	274	263	76
School 8	245	235	86
School 9	328	322	76
School 10	453	447	91
School 11	233	235	88
School 12	810	781	85
School 13	668	552	59
School 14	1064	893	94
School 15	229	191	83
School 16	149	138	68
School 17	122	139	65
School 18	708	575	64
School 19	92	96	64
School 20	167	165	84
School 21	177	153	100
School 22	193	145	89
School 23	115	101	88
School 24	160	178	88
School 25	132	130	97
School 26	108	120	73
School 27	107	129	100
School 28	134	114	97
School 29	388	320	n/a
School 30	212	233	88
School 31	30	17	n/a
School 32	120	111	70
School 33	110	123	96
School 34	551	441	87
School 35	245	251	64
School 36	220	238	83
School 37	168	169	97
School 38	276	287	72
School 39	118	124	74
School 40	114	122	91
School 41	104	99	79
School 42	377	375	85
School 43	134	119	72

	No. Male pupils	No. Female pupils	% Achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Maths
School 44	700	715	80
School 45	267	260	78
School 46	399	378	78
School 47	119	130	<i>Not given</i>
School 48	227	235	75
School 40	212	210	97
School 50	15	5	<i>Not included in 2013 KS 2 Performance Tables</i>
School 51	266	227	60
School 52	221	219	71
School 53	173	189	86
School 54	172	187	78
School 55	474	448	60
School 56	200	183	95
School 57	297	238	51
School 58	279	218	79
School 59	392	280	71 (GCSE A-C)
School 60	416	350	55 (GCSE A-C)
School 61	108	92	92
School 62	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
School 63	300	285	78
School 64	330	270	65
School 65	224	243	84
School 66	118	115	82
School 67	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
School 68	410	360	75
School 69	230	192	78
School 70	209	174	59
School 71	254	263	80
School 72	140	149	86
School 73	25	31	<i>N/A</i>
School 74	211	237	89
School 75	345	308	62
School 76	---	596	69
School 77	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
School 78	289	296	69
School 79	261	213	69
School 80	495	461	69
School 81	439	445	57
School 82	268	284	64
School 83	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
School 84	208	268	66
School 85	126	112	72
School 86	378	352	59

The Key Beneficiary Data for the above Pupil Sub-groups has been taken from [DfE Schools Performance](#). This provides an overview of the profile of the 86 schools we have been working with. A coding system and pupil assessment tool developed specifically for this project enabled teachers to track the progress of the same class of pupils throughout the project. Data were collected at four points in September 2014 and January, April and July 2015 for KS 2-4. We had intended to capture additional key beneficiary data for each pupil being monitored, but felt the teachers were already being asked to provide us with a lot of data and did not consider it reasonable to burden them with further requests. LAC (looked after children) data have also not been submitted owing to the sensitive nature of this data and not all schools wishing to make these data publicly available.

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

The quantitative pupil data collected pertained to attainment and progress in the four skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) and were yielded by pupil evaluation grids completed by the participating teachers at each cycle of the project. During each cycle, teachers were encouraged by their mentors to assess the skills-based proficiency of their pupils (based on the pupils' performance in classroom tasks and activities) and to record on the pupil evaluation grids an assessment score for each pupil that corresponded to the pupils' attainment against agreed criteria (see 4.1 above).

The statistical analyses of the pupil data comprised repeated-measures tests to determine whether there was an increase in pupils' attainment from each cycle to the next, and across the project as a whole. An overview of the findings of these analyses can be found in the executive summary of Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report.

There are currently no data held nationally or at borough level for languages. Also, the removal by the DfE of the requirement for all schools to record progress in the same way (e.g. the previous national Attainment Levels) means that no two schools necessarily record in the same way or focus on the same aspects of performance.

Qualitative pupil data were available in the form of teachers' reflective logs and lesson observations by mentors. However, the prime purpose of these documents was to comment on the teachers' professional development and not on the performance of their pupils; comment on pupil attainment and progress was therefore often implicit rather than explicit.

One of the key priorities identified by teachers at the start of the project was a need for a pupil assessment tool to monitor pupil progress at Key Stages 2, 3 and 4, as there was a general lack of workable tools for this purpose. The pupil assessment tool used had a dual purpose in that it provided teachers with something they could use from September 2014 onwards and at the same time allowed for the capturing of pupil attainment data for the project. Local workshops delivered and sessions on assessment at the Summer Schools provided teachers with training on how to assess their students using the tool and how to measure progress. The assessment tool enabled a substantial amount of pupil data to be collected between September 2014 and July 2015 with teachers monitoring a class they were teaching for a full academic year.

8. Project Impact

In the Interim report, early encouraging indications of impact were identified, namely:

- the successful Summer conference and the Summer School
- the positive feedback received from the teachers who participated in these
- teachers welcoming the opportunity to be part of a network or forum
- the first audit meetings of mentors with teachers which have resulted in the identification of key training needs to be met in subsequent Learning Cycles with individual schools or teachers
- teachers are beginning to reflect upon and modify their practice, as result of the first classroom observations and feedback from mentors
- some common themes, e.g. development of schemes of work, and use of the target language, have been identified and can be pursued across the project, although the needs identified across the participating schools are extremely diverse (e.g. range of languages, variety of teachers' linguistic and pedagogical competences)."

These early indications have been confirmed during the life of the project (see 8.1 below).

In order to explore the multi-faceted provision of PLN and its outcomes, a range of variables was analysed; 12 for Teacher Outcomes and 8 for Pupil Outcomes. This quantitative evidence is complemented by qualitative evidence including: teachers' reflective logs, lesson observations, evaluation questionnaires on workshops and other events and the comments based on first-hand contacts with the schools by the team of experienced mentors, for example on good practice.

8.1 Teacher Outcomes

Date teacher intervention started: There was no common date for the start of the intervention. It varied from school to school and borough to borough, because some teachers joined the project at a later stage than others. For example, Newham teachers joined the project in LC 4 (May 2015 – July 2015), whereas some Brent teachers involved started in LC1 (May 2014 – July 2014) and benefited from the project interventions through to LC4.

The assessment instruments devised for Teacher outcomes and Pupil outcomes were developed during LC1 and first applied to the intervention in LC2 when baseline data was collected in September 2014. Most data were collected at four points throughout the project. In Table 9 the first return (Baseline Data) and 2nd return (Final Data) are provided. For the two sets of data collected in between the Baseline and Final Data for some of the teacher outcomes please refer to Appendix 1.

Table 9 – Teacher Outcomes: teachers benefiting from the project

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return (Baseline) and date of collection	2 nd Return (Final) and date of collection
Teacher Outcome 1 – Better coordination between primary and secondary teaching	Questionnaire of coordination between primary and secondary schools	Such a small number of secondary participants is not representative of the population as a whole.	Qualitative comments from initial audits conducted with participating secondary teachers (teachers are asked how many feeder schools they have and whether they get information from their primary feeder schools about pupils' prior language learning experience and attainment).	3 teachers reported they had no contact with their feeder primary schools. 2 secondary schools commented that they used the information they collected from their feeder schools to allocate the languages to be studied in year 7, or passed the information on to the subject leaders.	No questionnaire conducted and further data collected due to limited number of secondary schools participating in the project (see notes on changes in Project Description)
Teacher Outcome 2 – More relevant teaching that addresses the needs of all pupils in the focus class.	Self-efficacy questionnaire comprising of 16 items to which teachers respond on a 9 point scale (from 'nothing' to 'a great deal').	Data collected about 133 teachers altogether, including a paired sample of 61 teachers (those who completed the questionnaire at both baseline and end of learning cycle 4)	Mean score of teachers' overall sense of self-efficacy from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.	Baseline (Av. score): 5.75 (self-efficacy overall score taken in September 2014 & later by the same teachers)	6.83 taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4
Teacher Outcome 3 * – Better quality of teaching	Confidence Questionnaire (Question on ability to provide quality language lessons)	Data on confidence in ability to provide quality language lessons collected about 99 teachers in total.	Mean score of teachers' self-reported confidence of their ability to provide quality language lessons from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.	Baseline (mean score taken in September 2014): 4.77	5.64 taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return (Baseline) and date of collection	2 nd Return (Final) and date of collection
Teacher Outcome 3 * – Better quality of teaching	<p>Teachers report on the self-efficacy questionnaire on 8 items which measure efficacy of instructional strategies.</p> <p>Evaluation of Teacher Development Grid (ETD). Teachers were required to state on a 12 point scale their level of expertise from 1(basic set language) to 12 (complex and creative language) for subject knowledge and 1 (starting out) to 12 (creative, flexible and spontaneous) for pedagogical knowledge.</p>	<p>Data collected on 133 teachers on instructional strategies.</p> <p>Data on subject and pedagogical knowledge collected on 87 teachers in total.</p>	<p>Mean score of teachers' sense of self-efficacy in terms of instructional strategies from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.</p> <p>Mean score of teachers' self-reported increase in subject knowledge from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.</p>	<p>Baseline (mean score taken in September 2014): 5.78</p> <p>Baseline subject knowledge data (mean score taken in September 2014): 6.35</p> <p>Baseline pedagogical knowledge (mean score taken in September 2014): 5.03</p>	<p>6.97 mean taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4</p> <p>7.98 mean taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4 for subject knowledge</p> <p>7.51 mean taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4 for pedagogical knowledge</p>
Teacher Outcome 4 – Increased knowledge of subject and teaching methodologies in foreign languages	<p>Evaluation of Teacher Development Grid (ETD). Teachers were required to state on a 12 point scale their level of expertise from 1(basic set language) to 12 (complex and creative language) for subject knowledge and 1 (starting out) to 12 (creative, flexible and spontaneous) for pedagogical knowledge.</p>	<p>Data on subject knowledge collected on 87 teachers in total.</p>	<p>Mean score of teachers' self-reported increase in subject knowledge from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.</p>	<p>Baseline subject knowledge data(mean score taken in September 2014): 6.35</p> <p>Baseline pedagogical knowledge(mean score taken in September 2014): 5.03</p>	<p>7.98 mean taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4 for subject knowledge</p> <p>7.51 mean taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4 for pedagogical knowledge</p>

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return (Baseline) and date of collection	2 nd Return (Final) and date of collection
Teacher Outcome 4 – Pedagogical Knowledge	Evaluation of Teacher Development Grid (ETD). Teachers were required to state on a 12 point scale their level of expertise from 1 (starting out) to 12 (creative, flexible and spontaneous).	Data on pedagogical knowledge collected on 87 teachers in total.	Mean score of teachers' self-reported increase in pedagogical knowledge from baseline to Learning Cycle 4.	Baseline (mean score taken in September 2014: 4.93)	7.51 taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4.
Teacher Outcome 5 – increased confidence in teaching languages	Confidence questionnaire with teachers stating on a 7 point scale (1=no confidence, 7=fully confident) on how confident they feel about their language knowledge, ability to provide quality lessons, ability to deliver the Programme of study, the support they have received and their value of language learning for pupils of primary age.	Data on overall confidence was collected about 99 teachers in total.	Mean score of overall confidence taken at baseline and in July 2015, at the end of Learning Cycle 4.	5.23 taken when teachers joined the project.	5.82 taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4.
Teacher Outcome 6 – increased enthusiasm for teaching languages	Confidence questionnaire with teachers stating on a 7 point scale on how confident they feel about their language knowledge, ability to provide quality lessons, ability to deliver the Programme of study, the support they have received and their value of language learning for pupils of primary age.	Data on overall confidence was collected about 99 teachers in total.	Mean score of overall confidence taken at baseline and in July 2015, at the end of Learning Cycle 4.	5.23 taken when teachers joined the project.	5.82 taken in July 2015 and at the end of Learning Cycle 4.

The research method/data collection for target outcome 3* (better quality of teaching) refers to outcome 3 from the original evaluation plan submitted in March 2014 provided in the Interim report in October 2014. Feedback from Project Oracle received in January 2015 meant some amendments were made to the evaluation plan in the indicators of outcomes section. Therefore, table 9 represents this change and differs slightly to the information submitted in section 7 (Teacher Outcomes) in the Interim Report.

Table 10 – Comparison data outcomes for Teachers

Not available as previously explained – data on intervention group only.

8.1.1 Please provide information on:

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

The sample of teachers was n=189. Teachers were recruited to the study if they expressed a desire to participate and their school supported that wish. Therefore, the predominant method for recruiting teachers to the study was that of convenience sampling. There was an element of snowball sampling as the project progressed in that participating teachers introduced other teachers in their school/borough to the project and the sample. It is difficult to assess the extent to which the sample is representative of either MFL teachers in London, or on a national level. This difficulty stems from a lack of comparison data in terms of the numbers of MFL teachers nationally or locally, and a lack of data about the makeup of these populations (e.g. languages taught; age ranges; number of years of experience; proficiency in the foreign language).

The analyses of the data pertaining to Teacher Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge yielded the same overall findings: that in both kinds of knowledge the teachers who participated in the project made statistically significant, moderate-sized self-reported gains from every cycle of the study to the next. Furthermore, there was a large effect size for gains in both kinds of teacher knowledge from the start of the project to its conclusion. Thus, there is convincing evidence to support the assertion that the teachers who participated in the project felt that they made significant gains in Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge across every cycle of the project, and made large gains across the project as a whole (c.f. Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report, section 2.1).

The analyses conducted on the teacher self-efficacy data found a statistically significant increase from baseline to the end of Cycle 4 in self-reported self-efficacy overall, self-efficacy related to student engagement, and self-efficacy related to instructional strategies, with a large effect size in all cases. Therefore, there is robust evidence to suggest that the teachers who participated in the project made large self-reported gains in self-efficacy between the start and the close of the project (c.f. Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report, section 2.2).

The analyses conducted on the teacher confidence data found a statistically significant increase from baseline to the end of LC4 in teachers' self-reported confidence overall; confidence in their speaking ability in the second language; confidence in their ability to read, write and understand in the second language; confidence in their ability to provide quality language lessons; confidence in their ability to deliver the Programme of Study; confidence in the support they received to deliver language lessons; and confidence in the value they place on language learning for primary age pupils. That is to say, there was a

significant increase from baseline to LC4 in every kind of teacher self-confidence that was measured in this study. The effect sizes of the differences were moderate to large, but mostly large. The effect size of the difference on overall teacher self-confidence was large. Therefore, there is persuasive quantitative evidence to indicate that the teachers who participated in the project made large self-reported gains in confidence between the start and the close of the project (c.f. Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report, section 2.3).

The findings on teacher outcomes from the qualitative evidence drawn from reflective logs, lesson observations and mentors' reports over the lifespan of the project are broadly consistent with the findings from the quantitative evidence. Teachers' subject knowledge and their pedagogical expertise, together with their self-confidence, grew as they gained experience and engaged in dialogue with their mentors and their peers.

It was not possible to track gains systematically from cycle to cycle because teachers may not have submitted a reflective log or been observed teaching in consecutive cycles. There are few cases of teachers for whom there was a full set of returns across four cycles and they did not necessarily have the same focus for each cycle. However, within individual cycles there is evidence of teachers responding to mentor feedback and adjusting their planning and practice in the light of experience.

There is ample qualitative evidence of teachers attributing their progress to input from their mentors, workshops and events (see Appendix 3 and Appendix 5). As primary teachers of MFL in particular do not have access to other sources of subject-specific support and CPD, it is reasonable to assume that change is due to the impact of the intervention.

8.2 Pupil Outcomes

Date pupil intervention started: See note under 8 above, regarding there being no common date for when the intervention started. Pupil data were collected at four points throughout the project. In table 9 the first return (Baseline Data) and 2nd return (Final Data) are provided. For the two sets of data collected in between the Baseline and Final Data for some of the teacher outcomes please refer to Appendix 1.

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	2 nd Return and date of collection
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the reading skill at primary level	Primary Evaluation Sheet, a grid completed by the teachers to rate their pupils on a 12-point scale in each of the four skills, presented as a four level classification from level 1 – 4.	Data on primary-level reading proficiency were collected about 1245 pupils.	Mean reading scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline reading taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 1.58	Mean score reading taken in July 2015: 4.77
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the writing skill at primary level	Evaluation Sheet, a grid completed by the teachers to rate their pupils on a 12-point scale in each of the four skills, presented as a four level classification from level 1 – 4.	Data on primary-level writing proficiency were collected about 1215 pupils.	Mean writing scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline reading taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 1.94	Mean score reading taken in July 2015: 4.71

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1 st Return and date of collection	2 nd Return and date of collection
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the listening skill at primary level	Primary Evaluation Sheet, a grid completed by the teachers to rate their pupils on a 12-point scale in each of the four skills, presented as a four level classification from level 1 – 4.	Data on primary-level writing proficiency were collected about 1448 pupils.	Mean listening scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline reading taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 1.70	Mean score reading taken in July 2015: 5.20
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the speaking skill at primary level	Primary Evaluation Sheet, a grid completed by the teachers to rate their pupils on a 12-point scale in each of the four skills, presented as a four level classification from level 1 – 4.	Data on primary-level writing proficiency were collected about 1774 pupils.	Mean speaking scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline reading taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 2.45	Mean score reading taken in July 2015: 4.49
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the reading skill at secondary level	Secondary Evaluation Grid, which requires teachers to state on a 27-point scale the L2 proficiency of their secondary pupils in each of the four skill areas, presented as a nine-level classification.	Data on secondary-level reading proficiency were collected about 94 pupils.	Mean reading scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline reading taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 1.97	Mean score reading taken in July 2015: 13.44
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the writing skill at secondary level	Secondary Evaluation Grid, which requires teachers to state on a 27-point scale the L2 proficiency of their secondary pupils in each of the four skill areas, presented as a nine-level classification.	Data on secondary-level writing proficiency were collected about 118 pupils.	Mean writing scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline writing score taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 3.40	Mean score writing taken in July 2015: 13.05
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the listening skill at secondary level	Secondary Evaluation Grid, which requires teachers to state on a 27-point scale the L2 proficiency of their secondary pupils in each of the four skill areas, presented as a nine-level classification.	Data on secondary-level listening proficiency were collected about 110 pupils.	Mean listening scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline listening score taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 2.0	Mean score listening taken in July 2015: 15.05
Pupil Outcome 1 – increased pupil attainment in modern foreign languages in the speaking skill at secondary level	Secondary Evaluation Grid, which requires teachers to state on a 27-point scale the L2 proficiency of their secondary pupils in each of the four skill areas, presented as a nine-level classification.	Data on secondary-level speaking proficiency were collected about 141 pupils.	Mean speaking scores across four time points taken.	1 st data/baseline speaking score taken in September 2014 (Av. Score): 3.48	Mean score listening taken in July 2015: 15.07

Table 12 N/A Comparison data for pupils not available as previously explained – data on intervention group only

8.2.1 Information on intervention group only

The sample of pupils was $n=2,943$, of which $n=2,660$ were primary pupils and $n=283$ were secondary pupils. Pupils were recruited to the study if their corresponding MFL teacher agreed to participate. As such, pupils were not directly recruited to the study (as indeed they did not directly provide data). Therefore, the method for recruiting pupils to the study was that of convenience sampling, mirroring the sampling procedure for teachers. It is difficult to assess the extent to which the sample is representative of either MFL pupils in London, or on a national level. This difficulty stems from a lack of comparison data in terms of the numbers of pupils studying MFL nationally or locally, and a lack of data about the makeup of these populations (e.g. languages studied; age ranges; hours spent studying languages per week/term/year; attainment and progress). However, the large sample size of pupils in this project suggests that to some extent the sample was representative of the population of MFL pupils in the Greater London area. Moreover, the sample was drawn from most of the London boroughs participating in the project.

In terms of primary pupils' outcomes, the quantitative analyses reported suggest that the teachers whose primary pupils participated in the project felt that their pupils made significant gains in all four skills across every cycle of the project, except between LC2 and LC3 for Speaking, and made large gains in all four skills across the project as a whole. Thus, it may be concluded that the participating teachers experienced significant perceived increase in their pupils' second language proficiency overall across the duration of the project (c.f. Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report, section 3.1.1).

The quantitative findings also indicate that the teachers perceived a significant increase in their secondary pupils' writing proficiency from each cycle of the project to the next, and across the project as a whole, with large effect sizes. The data also point to a possible increase in secondary pupils' perceived reading, listening and speaking proficiency across the duration of the project, yet, owing to the small sample size of available comparable cases in the dataset, the findings pertaining to secondary reading, listening and speaking are limited in terms of inferential power. Thus it may be concluded that there is robust evidence of large perceived increases in secondary pupils' writing ability across the project, and tentative evidence to suggest that if a larger number of comparable secondary cases were available, similar gains on reading, listening and speaking might be observed (c.f. Appendix 1: Quantitative Data Report, section 3.1.2).

The findings on pupil outcomes from the qualitative evidence is consistent with the findings from the quantitative evidence that the teachers experienced perceived increase in their pupils' second language proficiency overall during the project. For example, there are frequent references to pupils developing greater confidence in speaking (etc). For reasons similar to those explained in 8.1.1 above, it is not possible to track systematically pupils' performance from cycle to cycle in the qualitative evidence. Comments in lesson observations and logs on pupils' performance tend to be implicit rather than explicit but within individual cycles there are examples of gains in pupils' knowledge and understanding.

8.3 Wider System Outcomes

Table 13 – Wider System Outcomes

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric	1 st Return and date of collection	2 nd Return and date of collection
An increase in networking opportunities allows the teachers to learn from their peers.	Feedback questionnaire completed by teachers at MFL Conferences.	Questionnaires completed by participating teachers at the MFL Conference.	Number of questionnaires completed at the MFL Conferences.	135 questionnaires completed by participants at the MFL conference on 27 June 2015.	One further MFL Conference will take place on 14 November 2015, to allow for dissemination of the project's findings and for peers to learn from one another. Questionnaires will be completed on this occasion.
Subject knowledge is enhanced and teachers have more ideas for the MFL classroom in and beyond the six boroughs.	Dissemination via conference workshops and the Network for Languages London website.	Number of questionnaires completed and resources downloaded from the Network for Languages London website.	Number of questionnaires completed and resources from the website downloaded.	135 questionnaires completed by participants at the MFL conference on 27 June 2015.	One further MFL Conference will take place on 14 November 2015, to allow for dissemination of the project's findings and for peers to learn from one another. Questionnaires will be completed on this occasion. Resources are currently in the proofing stage and will be uploaded on to the Network for Languages London website in Autumn 2015. The number of resources downloaded will then be monitored.

8.3.1 Please provide information on:

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

Two primary and secondary MFL Conferences (November 2014 and June 2015) were held during the project life span and attended by 167 teachers (comprising both non-LSEF participants and LSEF participants). LSEF mentors and participants were invited to lead workshops at the conferences. As the first conference was held in LC2, feedback received from mentors and teachers indicated they would feel more comfortable running workshops at the June 2015 conference, because they would have more on which to report and to share at that stage of the project.

Subsequently, 11 LSEF teachers presented workshops at the June 2015 conference and shared their findings with colleagues attending from outside the project. Their presentations were well received by their peers. One further conference will take place on 14 November 2015 at which more LSEF teachers will present their findings, including those who participated in the MA Action Research Module.

Two 3-day Summer Schools took place during the lifespan of the project. A total of 156 teachers participated across the three days at the Summer School 2014 and 236 teachers participated across the three days at the Summer School 2015.

A total of 85 teachers attended 18 Network for Languages London short courses at the University of Westminster and 11 teachers benefited from the university's Evening Language Programme, attending termly evening courses in the languages and level of their choice.

Forty-four Workshops took place locally for the Professional Language Networks across four Learning Cycles and the boroughs involved. In addition to this, 47 teachers benefited from language upskilling classes in the language in 3 of the boroughs where a need for additional language support was identified. 10 teachers and one mentor have participated in the Action Research MA Module, accredited by the University of Westminster.

There were many interactive sessions in the above events which provided ample opportunities for teachers to learn from their peers. Teachers from outside the project schools and boroughs were able to network with LSEF participants at conference workshops and other Network for Languages London events and share ideas with colleagues about resources and methodology.

The coordinators of MFL in primary schools, who have benefited from peer observation and paired observation with mentors, have developed increased expertise and confidence from which their colleagues may benefit. Some coordinators led workshops themselves at the 2015 Summer school and demonstrated through this experience that they are now more confident and better equipped to develop into trainers themselves.

The pupil assessment tool is currently being reviewed and LSEF participants are being invited to provide feedback about the efficiency of the tool. Once reviewed, the plan is to pilot the tool and to make it available for teachers beyond the project to use. The planning documentation, such as schemes of work and the pupil assessment tool (see 7.2.1), developed by the project can be used by the coordinators and their schools in taking forward their work. The written case studies are also currently being reviewed and will be made available on the Network for Languages London website in the Autumn term, for teachers within and outside the project to access.

8.4 Impact Timelines

Given that the provision of MFL in primary was uncharted territory for most of the teachers involved and some schools only began to provide MFL at the beginning of LC2 when the subject became compulsory in KS2, there was little on which to base timeline expectations.

It was anticipated that there would be identifiable impact by the end of the project on teachers and on some teachers within each LC. A gradual improvement in confidence was noted in teachers from the first LC in which they participated and they developed a widening range of methodology from the first contacts with their mentors onwards. Reported progress was understandably more rapid in areas requiring some adjustment to generic practice, e.g. pupil management in the specific context of the MFL classroom, than in areas presenting new challenges, such as the non-specialist teacher's subject knowledge and use of the target language.

The quantitative data for teacher outcomes (see 8.1.1) support the assertion that the teachers who participated in the project felt they made significant gains in Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge across every cycle of the project and made large gains across the project as a whole.

It was expected that there would be a timelag between the impact on teachers and the impact on pupils becoming identifiable as adjustments to practice had a bearing on pupil performance later in the same, or in a subsequent, LC.

The quantitative data for primary pupils outcomes (see 8.2,1) indicated that the teachers whose pupils participated in the project felt that those pupils made significant gains in all four skills across almost every cycle of the project, and made large gains in all four skills across the project as a whole.

The small number of secondary teachers involved in the project means there are insufficient data to comment reliably on the points at which impact on them and on their pupils occurred, although there were gains by the end of the project, as noted above.

Teacher self-efficacy and confidence were not evaluated in each LC but a comparison was made between baseline and the end of LC4 (see 8.1.1 above).

As expected, some wider school outcomes, such as the development of schemes of work and planning documents for MFL, were identifiable at an earlier stage than organisational changes such as timetable adjustments to meet the needs of the subject.

Continuing impact may be anticipated because planning for MFL during 2015-2016 and beyond can be based on the documentation now developed. The teachers will be able to apply their increased methodological expertise in their classes, although impact may be reduced if they move on to other schools and are replaced by colleagues who have not experienced CPD for MFL.

Where teachers are able to sustain the networks which have been established in some of the boroughs, they will be more likely to benefit from the continuing exchange of experience and good practice than if they have to rely on informal contacts.

The University of Westminster will continue to support the Professional Language Networks through continuing to run its bi-annual MFL Conferences and other networking events for MFL teachers. The University hopes to secure additional funds in the future to continue with and expand the project.

9. Reflection on overall project impact

The long-term goal (see Theory of Change (ToC) 2) of PLN is to improve pupils' attainment in all key stages (KS). Involvement in the project is linked to considerable progress towards this goal in KS2 and to some extent in KS3 (see Section 8.1 and 8.2 above on project outcomes). However, the involvement of schools in KS4 and KS5 has been negligible. [KS1 is not relevant as MFL is not a required subject in that KS.]

The Project activities (ToC 3) included in the three Working Packages (access to: four LCs at borough level; two summer schools; and academic services) have been carried out successfully. There have been two modifications: the limited involvement of secondary schools in the project meant it was not possible to identify lead schools and to base clusters

around them. On the other hand, as indicated in the Project Description, the project has included teachers in far more boroughs across London than the six originally envisaged.

As noted in 8.1 above, the measurable outcomes (ToC 4) embraced the improvement of language teachers' subject and pedagogical knowledge and the raising of their confidence in, and enthusiasm for, teaching the subject. Related pupil outcomes were higher attainment together with increased enthusiasm for MFL.

The activities (ToC 5) such as workshops, observations and reflective logs across the LC have had a positive effect on the teacher outcomes and through them on the pupil outcomes doing the life of the project. Teachers have greatly appreciated and benefited from continuing constructive feedback on their work and, as envisaged, the mentors have played a key role in increasing teachers' knowledge and turning that into behaviour change.

By the end of LC4 (ToC 7), the teachers felt more confident and empowered to take forward improvements in their teaching. A basis for continuing informal contacts between schools has been established and in some boroughs local networks are being put into place. The sharing of resources online will complement these developing contacts.

Owing to the limited number of secondary schools committed to the project, it has not been possible to bring about 'better coordination between primary and secondary teaching' (as explained in 3.2 above).

PLN has contributed to the first two overall aims of LSEF in that it has re-focused the teaching of the teachers involved and through them influenced that of their colleagues, and has created new support, networks and resources, particularly for teachers in KS2. Given that all schools are breaking new ground with MFL in KS2, there was little or no pre-existing activity to develop, although the project has been informed by the wide experience of the mentors.

The project has set in train rethinking which can lead to cultural change and raised expectations. The findings support the hypothesis of LSEF that investment in teaching will lead to improved outcomes for pupils.

The PLN project has been part of a wider meta – evaluation conducted by SQW, which has focused on the effectiveness of different approaches taken by expert education partnerships involving Higher Education Institutes in supporting schools, teachers and their pupils (Theme 2). The project has demonstrated that there is a need for university-led support and guidance for teachers. The University has cultivated teaching excellence by enabling teachers to network and learn together, at a local level through the professional networks that it has established in the participating boroughs through to a London-wide level.

Through the project, teachers have been able to access CPD courses and events, such as the project's Summer Schools, delivered by the University. Working alongside a project mentor, teachers have been able to apply what they have learnt, whether that is at CPD short courses they have attended or at local network workshops. In this process they have reflected and thought critically about their practice. Furthermore, some teachers have been able to take their reflections on their practice further by undertaking an action research module, with MA credits awarded by the University.

Resources developed through the project are being made available at dissemination conferences and on the Network for Languages London website, which are accessible to teachers from London and beyond. The project will therefore have had a wide-reaching impact on participating and non-participating teachers.

10. Value for Money

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.

10.1 Apportionment of the costs across the activity

Broad type of activity	Estimated % project activity	£ Estimated cost, including in kind
Producing/Disseminating Materials/Resources (Case Study & On-line resources)	10%	£63,625 for case studies and online resources
Teacher CPD (face to face/online etc) (Network courses, Evening Language Programme & Action Research MA Module)	5%	£27,373 for Action Research & Evening Language Programme places
Events/Networks for Teachers (Conferences & Summer Schools)	15%	£21,438 for Conferences £65,161 for Summer Schools
Teacher 1:1 support (Mentoring)	70%	£417,861 for mentoring
Events/Networks for Pupils (n/a)	0	
Others as Required – Please detail in full	0	
TOTAL	100%	£ 595,458

The project concentrated mainly on the one-to-one bespoke mentoring for the teachers, which took place across the four Learning Cycles of the project (from May 2014 – September 2015). The mentoring consisted of a team of 12 mentors visiting teachers in their schools to do a range of activities, including: observations; orchestrating peer observations and delivery of termly Learning Cycle workshops and in some cases, upskilling classes in the 8 boroughs involved. Mentors also delivered sessions at the Summer Schools in 2014 and 2015. Throughout the project, mentors offered their mentees ongoing and continual support by maintaining regular contact and dialogue with the group of teachers they were assigned to and through the use of tools developed for the project, such as the reflective logs and pupil and teacher evaluation tools.

The Conference and Summer School events, although less cost intensive than the one-to-one mentoring support, were equally an important part of the project offer, as these activities enabled knowledge to be transferred and shared and networking between teachers to take place. The conference in June 2015 demonstrates this effectively, as 11 project participants delivered their own sessions for the first time to their peers, to allow their findings to be disseminated.

In the latter phase of the project (February – September 2015), five video case studies and a number of written case studies were developed, to illustrate good practice and different approaches to teaching languages in schools, which will form part of the dissemination and knowledge transfer of the project going forwards.

Would more or less of some aspects have been better?

All elements of the project complemented each other and provided teachers with the right balance between receiving one-to-one mentoring support, tailored to their individual requirements, to having access to networking opportunities at local workshops, CPD courses Summer Schools and Conferences. Furthermore, the model employed was flexible and enabled teachers to get out of the project what they needed. For example, 10 teachers opted to take their reflections and practice development further, by participating in the Action Research MA module and 11 on the Evening Language Programme.

10.2 Commentary of value for money

The “Professional Language Networks” project was set up to allow the language teachers involved to share ideas and approaches to teaching and to increase their confidence; this in turn would help to boost their pupils’ motivation and engagement and lead to improved attainment in the subject.

The project built on an already established and successful programme of Network for Languages London events and activities for MFL teachers, with the University of Westminster acting as a key hub for MFL teachers in London. The one-to-one mentoring programme was complemented by the Network for Languages London programme, as well as the other University services on offer, such as the academic services provided by the University. As a result, there were a lot of satisfied customers who could not have accessed CPD of this kind anywhere else, in such a joined-up way. The ‘bespoke model’ was highly regarded by teachers although it needs one-to-one (labour intensive) contact to be effective. Also, the model used by the project takes the CPD out to the schools and therefore provides ‘value for money’ in a different way as it means teachers’ time is used more efficiently and the need for cover in the schools is greatly reduced. The project activities have enabled teachers to share ideas and approaches to teaching and in doing so has boosted their confidence, so it is fair to say the outcomes have been met. Furthermore, some of the teachers have developed their own training/delivery skills, having presented their findings at the MFL Conferences and through developing their own resources and ideas, which will be made publicly available via the website in Autumn 2015. This is an investment for the future which many teachers from London and beyond are set to benefit from.

10.3 Value for money calculations

There is no comparison group, as previously explained.

11. Reflection on project delivery

11.1 Key Enablers and Barriers to Achievement

Factors in project success

The Network for Languages London (NfL London) infrastructure provided a sound basis for the PLN project as it has extensive experience in organising both large events and workshops tailored to individual needs.

The University of Westminster has a language-teaching centre with a reputation established over many years and the experience to provide linguistic upskilling focused on particular needs.

In providing CPD NfL London can draw upon a pool of national and regional specialists in language education as mentors, workshop leaders and guest lecturers.

NFL London has a wide range of contacts with teachers through which it can attract participation in its courses; its central location in Regent Street offers easy access to teachers from all parts of London.

Factors in improving teachers' subject knowledge in MFL

The subject knowledge needs of MFL teachers comprise the language skills and fluency and the knowledge about language (e.g. grammar and pronunciation) required to present an authentic model of the target language and develop the confidence to teach through the medium of it. This presents a significant CPD challenge, particularly in primary where many teachers do not themselves hold more than a GCSE qualification, in some cases acquired many years ago. The challenge will not be met in a single year and will increase as teachers who move schools may be replaced by colleagues who have not had any MFL-specific CPD and expectations for the subject are raised as it becomes embedded throughout KS2.

The following features of the PLN model enable it to address the improvement of subject knowledge for MFL teachers:

- the availability of linguistic upskilling for the teachers themselves
- bespoke mentoring to address those subject knowledge needs which particularly impinge on the delivery of the subject
- *in situ* workshops on topics identified in consultation with the schools
- updating about national developments and examples of good practice in the subject via workshops, summer schools and conferences.

Barriers to achievement

Barriers to achievement include the underestimation by school managers of the scale of the challenge (e.g. the implications for timetabling, the need for ongoing upskilling and the deployment of coordinators), and the diversion of teachers' focus on MFL to other subjects in the face of various pressures (e.g. from SATs assessment and from OFSTED inspections). The challenge will not diminish in the next three years as primary schools have to sustain delivery of MFL across all years in KS2; for example, a pupil in Year 4 in 2015-2016 who experienced MFL in Year 3 will be in a quite different situation from one in Year 4 in 2014-2015 who had no prior experience of MFL. It is important that some means be found of sustaining the PLN to support teachers who will continue to face new challenges, particularly in KS2

11.2 Management and Delivery Processes

- *How effective were the management and delivery processes used?*

The University-led model of delivery allowed for networking at various levels to take place (teacher-to-teacher, school-to-school and borough-to-borough). All elements of the project supported the teachers in a complementary and cohesive way which enabled teachers' needs to be met (see below for innovative delivery mechanisms). Teachers were able to access as many of the interventions as they could, and needed (and their Senior Leaders allowed).

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

Although not strictly 'innovative', there was an unusually strong focus on bespoke mentoring. This feature was highly valued by the teachers and was a significant factor in the success of the project. The team of highly experienced mentors deployed were able to support teachers in many ways and refer teachers to the CPD courses on offer at the University of Westminster.

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

A further three mentors were recruited to the project to support the demand of running a new PLN in Newham and EAL PLN.

11.3 Future Sustainability and Forward Planning

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

Yes. We are currently exploring options on sustainability and how we can continue to offer bespoke mentoring support to schools. We are also reviewing the assessment tool (pupil evaluation tool) and will be looking at ways of piloting it and disseminating this to schools in the future.

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

Enthusiasm and commitment from teachers involved in the project – key teachers have already been identified in some of the Professional Language Networks who would like to continue to act as network coordinators, with the support of the University of Westminster. Training offered through the project has provided teachers with the opportunity to develop their leadership skills and their own training/facilitating skills. A team of highly qualified mentors is key to the success of a project of this scale. Furthermore, additional funding would enable the project's activities to be continued and extended to more schools and teachers.

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

Via conferences planned for November 2015 and June 2016 via the Network for Languages London website and via other Network for Languages London events.

12. Final Report Conclusion

Overarching Conclusions

The "Professional Language Networks" project was set up to allow language teachers involved to share ideas and approaches to teaching and to increase their confidence; this in turn would help to boost their pupils' motivation and engagement in the subject. The project has provided teachers with the opportunity to update their professional skills as well as their subject knowledge in languages, linguistics and language teaching methodology.

In achieving virtually all its anticipated outcomes (see below), the project met the aims of LSEF because it refocused the teaching of the teachers involved and through them began to influence the practice of their colleagues. These changes are leading to increased pupil engagement and improved attainment. By creating new support, networks and resources,

particularly for teachers of MFL in KS2, many of whom were new to the subject when it became a compulsory part of the primary curriculum, the project has set in train rethinking that can lead to cultural change and raised expectations.

Key findings for assessment of project impact

- *What outcomes does the evaluation suggest were achieved?*

The self-evaluation supports the view that, with one exception (see below), the project achieved its teacher and pupil outcomes.

The quantitative evidence indicates that the teachers who participated in the project made significant self-reported gains in Subject and Pedagogical Knowledge, in self-efficacy, and in confidence between the start and the close of the project. The quantitative evidence shows that the participating teachers in primary schools experienced significant perceived increase in their pupils' second language proficiency overall across the duration of the project. The qualitative evidence from reflective logs and observation forms is consistent with the above findings.

In secondary schools, the quantitative evidence indicates that there were large perceived increases in pupils' writing ability across the project, and tentative evidence to suggest that if a larger number of comparable secondary cases were available, similar gains in reading, listening and speaking might be observed. There is insufficient qualitative evidence to confirm the findings about pupils' writing and tentative evidence that they made progress in their reading, listening and speaking skills.

The school system/culture change outcomes were also achieved. The teachers had ample opportunities to learn from their peers as well as their mentors. They confirmed that they benefited from these opportunities and rated the PLN activities very highly. Resources and good practice were shared by teachers beyond the anticipated six boroughs in a further 12 boroughs, and teachers from other areas across and beyond London participated in the conferences.

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

Owing to the limited number of secondary schools joining the project, it was not possible to achieve the outcome to bring about 'better coordination between primary and secondary teaching'.

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

The involvement of schools in KS4 and KS5 has been negligible and it is therefore not possible to measure the impact on pupils' attainment in these Key Stages.

Key lessons learnt for assessment of project delivery

- *What activities/approaches worked well?*

The bespoke mentoring model was the cornerstone of the project as it provided one-to-one dialogue to complement the local workshops. The summer schools and conferences brought

together teachers from across London to share ideas from across London and to learn of national developments in the subject.

The reflective log proved to be an effective instrument for stimulating focused rethinking and adjustments to practice and helped teachers to maximize the benefit of one-to-one mentoring.

The pupil assessment tool developed for the project should be of continuing value, particularly for KS2 teachers with no previous experience of assessing MFL.

- *What activities/approaches worked less well?*

Some teachers were reluctant to be observed from the outset and their apprehension had to be overcome before they could benefit fully from mentor contact. A few teachers were reluctant to persevere with and submit reflective logs and therefore derived more limited benefit from the process than their colleagues. However, reluctance was largely overcome by the end of LC4.

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

There was hardly any participation in the project of teachers of MFL in KS4 and KS5, partly because in many schools there are very few MFL classes in these key stages², and partly because of the pressure of teaching examination classes which made teachers more reluctant to become engaged.

Continuity of commitment to the project was disrupted because of the pressures on primary and secondary schools generally from factors including SATs assessment, Ofsted inspections and competing whole-school and core subject CPD priorities.

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

The project engaged far more boroughs, schools, and teachers than envisaged when the project was submitted.

Informing future delivery

- *What should the project have done more of?*

If resources had permitted, the project could have been taken to even more boroughs. The teachers participating aspired to have access to more of the kinds of activities and support they were experiencing.

- *What should the project have done less of?*

Neither the teachers themselves nor their mentors identified any areas in which the project should have been less active.

² The study of MFL is not a National Curriculum requirement in KS4 and consequently in most schools it is not a compulsory subject. The take-up of MFL in KS5 in those schools which have sixth forms is very low nationally.

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

There is no comparable provision available for teachers outside London. Any institution seeking to meet the need for CPD for MFL elsewhere should appreciate the importance of having a strong infrastructure in place and look closely at the key features of this tested model, such as the focus on bespoke mentoring.