London Schools Excellence Fund

Self-Evaluation Toolkit

Final report

Contact Details

educationprogramme@london.gov.uk

Evaluation Final Report Template

Introduction

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

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

Project Oracle: Level 2
Report Submission Deadline: ~~English for Integration - 9 June 2015~~ / Round 1 and Round 2 - 30 September 2015 *(delete as appropriate)*
Report Submission: ~~Final Report to the GLA /~~ Rocket Science *(delete as appropriate)*

Project Name: SHAKESPEARE AND BEYOND
Lead Delivery Organisation: PRESENT MOMENT PRODUCTIONS
London Schools Excellence Fund Reference: LSEF062
Author of the Self-Evaluation: PM TRANSITION TEAM: CAROLE PLUCKROSE, JULES TIPTON, RACHEL FRANCIS
Total LSEF grant funding for project: £45,175
Total Lifetime cost of the project (inc. match funding): PROJECTED £48,177, ACTUAL: 36271.81
Actual Project Start Date: SEPTEMBER 2013
Actual Project End Date: JULY 2015

1. Executive Summary

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

Note of Special circumstances

> **Comment [AS1]:** See notes with final report review

The LSEF Shakespeare and Beyond evaluation report is written by the Present Moment Transition team, who picked up the project following the unexpected death of Present Moment's Artistic Director, Joss Bennathan, in November 2014. This Project was conceived, designed and largely delivered by him with some support from a small team of other theatre practitioners. The transition team has worked to excavate the detail of the project and Jules Tipton, Associate Director picked up the practical delivery of the final part of the project which was curtailed in size and scope to reflect these extenuating circumstances. The variation and adjustments to the project were agreed with Anna Spinks from Rocket Science and the budget adjustment and interim report was accepted by them. It is acknowledged that there are some gaps in the evaluation due to lack of evidence or missing information, however the Transition team has done its work with the utmost diligence to gather and evaluate what has been available and to return to schools to elicit further data where possible.

~~Executuve~~Executive Summary

This report for Shakespeare and Beyond reviews the original hypothesis, outcomes and objectives of this project ie; to introduce a practical approach to the teaching and learning of Shakespeare aimed at increasing confidence in English teachers as identified by them as a key learning need. The evaluation addresses the use of the practical processes of the professional theatre 'Rehearsal Room technique' as the core strategy to breakdown negative perception and barriers to learning Shakespeare amongst students corroborated by the start of project student surveys. The project was designed to cascade to other teachers within each school and to share good practice through teacher pairing across participating schools and to the production of schemes of work by teachers as a key sustainable legacy.

The project was rolled out to Present Moment's existing network of schools in East London and over two years was delivered to 8 schools in four London boroughs: Barking and Dagenham, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Haringey. The project was strengthened by the Present Moment Theatre Lab programme which brought student-performed Shakespeare plays into participating schools, who were also signed up to Shakespeare and Beyond.

The Theory of Change model was used as a reference throughout the project to evaluate progress and delivery remained in line with this. The Transition Team identified strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation methodology including the lack of setting up of control groups in schools and makes recommendations for this to be included in future practical theatre based projects.

Whilst the statistical improvement data is clearly the primary measure of success for the project, the Transition Team found that the constraints of evaluating a theatre-based practical programme within a school-focused reporting system to be the most difficult aspect. The company found that whilst overall schools participated enthusiastically with the project and the anecdotal and qualitative feedback was forthcoming, some were less helpful in providing the benchmarking data needed. The Transition Team believes this to be more of a challenge for a non-statutory organisation such as a theatre company.

> **Comment [AS2]:** Interesting. Look out for in other reports. Lessons learned log?

Of the revised target output of 8 secondary schools there were 7 actuals, with 13 participating teachers over 2 years and delivery to 390 students. The evaluation of journey travelled and pupil grade increases by school is outlined in the tables included along with qualitative narratives. These demonstrate an overall increase in attainment. Whilst this cannot be attributed categorically to the benefits of the Shakespeare and Beyond project it is reasonable to assume a significant contribution to overall attainment in English for the participating cohorts.

2. Project Description

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

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

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

The focus and emphasis of this project was to address the fear and attitudinal prejudices towards the teaching and learning of Shakespeare and to encourage the sharing of best practice between schools leading to better teaching. The perception that Shakespeare is difficult and inaccessible affects both teachers and students. Present' Moment's project responded to English teachers' requests for help with overcoming their own prejudices, increasing their confidence, and thus engaging their students more successfully and improving their attainment.

The project was introduced into an already existing network of schools in East London with which Present Moment had worked historically. This network was expanded through this project to include a further four schools increasing access to practical ways of engaging students with Shakespeare through modelling and application.

The approach taken by "Shakespeare & Beyond" enabled participating teachers and schools to learn the skills, strategies and techniques with which theatre professionals approach a text in the rehearsal room, and in performance, exploring how these can support students' engagement and learning and ensure a cascade of new practical theatre skills, knowledge and tools for teaching.

Teachers were provided with new and dynamic ways to teach Shakespeare. Practical professional theatre practice was modeled as a means of engaging students with the language, structures, themes, characters, setting and action of Shakespeare's plays. This was followed by targeted opportunities to apply the Rehearsal room technique in class. Through these new resources and methods lessons became more engaging and effective for students. By enabling students to make personal connections with the "world of the play" it became possible to replace fear with understanding of Shakespeare's relevance to contemporary life and students' personal experiences. Improving ability to understand leads

4

to a more confident and enjoyable relationship with the plays of Shakespeare.

"Shakespeare & Beyond" extended and up-scaled the Present Moment Theatre Lab provision: a production of A Midsummer Night's Dream, performed by KS4 students to audiences of 200 KS3 students in each participating schools; resource materials and a DVD of the production; workshops led by students and Present Moment's model teaching / workshop sessions.

Project activities delivered:
(Italics below are activities delivered immediately before this project and are included to indicate how "Shakespeare & Beyond" up-scaled and enhanced the 'Present Moment Theatre Lab' project.)

- *Schools signed up to participate in Present Moment Theatre Lab and identified teachers to participate in Shakespeare and Beyond.*
- Present Moment provided 2 days in-school support to each school: this included model teaching, lesson observation, support and advice developing the new schemes of work based around strategies and techniques with which theatre professionals approach a text in the rehearsal room.
- Schools were put into pairs and then the teachers selected a pre-2^{0th} century play for which s/he would like to develop or introduce a scheme of work. This pairing of practitioners introduced peer mentoring opportunities across different London boroughs and ensured that teachers were not preparing in isolation. Paired working gave hands-on skill sharing opportunities and teachers benefitted from working with people who had a range of teaching experience in terms of length and subject. Whilst the specific focus of this project was on the teaching and learning of Shakespeare its approach and methodology is equally applicable to other texts.
- The project delivered a whole day workshop for all 8 teachers from participating schools. This workshop gave opportunities for exploring practical approaches to deciphering & de-constructing the text; practical exercises exploring the world of the play - encouraging the making of connections & contemporary parallels to themes & situations within the play; practical interpretation of the text (*why & how* a character speaks/*why & how* a character enters).
- The project delivered a second whole day workshop for all teachers to trial their new schemes of work focusing on practical ways to approach their chosen text. This workshop took place in March 2014.
- *6 additional schools were identified to participate in Present Moment Theatre Lab 2014 and in Year 2 of Shakespeare & Beyond*
- New schemes of work piloted in schools
- Half day sharing of schemes of work and evaluation
- Schemes of work/ techniques cascaded within participating schools
- Present Moment provide 2 days in-school support to each school
- A whole day workshop for all 12 teachers from participating schools
- Year 2 Schools paired –with each other and with Year 1 school
- Paired schools decide a different pre-20th century play for which s/he would like to develop or introduce a scheme of work.
- All 12 teachers attend a whole day workshop, to trial their new scheme of work so far, focusing on practical ways of approaching their chosen play text.
- New schemes of work piloted in schools
- Schemes of work/ techniques cascaded within participating Y2 schools
- Half day sharing of schemes of work and evaluation
- All schemes of work published & distributed
- Final evaluation published

The project was delivered in four London boroughs: Barking and Dagenham, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Haringey. A school in a fifth borough was recruited (Waltham Forest) but ultimately failed to engage due to departmental staff changes.

The project was led, in the first year and at the start of the second year, by Joss Bennathan Artistic Director of Present Moment Theatre Company.
Following his sudden death in November 2014, the delivery of the project was led by Associate Director Jules Tipton.
Project changes were agreed by Anna Spinks & LSEF after a meeting on January 6th 2015
Throughout the project delivery was also supported by Present Moment's pool of theatre professionals.

The target beneficiaries of the project were English teachers and KS3 English students

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

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

The project addressed the new requirement for the teaching of English at KS3 to include the teaching of two full plays by Shakespeare. Additionally it addressed the development of pupils' ability to read critically, developing understanding of setting. plot and characterisation within the context of the plays thus exploring ways of raising levels of achievement on English according to the National Curriculum KS3/4 current guidelines.

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 PRODUCED:
KS3 Schemes of Work/Learning

"Introductory Unit to Shakespeare" - piloted at Warren Comprehensive School & Hornsey School for Girls
"ROMEO & JULIET" – 2 versions (12 lessons – Yr.7/8, 15 lessons – Yr. 8) – piloted at Kingsford Comprehensive School
"THE TEMPEST" (for Yr. 7) – piloted at George Green's Comprehensive School
"KING LEAR" (for Yr.8) – piloted at Warren Comprehensive School
"A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM" – piloted at Eastbury Comprehensive School & Royal Docks Comprehensive School
"MACBETH" – piloted at Eastbury Comprehensive School
"MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING" – piloted at Jo Richardson Community School

3. Theory of Change and Evaluation Methodology

LSEF R2 Evaluation Framework.doc   VALIDATED - THEORY OF CHANGE.doc

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

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

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

Table 1- Outcomes

> **Comment [AS3]:** These differ from the evaluation framework, but are in principle similar?

Description	Original Target Outcomes	Revised Target Outcomes	Reason for change
Teacher Outcome 1	Increased confidence and expertise in the teaching of Shakespeare		
Teacher Outcome 2	Access to and creation of a range of effective and differentiated new curriculum materials and approaches, applying a variety of new strategies in the classroom.		
Teacher Outcome 3	An increase in self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity		
Teacher Outcome 4	Benefits of support, mentoring and modelling		
Pupil outcome 1	Improved attainment and progress		
Pupil outcome 2	Greater social, cultural and historical understanding of the English literary heritage		
Pupil outcome 3	Enhanced ability to evaluate live performance and analyse the ways that great dramatists make their works effective on stage		
Pupil outcome 4	Improved creativity and critical understanding		
Pupil outcome 5	Improved speaking and listening skills,		

	and enhanced ability using persuasive techniques and rhetorical devices.		
Wider system outcome 1	An increase in self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity		
Wider system outcome 2	Development of a knowledge-led teaching and curriculum cascaded by participating teachers to colleagues.		
Wider system outcome 3	Cultural change and raised expectations within the participating schools offer a model for the wider school system		

3.2 Did you make any changes to your project's activities after your Theory of Change was validated? Yes/~~No~~

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

No alterations were made to the validated Theory of change, however – due to the death of the Artistic Director - certain activities were not delivered. Revisions were submitted to and agreed by LSEF. These changes included: Year 2 participating teachers did not visit year 1 schools, monitoring visits to schools were reduced. The overall delivery, however, remained congruent with our validated Theory of Change.

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

If **Yes**, please explain what changes you made, why, and provide some commentary on how they affected delivery.

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

Changes were made to the evaluation tools used in year 2 of the project in order to tighten the quantitative data provided for journey travelled. We introduced pre and post 'self-efficacy' surveys to be completed by teachers – this gave us a clear statistical measure of journey travelled through project. We also formalised the 'Pupil's Attitude to Shakespeare' survey and grouped responses in order to provide a statistical analysis.

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

4. Evaluation Methodological Limitations

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

~~This can include data limitations or difficulty in identifying a comparison group. In order to get a realistic idea of the strength of your evaluation, and identify possible improvements, it is essential that you reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of your evaluation.~~
~~You should address limitations of the evaluation only, not the project itself~~ *~~- Every evaluation has limitations, so please be honest. This could include limitations relating to:~~*

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

In reviewing the efficacy of the evaluation process we ~~belive~~believe that an improved systematic, quantitative process would have provided a fuller analysis. As this project was conceived and led by theatre practitioners the tendency is towards a more anecdotal, qualitative approach to evaluation and Present Moment would have benefitted from using an independent evaluator from the outset.

We were also reliant on schools providing data after their involvement in the project was finished and this proved to be impossible to collect.

It is important to bear in mind that the evaluative processes were set in place by Joss Bennathan and that, following his death, documentary evidence of year 1 evaluation was incomplete. The gap between the death of the director and the decision by the other Present Moment directors to continue with the project inevitably contributed to a loss of momentum. Additionally Joss had longstanding professional relationships with many of the participating schools which could not be replicated by the other directors which led to difficulties in extracting ongoing data.

4.2 Are you planning to continue with the project, once this round of funding finishes? ~~Yes~~/**No**

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

5. Project Costs and Funding

5.1 Please fill in Table 2 and Table 3 below:

Table 2 - Project Income

	Original[1] Budget	Additional Funding	Revised Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Actual Spend	Variance [Revised budget – Actual]
Total LSEF Funding	£45,175				
Other Public Funding					
Other Private Funding		£3000			
In-kind support (e.g. by schools)					
Total Project Funding			£48,175	£36271.81	11903.19

List details in-kind support below and estimate value.

Table 3 - Project Expenditure

	Original	Additional	Revised	Actual	Variance

Formatted: Highlight

---

[1] Please refer to the budget in your grant agreement

	Budget	Funding	Budget [Original + any Additional Funding]	Spend	Revised budget – Actual]	
Direct Staff Costs (salaries/on costs)						Formatted: Highlight
Direct delivery costs e.g. consultants/HE (specify)						Formatted: Highlight
Management and Administration Costs	3240			3811.34	-571.34	Formatted: Highlight
Training Costs	15385	3000	18385	10760.47	7624.53	Formatted: Highlight
Participant Costs (e.g. Expenses for travelling to venues, etc.)						Formatted: Highlight
Publicity and Marketing Costs	9300			9300	0	Formatted: Highlight
Teacher Supply / Cover Costs	15750			10300	5450	Formatted: Highlight
Other Participant Costs						Formatted: Highlight
Evaluation Costs	1500			2100	-600	Formatted: Highlight
Others as Required – Please detail in full						Formatted: Highlight
Total Costs	45175	3000	48175	36271.81	11903.19	Comment [AS4]: These figures differ from the final submitted claim – which totals £37,271.81

Formatted: Highlight

From final budget claiming tool:

	Original Budget	New Budget	Claimed / actual
Direct Staff Costs (salaries/on costs)	20500	15750	10300
Direct delivery costs e.g. consultants/HE (specify)			
Management and Administration Costs	1850	3240	3811.34
Training Costs	12025	15384.62	11760.47
Participant Costs (e.g. Expenses for travelling to venues, etc.)			
Publicity and Marketing Costs	9300	9300	9300
Teacher Supply / Cover Costs			
Other Participant Costs			
Evaluation Costs	1500	1500	2100
Others as Required – Please detail in full			
Total Costs	45675.00	43675	35171.81

5.2 Please provide a commentary on Project Expenditure

This section should include:
- *commentary on the spend profile*
- *budget changes that have occurred, including the rationale for any changes*
(Maximum 300 words)

The project budget was revised by the Transition Team and agreed with Rocket Science in January 2015 to realistically reflect the contingency plan needed to ensure a reasonable level of continuity given the special circumstances facing the project. There was a gap in the programme delivery between October- 2014 and January 2015 whilst the Transition Team reviewed the status of the project and ensured that it could take the project to final fruition with minimal loss of impact. The reduction in actual spend against budget simply reflects the scaled back project resulting in less payments for teacher cover and professional training fees.

6. Project Outputs

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

Table 4 – Outputs

Description	Original Target Outputs	Revised Target Outputs [Original + any Additional Funding/GLA agreed reduction]	Actual Outputs	Variance [Revised Target - Actual]
No. of schools	**10** *(4 in Y1, 6 in Y2)*	**8** *(4 in Y1, 4 in Y2)*	**7** *(4 in Y1, 3 in Y2)*	**1** *(1 school failed to send teachers to workshops & so withdrew)*
No. of teachers	**20** *(8 in Y1, 12 in Y2)*	**16** *(8 in Y1, 8 in Y2)*	**13** *(8 in Y1, 5 in Y2)*	**3** *(2 teachers withdrew through non-attendance; 1 teacher withdrew for personal reasons)*
No. of pupils	**600** *(240 in Y1, 360 in Y2 directly benefitting)*	**480** *(240 in Y1, 240 in Y2 directly benefitting)*	**390** *(240 in Y1, 150 in Y2 directly benefitting)*	**90** *(90 pupils less in Y2 due to withdrawal of 3 participating teachers)*

Comment [AS5]: Final claim says three (year 2 only rather than cumulative I suspect

Comment [AS6]: As above, final claim says 3

Comment [AS7]: Claim tool says '480 by end of project)

Numbers of pupils directly benefitting in this table is based upon the understanding that there are (on average) 30 pupils per class, as opposed to the actual figure on the school roll for that school.

It can be argued that, since the schemes of learning originated by Yr 1 participating teachers were taught again in Yr1 schools, during the projects Y2 lifetime, additional pupils in those schools also directly benefitted.
Actual figures for additional pupils benefitting in Y1 schools during Y2 were not available.

It was intended that Y1 schools & teachers would be involved directly in paired working with Y2 teachers. This did not happen due to PM "extenuating circumstances" & a Yr1 school withdrawal from project due to changes in departmental staffing (original teachers leaving the school)

7. Key Beneficiary Data

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

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

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

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

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

Table 5 – Teachers benefitting from the programme

	No. teachers	% NQTs *(in their 1st year of teaching when they became involved)*	% Teaching 2 – 3 yrs *(in their 2nd and 3rd years of teaching when they became involved)*	% Teaching 4 yrs + *(teaching over 4 years when they became involved)*	% Primary (KS1 & 2)	% Secondary (KS3 - 5)
Project Total						
School 1 *Eastbury*	2		50	50	0	100
School 2 *JRCS*	2	50	50		0	100
School 3 *Royal Docks*	2			100	0	100
School 4 *Kingsford*	2		50	50	0	100
School 5 *Warren*	2	50		50	0	100
School 6 *George Green*	1		100			100
School 7 *Hornsey*	2		50	50		100

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

The teacher subgroups relate entirely to the English department. Teachers were selected by the participating schools, with a view to mixing levels of experience. The schools were paired by Joss Bennathan but we have no information around criteria.

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

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

Numbers of pupils directly benefitting in this table is based upon the actual reported data supplied to Present Moment by the schools, some of which was incomplete. Despite repeated requests no further information was supplied before the reporting deadline.
2 classes from each participating school, averaging 30 pupils per class, directly benefitted.
The data was requested once the participating teachers, & the cohort of pupils, had been identified: Year 1 of the project – October 2013; Year 2 of the project – October 2014

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

	No. pupils	LAC	% FSM	% FSM last 6 yrs	% EAL	% SEN
Project Total						
School 1 *Eastbury*	No data supplied					
School 2 *JRCS*	28	0	11	No data supplied	No data supplied	0
School 3 *Royal Docks*	30	0	53	No data supplied	No data supplied	40
School 4 *Kingsford*	12	0	58	No data supplied	58	17
School 5 *Warren*	56	0	34	No data supplied	46	14
School 6 *George Green*	42	0	57	No data supplied	2	36
School 7 *Hornsey*	52	0	19	No data supplied	29	12

	No. Male pupils	No. Female pupils	% Lower attaining	% Middle attaining	% Higher attaining
Project Total					
School 1 *Eastbury*	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 2 *JRCS*	4	24	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 3 *Royal Docks*	18	12	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 4 *Kingsford*	7	5	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 5 *Warren*	19	37	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 6 *George Green*	26	15	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 7 *Hornsey*	0	52	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied

	% Asian Indian	% Asian Pakistani	% Asian Bangladeshi	% Asian Any Other background	% Black Caribbean	% Black African	% Black Any Other Background	% Mixed White & Black Caribbean	% Mixed White & Black African	% Mixed White & Asian	% Mixed Any Other Background	% Chinese	% Any other ethnic group
Project Total													
School 1 Eastbury	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied	No data supplied
School 2 JRCS	4	0	0	3.57	3.57	32.14	0	3.57	3.57	0	0	0	0
School 3 Royal Docks	3	10	10	0	0	6.67	10	3.33	3.33	0	0	0	3.3
School 4 Kingsford	8	8	0	0	8.33	8.33	8	8.33	0	0	8	0	0
School 5 *Warren*	7	5.36	7.14	3.57	1.79	14.29	3.57	3.57	0	2	0	0	0
School 6 *George Green*	0	2.38	45.24	4.76	2.38	14.29	2.38	0	2.38	0	4.76	0	2.38
School 7 *Hornsey*	0	1.92	11.54	9.62	3.85	9.62	7.69	3.85	3.85	0	7.69	0	7.69

	% White British	% White Irish	% White Traveller of Irish heritage	% White Gypsy/Roma	% White Any Other Background
Project Total					
School 1 Eastbury	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
School 2 JRCS	39.29	0	0	0	10.71
School 3 Royal Docks	20	0	0	0	30
School 4 Kingsford	25	0	0	0	17
School 5 *Warren*	35.71	0	0	0	16.07
School 6 *George Green*	16.67	0	0	0	2..38
School 7 *Hornsey*	16.5	0	0	0	16.5

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

The pupil data was supplied by the schools and was specific to the new schemes of work developed as part of *Shakespeare & Beyond* within the English departments within those schools. The data was minimal not allowing us to draw a comprehensive analysis. Present Moment's transition team does not have the empirical knowledge to draw meaningful comparisons or conclusions with the wider national or borough context.

Useful links: London Data Store, DfE Schools Performance, DfE statistical releases

8. Project Impact

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

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

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

8.1 Teacher Outcomes

Date teacher intervention started: Year 1: November 2013; Year 2: October 2014

Table 9 – Teacher Outcomes: teachers benefitting from the project

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

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1st Return and date of collection	2nd Return and date of collection
e.g. Increased Teacher confidence	e.g. E-survey	e.g. 100 respondents from a total of 200 invites. The profile of respondents was broadly representative of the population as a	e.g. Mean score based on a 1-5 scale (1 – very confident, 2 – quite confident, 3 neither confident nor unconfident, 4 - quite unconfident, 5 – very unconfident)	e.g. Mean score- 3.7, collected September 2015	e.g. Mean score- 4.5, collected June 2015

		~~whole.~~			
Increased confidence and expertise in the teaching of Shakespeare	Self-efficacy surveys. Plenary session.	5 of the participating teachers fully completed the surveys. 3 of the participating teachers completed one part of the surveys (see note below).	The scores were based on a 1-9 scale (1/2=Nothing; 3/4=Very little; 5/6=Some influence; 7/8=Quite a bit; 9=A great deal).	Yr 1 participants: Nov 2013

Yr2 participants: Oct 2014 | Post-project surveys were completed at the end of the summer terms (July 2014/2015) |
| Access to, and creation of, a range of effective and differentiated new curriculum materials and approaches, applying a variety of new strategies in the classroom. | Number of new, shared schemes of work available. Plenary session | 4 of the participating teachers attended a plenary session to share experiences and to give us feedback and evaluation data. | Qualitative responses to a number of outcome-related questions. | N/A | Final plenary held on Wednesday 8th July 2015

9 new schemes of work created. |
An increase in self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity	Number of new, shared schemes of work available. Plenary session	4 of the participating teachers attended a plenary session to share experiences and to give us feedback and evaluation data.	Qualitative responses to a number of outcome-related questions.	Final plenary held on Wednesday 8th July 2015	
Benefits of support, mentoring and modelling	Plenary session	4 of the participating teachers attended a plenary session to share experiences and to give us feedback and evaluation data.	Qualitative responses to a number of outcome-related questions.	Final plenary held on Wednesday 8th July 2015	

Comment [AS8]: Returns are below

NB - There was no self-efficacy survey in this format for Year 1 participants. It was introduced for Year 2 participants, by the late Joss Bennathan, at the suggestion of Project Oracle. We repeatedly requested yr 1 teachers to complete a retrospective 'before' survey but with little or no response.

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

~~Target Outcome~~	~~Research method/ data collection~~	~~Sample characteristics~~	~~Metric used~~	~~1st Return and date of collection~~	~~2nd Return and date of collection~~
~~e.g. Increased Teacher confidence~~	~~e.g. E-survey~~	~~e.g. 100 respondents from a total of 200 invites.~~

~~The profile of respondents was broadly representative~~ | ~~e.g. Mean score based on a 1-5 scale (1 – very confident, 2 – quite confident, 3 – neither confident nor unconfident, 4 - quite unconfident, 5 – very~~ | ~~e.g. Mean score~~ | ~~e.g. Mean score~~ |

		of the population as a whole.	*unconfident)*		

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

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

(Minimum 500 words)

Participating teachers were surveyed to capture their levels of self-efficacy before and after the project and 8 teachers responded either partially or fully. The surveys were analysed to establish baseline scores, follow-up scores, and distance travelled for all respondents.

Participants' scores were then averaged across all questions relating to the same outcome at the baseline and at the follow-up point. The distance travelled was calculated by subtracting the average score at the follow-up point from the average score at baseline. Paired two-tailed t-tests were performed to determine the statistical significance of the change between baseline and follow-up and between findings for different subgroups (the calculated p-value gives the likelihood that the difference observed was due to chance – the standard cut-offs are at 5%, 1% and 0.1%). The effect size (Cohen's d) was also calculated to measure the magnitude of the change where an effect size of 0.2 to 0.5 means a small effect, an effect size of 0.5 to 0.8 means a medium effect and an effect size of greater than 0.8 means a large effect.

The overall conclusion was that the outcomes generated by the project Shakespeare and Beyond were positive and ongoing.

Target: Increased confidence and expertise in the teaching of Shakespeare:

Overall, teachers' self-efficacy levels increased over the course of the project. On average there was a 12% increase in teachers' self-efficacy levels between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.001 level (there is less than 0.1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a large effect (effect size = 0.90).

Impacts on individual teachers

The teachers surveyed below completed both the 'before' and 'after' parts of the self-efficacy survey. This survey was designed to assess whether the project improved levels of confidence, effectiveness and responsiveness when teaching Shakespeare and other texts.

Warren School – EB
On average, there was an 8% increase in self-efficacy level of EB between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (there is less than 5% possibility i.e. unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance).

Warren School – LG
On average, there was a 15% increase in self-efficacy level of LG between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 5% level (there is less than 5% possibility i.e. unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance).

George Greens School – RM
On average, there was a 22% decrease in self-efficacy level of RM between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance).

HSG – KS
On average, there was a 36% increase in self-efficacy level of KS between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance).

Kingsford School – CH
On average, there was a 33% increase in self-efficacy level of CH between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance).

Two of the Yr 1 teachers completed a post-project self-efficacy survey and reported their self-efficacy at levels between 7 (quite a bit/quite good) and 9 (a great deal), consistently higher than any of the baseline data we gathered.

Target: Access to, and creation of, a range of effective and differentiated new curriculum materials and approaches, applying a variety of new strategies in the classroom:
Following the project, nine new schemes of work have been created and shared (a) among the participants and (b) with peers within the participants' schools and (c) with new colleagues of participating teachers who have moved onto other schools.   At the final plenary session it was reported that:

…lessons are shared and used by all KS3 teachers in the department: even those who are nervous have used small strategies built into their lesson as a whole. (HH – Kingsford)

George Green School is teaching 'The Tempest' scheme of learning as developed as part of "Shakespeare & Beyond" throughout year 7. (RM – George Green)

…I will be used in teaching & learning meetings to improve departmental practice. Schemes of work will be shared and used across the department. (AA – Eastbury)

Additionally these schemes of work will be uploaded to the LondonEd website for wider sharing.

Target: An increase in self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity:
A Google Group has been created for participating teachers to continue with sharing experience and learning. This continues the network approach initiated by the pairing of schools throughout the project.
In the 2015/16 academic year both teachers from Warren Comprehensive School will have taken positions in different schools (in Burnham on Crouch, Essex; and Hackney). They are continuing to actively use & promote the active/rehearsal room approach they explored whilst participating in "Shakespeare & Beyond" within their new departments, and colleagues. They will continue to promote, use & share the schemes of work developed as part of the programme.

This ensures that an expanding network of teachers and a growing cohort of young people are benefitting.

It is hoped that this will lead to ongoing achievement, attainment, and raising of aspirations within the young people taught in this way. It will also encourage engagement, and promote wider cultural change

Target: Benefits of support, mentoring and modelling

Present Moment delivered this project over two years with support, mentoring and modelling built into the delivery right from the start. Classroom observation and support was a key tool in the delivery. The mechanism of pairing teachers from different schools also embedded a mutually supportive approach which enhanced practice within the schools:

It has helped develop my confidence in leading other staff and helping them develop confidence. (EB – Warren School)

The teachers articulated the legacy of the project as:

Collaboration & teamwork within the classroom; learning to work together; resilience with text. (AA – Eastbury)

8.2 Pupil Outcomes

Date pupil intervention started: Yr 1 – Spring term 2014, Yr Spring term 2015

Table 11 – Pupil Outcomes for pupils benefitting from the project

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

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	Metric used	1st Return and date of collection	2nd Return and date of collection
e.g. Increased educational attainment and progress in Writing	*e.g. Pupil assessment data*	*e.g. Characteristics and assessment data collected for 97 of 100. The profile of respondents matches that initially targeted in the Theory of Change.*	*e.g. mean score or percentage at diff National Curriculum Levels or GCSE grades*	*e.g. Mean score- 3.7, collected September 2015*	*e.g. Mean score- 4.5, collected June 2015*
Improved attainment and progress	Pupil assessment data	Characteristics and assessment data was supplied by the schools. The profile of the pupil cohort is in line with those initially targeted in the	The grades were recorded by the teacher according to the National Curriculum level (e.g 6a, 7b) and were converted to average point scores (APS)	Year 1 schools collected November 2013 Year 2 schools collected October 2014	Year 1 schools collected July 2014 Year 2 schools collected July 2015

		Project outline	for numerical calculation purposes.		
Greater social, cultural and historical understanding of the English literary heritage	Paper survey on pupils' attitudes to Shakespeare	The profile of the pupil cohort is in line with those initially targeted in the Project outline	Mean score	Year 1 schools collected November 2013

Year 2 schools collected October 2014 | Year 1 schools collected July 2014

Year 2 schools collected July 2015 |
| Enhanced ability to evaluate live performance and analyse the ways that great dramatists make their works effective on stage | Paper survey on pupils' attitudes to Shakespeare | The profile of the pupil cohort is in line with those initially targeted in the Project outline | Mean score | Year 1 schools collected November 2013

Year 2 schools collected October 2014 | Year 1 schools collected July 2014

Year 2 schools collected July 2015 |
| Improved creativity and critical understanding | Paper survey on pupils' attitudes to Shakespeare | The profile of the pupil cohort is in line with those initially targeted in the Project outline | Mean score | Year 1 schools collected November 2013

Year 2 schools collected October 2014 | Year 1 schools collected July 2014

Year 2 schools collected July 2015 |
| Improved speaking and listening skills, and enhanced ability using persuasive techniques and rhetorical devices. | Paper survey on pupils' attitudes to Shakespeare | The profile of the pupil cohort is in line with those initially targeted in the Project outline | Mean score | Year 1 schools collected November 2013

Year 2 schools collected October 2014 | Year 1 schools collected July 2014

Year 2 schools collected July 2015?? |

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

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

		matches that initially targeted in the Theory of Change. Please find detailed analysis of the profile of respondents in Section 7.2			

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

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

(minimum 500 words)

During this project participating teachers devised new schemes of work based on rehearsal room techniques and they taught these schemes of work to one class each i.e two classes in each participating school.

Data was gathered from the participating students using surveys to evaluate the efficacy of the new way of working. Additionally the schools supplied monitoring data including ethnicity, gender, free school meals, grades etc.

The grades were recorded by the teacher according to the National Curriculum level (e.g 6a, 7b) and were converted to average point scores (APS) for numerical calculation purposes. Pupils' grades were then averaged at baseline and follow-up point. The distance travelled was calculated by subtracting the average score at the follow-up point from the average score at baseline.
Paired two-tailed t-tests were performed to determine the statistical significance of the change between baseline and follow-up (the likelihood that the difference observed was due to chance). The effect size (Cohen's d) was also calculated to measure the magnitude of the change.

Target: Improved attainment and progress

Present Moment repeatedly requested grade data from all participating schools but was only able to gather grade information from two schools, one from the first year of the project and one from the second year.

Jo Richardson Community School
There was information on grades for 27 pupils from Jo Richardson Community School. Of these:

- 2 pupils (7%) saw no improvements in grades over the course of the project
- 8 pupils (30%) saw an increase of 1 level in grades over the course of the project
- 9 pupils (33%) saw an increase of 2 levels in grades over the course of the project
- 7 pupils (26%) saw an increase of 3 levels in grades over the course of the project
- 1 pupil (4%) saw a decrease of 1 level in grades over the course of the project.

Overall, pupil's grades in Jo Richardson Community School increased over the course of the project. On average pupils' grades increased by 1.7 level between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 0.1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **medium effect** (effect size = 0.71).

Hornsey School
There was information on grades for 51 pupils from Hornsey School. Of these:
- 35 pupils (69%) saw no improvement in grades over the course of the project
- 7 pupils (14%) saw an increase of 1 level in grades over the course of the project
- 8 pupils (16%) saw an increase of 2 levels in grades over the course of the project
- 1 pupil(2%) saw an increase of 3 levels in grades over the course of the project

Overall, pupils' grades in Hornsey School increased over the course of the project. On average pupils' grades increased by 0.5 level between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 0.1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 2.91).

The surveys completed by pupils were designed to measure changes in pupils' attitudes towards the following:
- Accessibility and perception of Shakespeare
- Contemporary relevance and empathy
- Understanding of theatrical convention and language
- Confidence in reading and writing of English

For each question in the pupil survey, all possible responses were assigned a score, where 1 represented the option farthest from the ideal/correct option, 2 the next farthest option, and so on in increments of '1.' the highest score was assigned to the best/correct option. Participants' scores were then averaged across all questions relating to the same outcome at the baseline and at the follow-up point. The distance travelled was calculated by subtracting the average score at the follow-up point from the average score at baseline.

Again, despite repeated requests, full sets of data were only received from two schools, one from the first year of the project and one from the second.

Target: Greater social, cultural and historical understanding of the English literary heritage
The new schemes of work engaged the pupils with Shakespeare through contemporary references giving them an understanding of cultural behaviours present and past, and increasing their understanding and empathy for characters and situations appearing in Shakespearean plays.

Eastbury School
Pupils' attitudes towards contemporary relevance and empathy in Eastbury School increased over the course of the project. On average there was a 33% increase in average

score between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.1% level (there is less than 0.1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 2.42).

<u>Warren School</u>
Pupils' attitudes towards contemporary relevance and empathy increased over the course of the project. On average there was an 11% increase in average score between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e. highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 2.14)

Target: Enhanced ability to evaluate live performance and analyse the ways that great dramatists make their works effective on stage
The inclusion of rehearsal room techniques into the teaching of Shakespeare engaged the pupils practically, physically. The pupils enacted scenes putting their own interpretations into how they were performed and this, in turn, increased the understanding of how the script on the page becomes live on the stage and how this is achieved.

<u>Eastbury School</u>
Pupils' understanding of theatrical convention and language in Eastbury School increased over the course of the project. On average there was a 27% increase in average score between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e. highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 1.26).

<u>Warren School</u>
Pupils' understanding of theatrical convention and language in Warren School increased over the course of the project. On average there was a 27% increase in average score between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.1% level (there is less than 0.1% possibility i.e. very highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 0.91).

Target: Improved creativity and critical understanding
Pupils were encouraged to put the their own interpretations into selected scenes from Shakespeare's plays and find contemporary examples of images described in passages from selected Shakespearean sources. This practical application enhances the pupils' ability to interpret and decipher the dynamic nature of the text.

<u>Eastbury School</u>
Pupils' attitudes towards accessibility and perception of Shakespeare in Eastbury School increased over the course of the project. On average there was a 7% increase in average score between baseline and follow-up. This difference, however, is statistically insignificant (there is greater than 5% possibility that the difference observed was due to chance).

<u>Warren School</u>
Pupils' attitudes towards accessibility and perception of Shakespeare in Warren School decreased over the course of the project. On average there was a 6% decrease in average score between baseline and follow-up. This difference is statistically significant at the 1% level (there is less than 1% possibility i.e. highly unlikely that the difference observed was due to chance) and can be interpreted as a **large effect** (effect size = 2.61).

Target: Improved speaking and listening skills, and enhanced ability using persuasive techniques and rhetorical devices.
Within the context of rehearsal room techniques, decisions are made by directors based upon evidence within the text. Students were encouraged to engage with this analytical practice and to discuss and explain aloud their individual interpretive choices evidencing this from the text itself.

CASE STUDY:

Lesson observation at The Warren Comprehensive School, LBBD [4/3/15] – Yr 8 group.
Session 3 of "Introductory Unit to Shakespeare"

The unit is intended to be used with Yr.8 students before they embark on a study of a Shakespeare play. It aims to get them interested and enthusiastic about studying a play by Shakespeare. The unit is comprised of 5 lessons of 50 minutes each. The 5 lessons cover the following topics:
1. Context
2. What is a play?
3. Making the language comprehensible
4. Relating Shakespeare's world to the students' world
5. Encouraging empathy with the characters

Lesson observed by PM Associate Director, Jules Tipton, & a member of the school senior leadership team, as part of their ongoing monitoring of teaching within the school.
Due to the space constraints this lesson was mainly desk-bound, but included many practical elements which could be undertaken safely.

The learning objective of the lesson: *"To read an extract from Shakespeare for impact"*
- From the outset all the students were totally engaged, & the high expectations of the teacher were established.
- The initial task concerned relating a traditional tale (*Rapunzel)* to the plot of *Romeo & Juliet*
- Students worked in pairs, actively sharing ideas: they discussed parallels in the 2 plotlines:
  - Rapunzel is locked up in a tower: she is trapped – her family is being restrictive
  - Girls being forced to do something they don't want to do
  - Something is blocking the relationship from happening: Rapunzel/The Knight are like Romeo & Juliet being restricted by their families' feud

Exercise: "Cracking the Code" – using an extract from Act 1 sc. 5 of *Romeo & Juliet:* their first meeting.
- Pairs of students worked through a list of questions, in order, to decipher what is happening in the scene
  - This enabled them to find clues in the text, and quote them.
  - They discussed the use of language which indicated that the feelings of Romeo & Juliet had escalated quickly, and the use of the word 'sin' repeatedly indicates that their behaviour is forbidden.

> ➢ Students also noted that the entrance of another character (The Nurse) meant that this first encounter was stopped suddenly.

The teacher asked probing questions to:

ENCOURAGE the students to give specific examples to support their arguments & discoveries, by quoting from the extract.
ENABLE the students to <u>INTERPRET</u> the language: they noted that Juliet's language indicated that she was effectively seducing Romeo with her words: inviting him to kiss her
They were able to <u>IDENTIFY</u> that this was romantic, yet formal, language, indicating that the characters were of high status.
One student summed it up: "They were inviting each other with words."

Other comparisons were invited from popular culture: comparing the world of Shakespeare's play to the students' world. Examples of parallels:

- SHREK: "an ogre can't marry a princess"
- Using "soaps" to identify thematic strands
- Cultural or differences in heritage preventing people being together

Exercise: CRASH BANG WALLOP!
A practical punctuation exercise using an extract: students make different sounds according to which punctuation is used. An extension of this activity is to add physical actions to the sounds.
The teacher clarified the function of a semi-colon as part of the introduction to this task.
The students discovered that through the physicality of this exercise, by standing up and participating in it, that they became 'super aware' of the importance of the punctuation

The final task in this 50 minute lesson was an introduction to CHUNKING: an activity in which actors (students) break up their speeches into parcels of information.
This would be further developed in a later session when the students began to speak the text aloud.

In the final plenary of the lesson the students expressed their disappointment that they would have to wait to do this in the next lesson – they would have happily continued.
When asked what they enjoyed about the lesson one student stated:
"It was different – more practical – it was fun!"

8.3 Wider System Outcomes

Table 13 – Wider System Outcomes

Target Outcome	Research method/ data collection	Sample characteristics	*Metric*	1st Return and date of collection	2nd Return and date of collection
e.g. Teachers/schools involved in intervention making greater use of networks, other schools and colleagues to improve subject knowledge and teaching practice	*e.g. Paper survey*	*e.g. Surveys completed by all participating teachers*	*e.g. average number of events attended per teacher per year before the project and over the course of the project*	*e.g. Average number of events attended in the academic year 2012-2013: 3.2*	*e.g. Average number of events attended in the academic year 2013-2014: 4.3* *Average number of events attended in the academic year 2014-2015: 4.5*
An increase in self-sustaining school-to-school and peer-led activity	*Group discussion during project final plenary*	*4 out of the remaining 13 participants attended the final project plenary: 2 teachers from Yr 1 schools 2 teachers from Yr 2 schools*	*N/A*	*First discussions held at initial workshop with Joss Bennathan: Yr 1: November 2013; Yr2: October 2014*	*Final discussions – based around targeted questions – formed part of the project final plenary July 2015*
Development of knowledge-led teaching and curriculum cascaded by participating teachers to colleagues.	*Group discussion during project final plenary*	*4 out of the remaining 13 participants attended the final project plenary: 2 teachers from Yr 1 schools 2 teachers from Yr 2 schools*	*N/A*	*First discussions held at initial workshop: Yr 1: November 2013; Yr2: October 2014*	*Final discussions – based around targeted questions – formed part of the project final plenary July 2015*
Cultural change and raised expectations within the participating schools offer a model for the wider school system	*Group discussion during project final plenary*	*4 out of the remaining 13 participants attended the final project plenary: 2 teachers from Yr 1 schools 2 teachers from Yr 2 schools*	*N/A*	*First discussions held at initial workshop: Yr 1: November 2013; Yr2: October 2014*	*Final discussions – based around targeted questions – formed part of the project final plenary July 2015*

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

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

A Final Plenary session for the project was held in on July 8 2015.
All remaining participating teachers, from both year 1 & year 2 of "Shakespeare & Beyond", were offered the opportunity to meet, assess and reflect on the wider impact/outcomes, & legacy, of the project.

- 4 out of 13 remaining participating teachers attended the project's final plenary on July 8th 2015.
- They represented 4 out of 7 schools who participated in Shakespeare & Beyond: 2 schools from Year 1 [1 from LB Barking & Dagenham, 1 from LB Newham]; 2 schools from Year 2. [1 from LB Barking & Dagenham, 1 from LB Tower Hamlets]
- This sample represents teachers at different points in their teaching careers: 3 x 2-3 years, 1x 4 years+

The Wider System Outcomes have been drawn from anecdotal evidence, feeding back on teachers' experience of participating in the project.
Participants reflected that the peer-to-peer led nature of the project had been beneficial through the cross-borough pairing of teachers with different levels of teaching experience. This approach also, it was felt, contributed to the development of teacher confidence.

- *HH from Kingsford School (LBNewham), teaching for 2-3 years stated that the project had enabled her to develop some practical strategies for teaching Shakespeare in the English classroom. During the course of the project she felt her confidence had increased" because we had the chance to trial the lessons with peers and other students at the "Shakespeare & Beyond" workshops"*
- *She also stated, "Lessons now contain active strategies which look at plays as scripts/things to be performed rather than to be read in class. It has worked best when these are used as short 15 minute tasks built into the lesson as a whole"*
- *EB from Warren School (LBBD), teaching for 4+ years, stated that participation in "Shakespeare & Beyond "has helped develop my confidence in leading other staff and helping them develop confidence"*
- *It was reported that in Kingsford School the Schemes of Learning developed as part of the project were being used by other members of the English department: "lessons are shared and used by all KS3 teachers in the department: even those who are nervous have used small strategies built into their lesson as a whole" [HH]*

"Shakespeare & Beyond" encouraged and promoted the development of knowledge-led teaching and new curriculum content which would be cascaded by participating teachers to colleagues.
All the teachers who attended the final plenary spoke of plans to embed this knowledge-led teaching within their respective departments.

- *RM, a teacher who has been teaching for 2-3 years, stated that George Green's School is teaching 'The Tempest' scheme of learning, developed as part of "Shakespeare & Beyond" throughout year 7.*
- *Kingsford School plan to continue to plan materials & resources which allow students to access Shakespeare in an active, rehearsal room approach [HH]*
- *At Eastbury Comprehensive it will be used in teaching & learning meetings to improve departmental practice. Schemes of work will be shared and used across the department [AA]*
- *It was felt that for KS3 this will be a valuable tool for accessibility; for KS4 it will be useful in cementing skills [EB – Warren Comprehensive School]*

It was felt that an active approach to Shakespeare was already assisting pupils to remember quotations. This can be regarded as beneficial as the new GCSE specifications stipulate 'closed book' exams.

"The active teaching helps students remember quotes without realizing they are!" [AA – Eastbury Comprehensive]

Comments were made that the new National Curriculum changes, and additional time pressures, could necessitate the active 'rehearsal room' approach being placed "on the back-burner" during the curriculum change. It was felt, however, that the approach should return once teachers are settled, be embedded into the curriculum and allocated the additional time focus.

It has been acknowledged, in the early stages of its integration into a teacher' practice, using the active approach requires more time. This is possible with KS3 pupils, since there is currently more freedom within the curriculum.
The impact of the attainment and progress of KS3 pupils at Kingsford Comprehensive was raised by HH:
"After teaching 'A Midsummer Night's Dream' using this approach the year 7 assessments showed an increased proportion of students making expected progress". [HH]

The implementation of new practical skills, a wider pedagogic & subject knowledge provides an example which could be beneficial across learning environments. The early indications from data interpreted as part of this report, and from anecdotal reporting from both teachers & pupils who participated in this more kinaesthetic approach to English is that lessons were more accessible.
This has wider implications for cultural change and raised expectations within the participating schools, thus offering a model for the wider school system.
Teachers commented on the benefits to their own practice:
It has encouraged me to use more physical learning within my lessons...I spend more time considering how accessible my lessons are and how to address possible issues
EB (Warren Comprehensive School)

The active teaching approaches have enabled me to think more carefully & creatively about my lesson planning: there is less focus on a 'traditional' lesson plan and more attention to the longer term objectives & goals with a text
AA (Eastbury Comprehensive School)

The indications are that this practical 'rehearsal room approach' to Shakespeare benefits teachers and pupils alike.
Teachers commented that it Is:

Making Shakespeare more accessible to students, especially EAL [EB]
Students have less fear about Shakespeare [AA]
These active approaches raise our expectations of pupils' ability to access "challenging" texts [HH]
Teachers are linking it to their own raised achievement and access to new ideas, creating curriculum content, and confidence.

The approach requires
"Collaboration & teamwork within the classroom; learning to work together…" AA (Eastbury Comprehensive School)

This offers an additional model for the wider school system.

8.4 Impact Timelines

Please provide information on impact timelines:

- At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on teachers? Did this happen as expected?
  At the end of the first workshop session, the participating teachers indicated (via a show of hands) that they may attempt to trial an exercise in the classroom.
  They reported increased confidence having seen a practical text/language exercise demonstrated, and had participated in it themselves.
  From a theatre practitioner's point of view, we KNOW how quickly actors access the strategies and techniques within the rehearsal room. It was not unexpected that the teachers accessed the approach in a similar way.

- At what point during/after teacher CPD activity did you expect to see impact on pupils? Did this happen as expected?
  During a lesson observation attended by Jules Tipton, Present Moment project lead 2015, at Warren Comprehensive School, EG (an NQT) was delivering one of the lessons planned as part of her 'Introduction to Shakespeare' scheme of learning with a year 8 group.
  The impact on pupils was immediate in terms of accessibility and comprehension. The active approach ensured that all pupils were engaged, working collaboratively in pairs, in interpreting a short extract from 'Romeo & Juliet'. Having never seen the extract before they were able to clearly describe what was happening and what the characters were talking about. They discussed the tone of voice that the characters were speaking in & why this might be the case.
  This happened as expected: the teacher gave clear confident instructions, breaking the task into manageable sections, using the strategies explored during the first workshop, having had the experience of trialling the lesson with her peers during the second workshop.
  Similar experiences were reported by other participating teachers.

- At what point did you expect to see wider school outcomes? Did this happen as expected?
  The pairing of schools & teachers across boroughs formed an essential part of the project. This ensured the immediate establishment of ongoing school to school, peer-led working.
  In participating schools (most readily at George Greens School, & Warren Comprehensive School) natural links were formed with other departments from the outset: often with 'related' subjects. Staff in the drama/performing arts department were interested in knowing about the approach and became willing to share spaces, when practical. The active approach requires more physical space: English lessons took place in more diverse spaces, including school libraries.
  These specific links were not unexpected.

- Reflect on any continuing impact anticipated.
  In the forthcoming 2015/16 academic year both teachers from Warren Comprehensive School will have taken positions in different schools (in Burnham on Crouch, Essex; and Hackney). They are continuing to actively use & promote the active/rehearsal room approach they explored whilst participating in "Shakespeare & Beyond" within their new departments, and colleagues.
  They have pledged to promote, use & share the schemes of work developed as part of the project.

29

This offers the benefits of this approach to an expanding network of teachers, & a growing cohort of young people.

The establishment of an informal on-line network of the participating teachers is designed to encourage the sharing of new schemes of learning developed using the Shakespeare & Beyond model.

It is hoped that as the other teachers who have participated in Shakespeare & Beyond continue & develop their careers they too will cascade the work further. This will lead to ongoing achievement, attainment, and raising of aspirations within the young people taught in this way. It will also encourage engagement, and promote wider cultural change.

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

In this section we would like you to reflect on:
- The overall impact of your project
- The extent to which your theory of change proved accurate
- How your project has contributed to the overall aims of LSEF
- Whether your findings support the hypothesis of the LSEF
- What your findings say about the meta-evaluation theme that is most relevant to you

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

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

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

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

- The overall impact of your project

The Shakespeare and Beyond project had two primary ambitions: to introduce robust teaching strategies and skills to participating teachers in the targeted schools and to make a significant impact on the learning and achievement of students. Within this teachers were trained in professional theatre 'rehearsal room' techniques used by Present Moment's Artistic Director in working with actors to produce high quality and accessible productions of Shakespeare plays.

In spite of the challenges presented by the death of the Artistic Director, the project was delivered and completed within the overarching ambitions of its design. Teachers worked intensively and practically to learn these techniques and then to apply them in the classroom. The pairing of teachers across schools afforded the opportunity to work with peers and to cross fertilise ideas and practice. In turn teachers worked effectively together in these pairs to design schemes of work which could then be cascaded and rolled out to other teachers within their own schools and the other participating schools. These schemes serve as an ongoing legacy for teachers in the coming years and as a useful resource for further work on text across the curriculum. In themselves these resources also provide tangible evidence of the learning and journey travelled by individual teachers. Teacher's self-efficacy reporting is an instrumental tool in coming to an understanding of how they have embedded the learning into their own experience and teaching.

Class observations undertaken by the Transition Team's Associate Director Jules Tipton and documented in the delivery section of this evaluation offered an opportunity to see the learning in action and to appraise teacher's understanding and implementation. It also gave an opportunity to observe directly how students engaged with the material in practical ways, making the text accessible and relevant to them and encouraging their confidence and ability to access further texts new to them.

- The extent to which your theory of change proved accurate

Our Theory of Change model offered a clear, accurate and consistent framework against which to measure the success and impact of the project. In this all levels of change were implemented and the process recorded and documented in the evaluation tools used.

In reviewing the whole project the Transition Team is confident in the overall achievement of the coherence and progression in the process and there was a significant value in the explicit and transparent sharing of the Theory of Change Model with teachers so that this could also be measured by them independently. This enabled a structured and informed conversation amongst participants which contributed significantly to the peer learning aspect of the project.

- How your project has contributed to the overall aims of LSEF

Shakespeare and Beyond offered a pedagogic methodology of practice which worked on the assumption that significant improvement in teaching and attainment could be achieved by targeting investment in SMART outcomes and output. These focused on enhancing practical teaching skills, increased confidence in the subject knowledge of Shakespeare and evidenced by the breakdown of barriers to understanding amongst students and thereby an increase in accessibility and aspiration. The Transition Team believes that there will be a useful 'knock-on' effect of this project into other aspects of teaching and learning within other areas of the curriculum. This cannot be fully proven at this stage however self-reporting by teachers indicated that they were more confident and enthusiastic and could envisage wider application and cascading going forward. In turn the sharing of resources and peer-to-peer exchanges have galvanised a new conversation between schools and teachers which we believe contributes to the overall aims of LSEF.

- Whether your findings support the hypothesis of the LSEF

Our project findings fully support the LSEF hypothesis and the targeted and specific focus of this funding offers a greater opportunity for acceleration in the quality of delivery and subsequently in enhanced student learning experience leading to improved attainment outcomes for students. Hard data to support this will be an ongoing objective for teachers as the methodology is further embedded into 'business as usual' for their departments. By having upskilled teachers as fulcra in each school the chances of long-term sustainability and longevity are increased considerably. Teachers will provide in-house training for others in their schools fostering further self-directed learning and improvement of practice. Teachers are encouraged to make greater use of other similar opportunities to bring Shakespeare alive through the emphasis on the practical ways of learning enshrined in this project's approach.

- What your findings say about the meta-evaluation theme that is most relevant to you

For the Shakespeare and Beyond project the key meta-evaluation theme is the learning and then dissemination of good (and improved) practice within and across schools, and has the potential to find its way as a key pedagogic methodology within the English curriculum, with an easily accessible bank of example Schemes of Work available to all schools. Sign-posting to these is a fundamental legacy of this project.

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

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

Broad type of activity	Estimated % project activity	£ Estimated cost, including in kind
Producing/Disseminating Materials/Resources	10%	£7300
Teacher CPD (face to face/online etc)	70%	£21060.47
Events/Networks for Teachers		
Teacher 1:1 support		
Events/Networks for Pupils	5%	£2000
Others as Required – Please detail in full EVALUATION MANAGEMENT & ADMIN	 15% 5%	 £2100 £3811.34
TOTAL	100%	£ (same as total cost in section 5)

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

- Producing/Disseminating Materials/Resources: includes Schemes of work, DVDs of Theatre Lab gala performance, photos of Theatre Lab gala performance
- Teacher CPD (face to face/online etc): the majority of the project was hands-on working with teachers. This included 1-to-1 observation of teaching; modelling of practical Shakespeare techniques in schools, delivered by experienced theatre practitioners, as well as the organised workshop days which brought the participating teachers together. Venues hired for this purpose included well established and respected pedagogic and theatre training institutions such as the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, and Goldsmiths, University of London.
- Events/Networks for Pupils: Gala performance of Theatre Lab production contributed to peer interest in Shakespeare and generated interest from schools in the Shakespeare and Beyond project.
- EVALUATION/MANAGEMENT & ADMIN: Should a similar project be undertaken there should be a greater allocation and cost allocated to Evaluation throughout the timeline. Evaluation should be thought through and embedded as process throughout.

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

The Transition Team is not in a position to reference parallel or similar project with respect to a comparison of value for money. This project was unique in bringing together teachers and theatre professionals in this specific manner to enhance teacher confidence in strategies for teaching Shakespeare, thereby making it more accessible for students. In spite of the challenges and difficulties of the second year of the project due to the death of Joss Bennathan, the Transition Team assesses that the overall benefits to teachers remained of a high quality and the diligence of this team to ensure satisfactory completion meant that schools, teachers and students had a completed project and that this was deemed to have been successful in spite of a reduction in contact time.

10.3 Value for money calculations
Note: This section is only required for projects with control or comparison groups

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

11. Reflection on project delivery

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

Please include reflection on the following:

11.1 Key Enablers and Barriers to Achievement

- *Were there internal and/or external factors which appear to have had an effect on project success, and how were these responded to (if applicable)?*

Clearly the key barrier with regards to this project was the death of its creator and deliverer, Joss Bennathan. Key members of the Present Moment team, in consultation with Rocket Science, completed a scaled-back second year's delivery but the success of the project would, no doubt, have been greater with the originator at the helm.

Joss had very close professional ties with many of the participating schools due to many years of working with them in various capacities and the Transition Team found it hard to replicate these relationships and some school, (especially those from the first year) became disengaged during the second year. This was especially difficult when it came to data-gathering evidence of grades and few schools delivered the final figures.

The competing demands on teachers proved challenging in terms of retaining teachers and managing timetables comfortably. Greater engagement from more senior staff in the school could have eased this pressure.

The key enabler for Present Moment was having access to skilled theatre-makers who used rehearsal room techniques on a day-to day- basis. This allowed the project to continue after the death of the key deliverer.

The second key enabler was the enthusiasm of the teachers who did fully commit to the project. The instant results they experienced in the classroom increased their confidence and their subject enjoyment. Additionally the techniques they applied in the classroom had the added benefit of de-mystifying and and deconstructing Shakespeare for themselves as practitioners and as adults.

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

The best way to consolidate and improve teacher subject knowledge is to ensure ongoing opportunities to practise the skills they have learned. Application of these new techniques across the subject are already in place in some of the participating schools:

I have used the rehearsal room approaches when teaching other plays e.g. 'A Doll's House', & 'A view from the Bridge', with year 11. (AA – Eastbury)

… use with poetry – looking at characterisation & language; other play scripts. (HH – Kingsford)

An additional benefit would be some provision to access to further professional training, and maintenance of ongoing peer-to-peer support networks. Organisations like Shakespeare's Globe and the Royal Shakespeare company provide practical opportunities to engage with Shakespeare on a visceral level and the benefits of this learning environment are powerful.

35

11.2 Management and Delivery Processes

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

    Delivery of Shakespeare and Beyond was very effective while Joss Bennathan was the key contact and point of delivery. Following his death it took some time for the Transition Team to gather information and documentation. A more team-focused approach to project –management would have been beneficial.
    The hands-on, practical nature of delivery made the experience for the participating teachers a unique one and gave them a very personal understanding of how the techniques would be experienced in the classroom by the pupils.
    The Transition Team identified strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation methodology including the lack of setting up of control groups in schools and would make the recommendation that this be included in future practical theatre based projects.

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

    The whole project was built upon an innovative mix of professional theatre with professional educator. Shakespeare was a living playwright and the scripts are there to be performed rather than simply read. A clear comparison would be a musical score is not simply read by students it is performed. The effect of physical learning is instant and fun and the personal nature of a new way of understanding has a long-lasting effect.

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

    Yes, as previously referred to – the death of Present Moment's Artistic Director had a significant impact on delivery of the second year of the project. In spite of this, however, the project has still been delivered in line with the validated Theory of Change and the Evaluation Framework.

11.3 Future Sustainability and Forward Planning

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

The project will not be continued as Present Moment Productions will be closed following completion of all outstanding projects. We are confident however that the participating teachers will continue to benefit from their new skills and will skill-share throughout their careers.
New resources from Theatre Lab and also Shakespeare and Beyond will be available through the London Ed website and have already been distributed to schools.

12. Final Report Conclusion

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

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

Shakespeare and Beyond was a well-conceived project which benefitted from the extensive application of the Theory of Change model and embedded evaluation methodology established in direct relationship to the measures of outputs and SMART outcomes in the original funding bid. One of the key challenges of measuring a project such as this, is that whilst it is possible to evaluate the journey travelled through self-efficacy metrics and staged reflection much of the learning is visceral and experiential, and would benefit from a greater longitudinal study that this project had scope to deliver.

The central hypothesis of the project around which the architecture of the project was built was that the practical professional process used by theatre practitioners could successfully migrate to the practice of English teachers tasked with teaching Shakespeare. The ubiquitous negative attitudes to studying Shakespeare amongst students presents a barrier for teachers. Through learning, gaining confidence and developing practical skills and strategies teachers were able to break down attitudinal barriers and bring the texts alive with students. The cracking of the code of seemingly impenetrable language allowed students to find a contemporary connection to the universal narratives, dilemmas and questions explored through the richness of character and plot in Shakespeare's plays.

Key findings for assessment of project impact
- *What outcomes does the evaluation suggest were achieved*

The project successfully introduced new skills in teaching Shakespeare and addressed confidence issues for teachers when considering how best to approach their delivery for students, keeping the engaged and breaking down barriers.

Teachers worked together in pairs - sharing knowledge and exchanging ideas which in turn led to the authoring of specific schemes of work which were then disseminated and cascaded to other teachers in their own schools and shared across the cohort of participating schools.

Teacher self-efficacy reporting demonstrates an overall progression in confidence in the practical strategies used in the project.

Student qualitative feedback largely demonstrates a movement from disengagement and negative perception of Shakespeare at the outset of the project to a place of engagement and enjoyment by the end.

The legacy of the project is captured in the practical application of the schemes of work in individual schools, the viral nature in the sharing of good practice in those teacher's migrating to other schools and embedding theory and practise into their new environments. The accessibility of these Schemes Of Work is essential as a valuable ongoing resource.

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

Due to the special circumstances of the second year of this project - the loss of the expertise and experience of the Artistic Director was a significant impairment to the project. Joss Bennathan brought a unique combination of skills as a qualified English and Drama teacher

and a practising professional theatre director to the project – skills which it was not possible to replicate. The Transition Team was represented by a highly skilled theatre practitioner in Associate Director Jules Tipton who led the final stages of the practical delivery of the project. However neither she nor the other two members of the team are qualified teachers and whilst this was acceptable given the nature of the project, the familiarity with core English teaching was not as great.

The project did not succeed in establishing significant control groups, in large part this was to do with the lack of cooperation from schools in this area - where the competing demands on teachers sometimes limited the amount of follow through on original commitments. This was disappointing.

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

As described above the statistical trend in grade improvement would benefit from tracking through a five-year period to ascertain an upward trend. Whilst it is significant that grade improvement occurs following intervention, it is also the case that it cannot be solely proven or attributed to this one project, but worked synergistically with other aspects of teaching and learning.

Key lessons learnt for assessment of project delivery
- *What activities/approaches worked well?*

The practical theatre rehearsal room approach worked well for teachers and students. This gave an opportunity for experiencing the language in the body and in space, which in turn opened the door to understanding that Shakespeare's plays were written to be performed and this is the best way to teach and learn them.

- *What activities/approaches worked less well?*

There was some variance in the paired work success, with some teachers committing more time and input into this peer support work than others. There was also some patchiness in commitment from senior leadership in some schools which meant that the project was not given as much weight in some circumstances as was warranted.

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

Communication with staff in schools is always a challenge and this was not always helped by school gatekeepers. Competing pressures on time, targets and milestones meant that sometimes the depth and level of the project could not be afforded as much time as would have been more fully beneficial.

Teachers not attending workshops: external circumstances (e.g. school review/inspection) meant that although teachers had verbally committed to attending workshops their priorities ultimately lay with school commitments. Often Present Moment were not notified of their withdrawal from the workshop until the day itself.

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

Informing future delivery

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

Filmed evaluation: this would have complimented the practical nature of the project and captured it more effectively.

Student leadership: this would have embedded their learning and increased confidence.

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

  N/A

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

    - Greater commitment from Senior Leadership.
    - Intensive training weekend.
    - Videoing of lessons for uploading and sharing good practice in addition to sharing schemes of work.
    - Online forum for greater virtual engagement and discussion, peer support and online learning tools and modules (ie; film of professional actors and director working with text and rehearsal room technique).
    - Better methodology for measuring qualitative impact in the short term but also longitudinal tracking to assess significant trends.