

# Maths Hubs Evaluator in Residence 2022/23

Evidence and reporting  
summary

Hub: LO6

# 2022/23 Evaluator in Residence evidence and reporting summary

## Introduction

The NCETM and Maths Hubs' Evaluator in Residence was a new initiative for 2022-23. The rationale for the initiative was: to gather high quality data to illuminate the impact of NCETM and Maths Hub Network activity in a specific hub, and to develop a collaborative approach to evaluation across the network. Our previous evaluation methods prioritised yearly, programme-level evaluation: we knew less about long term impact, sustained impact, and interconnected impact of projects, or the systemic change taking place within hub communities. Since 2020 Maths Hubs have presented impact evidence against strategic goals and fed back that this process has been worthy, challenging, and they have an appetite to develop their evaluation capacity.

In 2022-23 evaluation leads worked with 8 hubs, who each had a broad remit to evaluate the impact of their activity within one of the strategic goals. Central to the work were the LLME Community Design principles and developing an evaluation community within each hub.

## Summary structure and contents

- Details of the hub, strategic goal, research questions and chosen cases
- Description of the context of the hub and rationale for research questions and data collection methods
- Description of the activity and data collection methods
- Reflection on the significance of the themes identified during the activity, and the hub responses to those
- Significant outputs, for instance case study documents

## Activity, data collection and evidence

Evaluators worked with Maths Hub Leadership and Management teams over one academic year. They co-constructed appropriate research questions and methods for collecting data, with emphasis on finding data that illuminated impact and challenges.

The findings and evidence, along with hubs' reflections on development, are 'owned' by the hub. Anonymised findings will be used as part of strategic goal evaluation. The hub may give permission for their findings, evidence and outputs to be used elsewhere as appropriate.

Evaluator in Residence Summary	
<b>Maths Hub</b>	London SE Plus (LO6)
<b>Strategic Goal</b>	SKTM
<b>Research question(s)</b>	<u>SKTM Strategic Goal (LO6) - Research questions:</u> <u>ECTs:</u> 1. Do NCETM/CLs/Participants have a clear picture of progression from Phase 1 to Phase 2. 2. How do we acknowledge the ECF and the core programmes that ECTs will also be engaging with? 3. Do ECTs recognise what NCETM has to offer in addition to other commitments in school?

	<p><u>RECRUITMENT:</u></p> <p>1. What supports recruitment to SKTM programmes and what are the barriers?</p> <p><u>COMMUNITIES:</u></p> <p>1. How are Cohort Lead communities developing?</p> <p>2. Are communities getting PD themselves from the national workshops?</p> <p>3. Do you feel part of the process of ongoing project development and refinement?</p>
<b>What is the case?</b>	<p><u>ECT focus:</u></p> <p>Based on the SKTM Evaluation outcomes and recommendations from 2021-22 end of year report, discussions with the EiR and LO6 Hub Lead led to a focus being agreed for ECTs and the impact of the programme on their confidence and practice (particularly given that many ECTs training and face to face support were impacted by the Covid pandemic).</p> <p>It was important to know that ECTs felt supported by the programme and that it was making an impact on their confidence, practice, and in classroom with their pupils, and where there were areas for improvement, what changes could be made to the programme to enhance impact. It was also important that ECTs saw this an ongoing professional development over time.</p>

### Context

LSE+ is situated across six London Boroughs. The population density is quite high and therefore schools are very close to one another. Each of the local authorities with exception of Lewisham are still very active with ECTs and LSE+ has LLME situated across all the Boroughs.

To aid recruitment LSE+ runs 1 SKTM ECT Work Group per LA at primary and 1 SKTM ECT for secondary. The LA then complete recruitment for each of the Work Groups.

As the hub puts a lot of resources into these Work Groups it is important for the hub to understand the impact and if there is consistency in quality of delivery and impact across each LA.

### Activity and data collection

EiR & MHL visited several SKTM ECT sessions across both Primary and Secondary.

Individual feedback was gained from all ECTs involved in the sessions both in written and verbal form through group and one to one discussion.

Participant responses were collated and organised to pull out common themes to find out the impact within settings, and where there is consistency between Work Groups.

These valuable findings helped to inform strategic hub planning moving forward to next year and make significant improvements and links to other key providers to further enhance the impact of the programme.

Regular meetings both within the Hub and with the EiR, and discussions throughout the year, provided constant feedback with which to inform future planning.

(8/34, 24% of initial survey data showed a lack of confidence in their knowledge of teaching mathematics)

### Significant themes

Themes (findings and process)	Possible implications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment of participants was high and attendance regular. (20+ participants per WG – total 110 ECTs) However, recruitment into ECT 2 was significantly less. Less than</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When recruiting, register participants for both years.</li> <li>Retain LA involvement with recruiting across both years.</li> </ul>

<p>25% of participants move from Y1 to Y2 of the programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When surveyed, few participants knew the commitment or the next steps of the programme. Most participants were signed up by their mentors or maths leads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Make commitment and CPD pathways clearer for participants by outlining this at session 1.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participants found sessions did not directly tie into ECF or their compulsory ECT training which made it challenging to find the time to commit to sessions and they felt overwhelmed at times.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Involve TSH and their ECF providers in programme design. Use TSH and HEI on strategic board for contacts to plan detail around sessions. (Already commenced work with UCL on this)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participants felt their mentors were not aware of what they were doing so found it hard to discuss implementations or to be given opportunity to follow up on intersessional tasks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Collect mentor details on registration forms.</li> <li>● Update mentors with CPD plan and outcomes at session 1.</li> <li>● Potentially invite mentors to join one of the ECT sessions.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participants wanted to look at resources that they specifically use such as White Rose, Power Maths, Maths: No Problem, MM etc. Participants commented that whilst they found the resources they used in the sessions (NCETM materials) they wanted to explore the themes of the sessions through other materials too.</li> <li>● Participants wanted practical activities to try in sessions and then implement in class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● During planning phase AMHL to ensure SKTM WGLs carefully consider activity design to allow for participants to build and design an in-class activity.</li> <li>● Plan for participants to bring a copy of their own lesson materials on a selected theme for discussion. This could then include their own resources of choice.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participants wanted the sessions to be tailored more to their key stage of teaching and opportunities to discuss more and compare with their peers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Collect data on what year groups are being taught and share with WGL to allow them to group participants in sessions based on classes taught.</li> </ul>

## Conclusion

Sessions across LA WGs had common materials and collaboratively planned sessions. This made the experience consistent between LA. This allowed us to pick out themes that were common.

There is clear need for some hub input into some statutory materials for sessions such as CPD pathways and commitment outline to ensure participants know the journey they are on and the bigger picture of their participation. Other hub level inputs can include key data for WGL such as classes taught. Hub can also more directly involve mentors by inviting them to part of session 1.

For the SKTM ECT to be at its most effective it needs to consider the ECF and how it fits into the work of an ECT and their general development without increasing workload. It would be hugely beneficial for NCETM central workshops to consider this but on a local level the hub will liaise with delivery partners to mitigate this.

The hub has identified a new AMHL responsibility focusing on QA of SKTM programmes and ensuring these pathways are linked to a school's TFM journey. This will maximise the impact within schools directly on

students by ensuring this CPD is not standalone on an ECTs journey. The AMHL for SKTM will review the lessons learned from the EiR (added as an appendix) to ensure these are implemented.

Participants made it clear that there was an impact on their lesson planning and design as well as their thinking, however, to see this impact translating to pupils a follow up for 2023/24 would be beneficial as part of participation in the EiR programme.

Appendices to include:

Any other outputs

## Appendices

# PROJECT MANAGEMENT LESSONS LEARNED

### PROJECT TITLE

SKTM Primary & Secondary

### AMHL

### DATE PREPARED

Aidan Gollaglee

03/07/2023

## PROJECT NCP: SKTM Primary ECT/Teacher/TA

Was the project completed according to the original expectation?

- SKTM ECT was delivered as per expectations, there were some discrepancies in the order of delivery with some materials and some variation in use of materials between WGs.

## PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS

What were the major accomplishments?

- Recruitment of 20+ participants within 4/5 London Boroughs.
- ECT feedback was that it was more useful for their practice than statutory ECF sessions
- Participants of all SKTM sessions felt it had direct impact on their practice

What worked well?

- Recruitment and ownership by LA – LLME based within LA
- WGL delivery was excellent and relationships between LLME and participants was good

What was found to be particularly useful to accomplish the project?

- Collaborative planning
- LA based Work Groups
- Agreed outcomes and materials

## PROJECT CHALLENGES

What elements of the project went wrong?

- Sessions had common materials but the delivery was not always common in the goals and aim of the activities
- WGL didn't always have the same key outcome
- Intersessional tasks were not always completed

What specific processes need improvement?

- Alignment of the programmes and how they fit together, avoiding repetition between SKTM Primary Teacher content
- Understanding of long term commitment and sharing of the next phase of the programme
- Communication of aims and expectations with mentors and subject leads for all SKTMs
- Planning phase to be led by the WGL and not the AMHL

How can these processes be improved in the future?

- Liaising with LA
- Sharing of CPD map for participants
- Creating framework for WGL to plan around

What were the key problems areas (i.e., budgeting, scheduling, etc.)?

- Scheduling – some WGL changed dates mid-year without effectively communicating with operations team

List any recruitment or participation challenges

- Clashing dates with statutory ECF sessions
- SLT/mentors not feeling confident to release due to workload on ECT (not linked with ECF)



Actions for future	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SKTM Primary Teacher to be KS1, LKS1, UKS2 focussed</li> </ul>	<p>This is as a result of participant feedback that they wanted to be able to take elements to try with their classes immediately which was not always possible if focusing on materials aimed at a different year group.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WGL to map out journey and commitment at session 1</li> </ul>	<p>Participants did not always see how this CPD was continued and where this fitted into the wider goals of their school.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaborative planning session to include daily session outcomes (deliverables)</li> </ul>	<p>The outcomes and takeaway from each session was not always clear and participants wanted to have something to take away and trial or use as a result of the session.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Liaise with LA and key organisations to pick dates</li> </ul>	<p>Attendance was sometimes sporadic due to clashed dates. This could have been avoided by knowing other LA dates in advance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collect mentor details and share CPD plan and outcomes with them at beginning of the year</li> </ul>	<p>Many participants did not find that the ECT programme linked in with mentor meetings and did not inform their planning with mentors.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with TSH and Lead Providers to design sessions to fit with ECF</li> </ul>	<p>Participants and school leaders commented that the work load was too much due to being in addition to statutory ECF sessions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dates to be fixed at the start of the year and December avoided</li> </ul>	<p>Attendance due to illness was significant during Aut 2 (December) and confusion amongst participants for dates occurred due to WGL changing dates without communication with operations team.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sessions to have time for active planning/lesson study</li> </ul>	<p>Participants wanted to construct more useable materials during a session as they would lose PPA as a result of attendance.</p>



## PROJECT CLOSE ACCEPTANCE

### Programme Manager NAME

### Programme Manager SIGNATURE

### DATE

Jo-Ellis Williams	J. WILLIAMS	03/07/2023
-------------------	-------------	------------

### MHLM Reviewer NAME

### AMHL SIGNATURE

### DATE

Aidan Gollaglee	A. GOLLAGLEE	03/07/2023
-----------------	--------------	------------