

Maths Hubs Evaluator in Residence 2022/23

Evidence and reporting summary

Hub: London South East+

Evaluator in Residence Summary	
Maths Hub	London South East+
Strategic Goal	SKTM
Research questions	<p>ECTs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the NCETM has to offer in addition to other commitments in school? <p>RECRUITMENT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What supports recruitment to SKTM programmes and what are the barriers? <p>COMMUNITIES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are Cohort Lead communities developing? 2. Are communities getting PD themselves from the national workshops? <p>Do you feel part of the process of ongoing project development and refinement?</p>
What is the case?	<p>ECT focus:</p> <p>Based on the SKTM Evaluation outcomes and recommendations from the 2021/22 end-of-year report, discussions with the EiR and 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 the 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 as 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, is still very active with ECTs, and LSE+ has LLMEs 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 completes 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 and the 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 on settings, and where there is consistency between Work Groups.

These valuable findings helped to inform strategic hub planning for 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.

Significant themes

Themes (findings and process)	Possible implications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 25% of participants moved from Y1 to Y2 of the programme. • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When recruiting, register participants for both years. • Retain LA involvement with recruiting across both years. • Make commitment and CPD pathways clearer for participants by outlining this at session 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect mentor details on registration forms. • Update mentors with CPD plan and outcomes at session 1. • Potentially invite mentors to join one of the ECT sessions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants wanted to look at resources that they specifically use such as White Rose, Power Maths, Maths: No Problem, Maths Mastery etc. Participants commented that whilst they found the resources they used in the sessions (NCETM materials) useful, they wanted to explore the themes of the sessions through other materials too. • Participants wanted practical activities to try in sessions and then implement in class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During planning phase, AMHL to ensure SKTM WGLs carefully consider activity design to allow for participants to build and design an in-class activity. • 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants wanted the sessions to be tailored more to their key stage of teaching and opportunities to discuss more and compare with their peers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Conclusion

Sessions across LA WGs had common materials and collaboratively planned sessions. This made the experience consistent. 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, 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 on students by ensuring this CPD is not standalone on an ECT's journey. The AMHL for SKTM will review the lessons learned from the EiR 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.