

ECT Mentor session

Module 8: Developing quality pedagogy and making productive use of assessment

Week 3: What might be a useful alteration to the ECT's teaching?

Session Elements



discuss with a mentor



collaborative planning



analyse artefacts



action planning

Learning Intentions for this session

The focus of your mentee's inquiry for Module 8 is on an element of the Early Career Framework (ECF) from Standards 4, 5 or 6. They might have chosen a focus which combines different elements of these standards.

The case studies are a reminder how to:

Case Study A

Group pupils effectively, by:

5n. Changing groups regularly, avoiding the perception that groups are fixed

And stimulate pupil thinking and check for understanding, by:

4o. Considering the factors that will support effective collaborative or paired work (e.g. familiarity with routines, whether pupils have the necessary prior knowledge and how pupils are grouped)

Case Study B

Develop pupils' literacy, by:

3r. Modelling and requiring high-quality oral language, recognizing that spoken language underpins the development of reading and writing (e.g. requiring pupils to respond to questions in full sentences, making use of relevant technical vocabulary)

3s. Teaching different forms of writing by modelling planning, drafting and editing

Plan effective lessons, by:

- 4a. Using modelling, explanations and scaffolds, acknowledging that novices need more structure early in a domain
- 4c. Removing scaffolding only when pupils are achieving a high degree of success in applying previously taught material
- 4d. Providing sufficient opportunity for pupils to consolidate and practice applying new knowledge and skills

Make good use of expositions, by:

- 4g. Combining a verbal explanation with a relevant graphical representation of the same concept or process, where appropriate
- 4i. Narrating thought processes when modelling to make explicit how experts think

And stimulate pupil thinking and check for understanding

- 4o. Considering the factors that will support effective collaborative or paired work
- 4p. Providing scaffolds for pupil talk to increase the focus and rigour of dialogue
- (6k. Thinking carefully about how to ensure feedback is specific and helpful when ensuring peer- or self-assessment)

Case Study C**Providing high quality feedback, by:**

- 6h. Focusing on specific actions for pupils and providing time for pupils to respond to feedback
- 6k. Thinking carefully about how to ensure feedback is specific and helpful when using peer- or self-assessment

Make marking manageable and effective, by:

- 6m. Working with colleagues to identify efficient approaches to marking and alternative approaches to providing feedback (e.g. using whole class feedback or well-supported peer- and self-assessment)
- 6n. Using verbal feedback during lessons in place of written feedback after lessons where possible
- 6o. Understanding that written marking is only one form of feedback

- 6p.** Reducing the opportunity cost of marking (e.g. by using abbreviations and codes in written feedback)

Case Study D

Stimulate pupil thinking and check for understanding, by:

- 4m.** Including a range of types of questions in class discussions to extend and challenge pupils (e.g. by modelling new vocabulary or asking pupils to justify answers)
- 4n.** Providing appropriate wait time between question and response where more developed responses are required
- 4e.** Breaking tasks down into constituent components when setting up independent practice (e.g. using tasks that scaffold pupils through metacognitive processes)

Meet individual needs without creating unnecessary workload, by:

- 5k.** Reframing questions to provide greater scaffolding or greater stretch

Check prior knowledge and understanding during lessons, by:

- 6f.** Prompting pupils to elaborate when responding to questioning to check that a correct answer stems from secure understanding

Introduction

In your first mentor meeting of the term, you carried out a Module 8 audit with your mentee (based upon the same audit they completed in Modules 3 and 4). You identified development priorities in relation to Standards 4, 5 and/or 6 and you refined one of these priorities into an exploratory inquiry question. Since last week, within their self-directed study time, your mentee has been collecting some evidence about their exploratory question. They should have summarised this within a simple evidence statement about the impact upon their pupils of their normal practice.

In this session, you will consider whether the evidence suggests that your mentee's normal practice is helping their pupils to make progress, or if there should be an alteration. Together, you will use the evidence base of the ECF to speculate about what that change could be. You will decide what evidence your mentee would need to collect to tell them that the alteration had led to improvement. Finally, with that evidence in mind, you will help them to create an 'evaluative inquiry' question, which they will work on until the end of this module.

A note on evidence and workload

Schools are already data-rich environments. Practitioner inquiries first of all make use of what we call here ‘naturally occurring’ evidence. They are in the pupils’ work and the ECT’s assessment of it. They are in the words and reactions of the pupils and what the ECT has heard or seen of this. When we refer to evidence-collection, in the main we mean: look at what the pupils have done, and listen to what they are saying. A practitioner inquiry invites you to be more systematic about how you do this, looking and listening, so you might deliberately ask a few questions of a few pupils for five minutes at the start of breaktime, or you might share lunch with a colleague and quiz them about how they approach a problem in their own class.

Case Studies

These case studies explore how four teachers – improving their practice and without adding to their workload – conducted their own practitioner inquiries into developing quality pedagogy and making productive use of assessment. All are interesting but you should focus on the one or two that most closely relate to the exploratory question your mentee is working on. The case studies set out the issue the teacher was interested in, how they gathered evidence about the impact upon pupils of their own normal practice, and how they decided to introduce an alteration to the way they taught. (Later in the module, you will return to these case studies to learn what they did next.)

When reading these cases, your mentee will need to take account of their own pupils’ characteristics, the context of their classroom and the nature of the material that they are teaching.

Case Study A: Grouping Pupils Effectively

Andy has several vulnerable children in his Year 1 class: many suffer from low self-confidence or poor self-regulation. At the start of the year, he organised his table groups randomly, making only small changes when he sensed that two or more pupils in a group were disengaging. He was unhappy with their apparent levels of motivation and found that he was struggling to offer the more tailored support to groups that he felt they needed. To explore how he might overcome these problems by improving the effectiveness of his grouping strategy, Andy decided to undertake a practitioner inquiry.

Andy first wanted to get to the bottom of the impact of his current practice of random grouping, and why it appeared not to be working. He had a highly experienced teaching assistant, so he began with this exploratory question:

What has the class Teaching Assistant (TA) noticed about the grouping of pupils and its effect on their attainment, behaviour and motivation?

Since the start of the year, Andy and his TA have established the habit of taking 10 minutes for a cup of tea at the end of the day on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays to talk about how the pupils have been progressing. He uses one of these informal meetings to gather his TA's thoughts on what effects his grouping strategy is having on their pupils' attainment, behaviour and motivation, and compares this with his own reflections.

Their joint conclusions were that:

- some pupils were reluctant to work with others because they did not know them – this was causing low-level disruption to occur in the lesson
- some were worried about what the other pupils might think if they made a mistake with their learning – they were becoming averse to trying out their ideas
- neither the TA nor Andy was being effective in how they were targeting their support for their pupils, neither for those who required greater scaffolding nor for those who were ready for more challenge

Andy also undertook some reading around pupil groupings, to explore a range of options. He re-read the Research and Practice Summaries from Module 3 of the programme and checked his Learning Log. He was especially interested in how, when grouping pupils, care should be taken to monitor the impact of groupings on pupil attainment, behaviour and motivation (4.10); that, when this was done, paired and group activities can increase pupil success (4.9); changing groups regularly can help avoid the perception that groups are fixed (5n); and flexibly grouping pupils within a class could help him provide more tailored support (5.5). He understood that one important factor in supporting effective collaborative or paired work would be building his pupils' familiarity with routines (4o).

What alteration to his teaching might Andy make to improve the effectiveness of his pupils' work in groups?



Andy's approach to grouping pupils effectively

- following discussion with his TA, Andy devised a system whereby all pupils would be obliged to work regularly with two different groups
- from the start of a half-term, he introduced a 'dual grouping' system in which each pupil was assigned one table group by mixed attainment; and another by a hierarchy of need – where pupils were grouped with others with similar prior attainment for their literacy lessons
- Andy and his TA kept a close eye on the effects of the mixed attainment groups on motivation and behaviour. In the thrice weekly meetings, they discussed these arrangements and were prepared to make adjustments – these adjustments might help communicate to the pupils that their grouping (and their attainment levels) were not fixed
- he made sure each day that there was a structured opportunity for the mixed attainment groups to talk together - for example, about their favourite toys, pets, subjects or favourite television programmes; he hoped this would improve motivation and behaviour
- in their literacy lessons the pupils were regrouped by near attainment. He gave them paper, coloured pencils and a stimulus – such as a toy – for the group to create a story, which they would tell back to the class. Andy concentrated his support on two groups, his TA on one group, and two groups were allowed to work independently. The extra support was to ensure that all pupils were involved in contributing to the group's story. He was also able to stretch the higher attaining pupils to expand upon their stories by asking them some 'what if' questions

Case Study B: Modelling and Scaffolding

Vashti (a Year 4 teacher) wants to develop an aspect of her practice in relation to literacy. She has found that around one-third of her pupils are still making basic errors with writing week in, week out. In particular, they are inconsistent in their use of capital letters, full stops and finger spacing. They don't seem to respond to her written feedback, and she often has to spend time in lessons going over the same ground. She decides she must develop this aspect of her practice, so, with her mentor, she agrees to undertake a practitioner inquiry. To begin her inquiry, she writes two exploratory questions:

How do effective teachers of literacy at Key Stage 2 provide scaffolding and support for struggling writers?

What are the characteristics of pupils who struggle with written literacy in Year 4?

To answer these questions, Vashti first looked at the evidence she already had to hand:

- she analysed progress data in her mark-book to identify particular pupils
- she inspected those pupils' literacy books to compile a list of their common errors
- she also looked back at her Research and Practice Summary from Module 2 and in her Learning Log where she had noted writing composition strategies through modelling and supported practice

She did one extra thing: for twenty minutes, she observed a colleague from Key Stage 2 who is known for making good progress in literacy.

Having pulled together this exploratory data, Vashti drew the following tentative conclusions:

- effective teachers use physical resources to provide scaffolding for struggling writers – e.g. laminated sheets
- they model the planning, drafting and editing processes when teaching writing
- effective teachers use symbols and icons alongside short, written prompts
- effective teachers require, and harness the power of, high-quality classroom talk to help children organise their thoughts before they put pen to paper

- effective teachers often pair up struggling writers with stronger writers
- of the six pupils she had identified as struggling, she noticed that five were identified as having a Speech, Language and Communication Need (SpLCN)

What alteration to her normal modelling and scaffolding might Vashti make to support her class to improve their writing?



Vashti's use of modelling and scaffolds to support writing

Vashti decided to create a 'speaking sentences' intervention, comprised of the following elements:

- create a physical resource – a laminated sheet with an icon and a key word to remind pupils of the basic features of sentence-writing (e.g. capital letter at start of sentence, capital letter for any names, quote marks to denote spoken language, full stop at end of sentence, finger spacing between words) (4a). She used this scaffold first with the target pupils, monitored how her pupils used it then gradually withdrew it from those who were successful without it (4c)
- model the use of the resource, graphically and verbally using the visualizer (4g) – she modelled this first, narrating her thought processes explicitly (4i), then three confident pupils used the visualizer to show their classmates how they used the laminated sheet
- create talk partners where target pupils are paired up with stronger writers (4o)
- create opportunities for talk partners to practise talking and responding to each other in full sentences, as a prelude to writing (3r)
- in pairs, each pupil talks through the stages of writing a successful sentence, using the laminated sheet as a scaffold (4p) and then they practise writing together for 10 minutes (4d)
- pairs use the laminated sheet to conduct an interim peer assessment on each other's work, and make recommendations for redrafting and editing (3s)
- after a writing exercise, ensuring peer feedback is specific and helpful (6k), all pupils use the laminated sheet as a checklist to check their partner's work and suggest corrections if necessary

Case Study C: Making Marking Manageable

Louise (secondary history) is concerned about her marking workload. Department policy states that books should be marked at least once every two weeks. Louise teaches 9 classes this year, and it takes her 2 hours to mark a set of books. This means that she typically spends 8 to 10 hours a week marking books. Louise is concerned about the fact that she isn't able to spend as much time planning lessons as she would like. She is also concerned that some of her pupils don't seem to find her written feedback useful, as they often make similar mistakes to those she has corrected the previous week. Following a meeting where she asked her Head of Department whether she could try some different approaches to marking, Louise agreed with him that she should develop this area of her practice. She decided to undertake a practitioner inquiry to explore some other approaches to providing her pupils with feedback. To get started, she wrote the following, exploratory question:

What alternative approaches to providing children with feedback are there, as an alternative to written marking?

To answer this question, Louise first looked at the evidence she could access easily:

- she raised it as an item in a department meeting, and noted her colleagues' alternative ideas about assessment and feedback (6m)
- she looked back to her Learning Log from Module 4, in particular the references to 'Making marking manageable and effective' (6l, 6m, 6n, 6o, 6p, 6q)
- she re-read the Research and Practice Summary for Week 5 of Module 4, which gave practical guidance on alternative approaches, and she read again the example of Sara on 'Reducing the opportunity costs of marking'

Louise then chose to read more widely. (ECTs will not often have time to do this.)

She read online **Education Endowment Foundation (2016) A marked improvement? A review of the evidence on written marking**. Accessible from: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Publications/EEF_Marking_Review_April_2016.pdf.

As a result of this data collection, Louise identified two approaches that she wanted to explore further:

- whole-class verbal feedback (6.5, 6n)

- an approach known as ‘minimal marking’ whereby the teacher provides feedback in the form of abbreviations and codes, rather than making corrections and writing out ‘what went well / even better if’ comments in longhand (6p)

What alteration to her marking might Louise make so that it is both effective and manageable?



Louise’s new approach to marking

Louise consulted her department’s marking policy. Then she:

Use of codes (6p):

- created a set of codes to represent the most common kinds of feedback relating to spelling, punctuation and grammar
- created codes to represent the success criteria for each written task she set: whether the pupils had referred to source material (SM), and whether they had written a balanced argument (BA) etc (6k)
- when marking books, instead of writing comments, wrote short codes in the margin (she found that this took around 1 minute per book, or 30 minutes to mark the class set) (6o)
- created a slide with a key explaining what each code meant

Verbal feedback (6.5):

- in the feedback lesson, she would also provide whole-class verbal feedback to highlight any common misconceptions she had noticed when marking the books (6n)
- made sure that her codes led to specific actions for pupils, and provided 15 minutes at the start of lessons for her pupils to respond to the feedback (6h)

Case Study D: Questioning

Mo wants to work on his use of questioning with his Year 11 GCSE PE class. He finds that lots of lesson time is spent on providing pupils with detailed instruction and feedback about how to meet particular assessment objectives for the exam, and he sometimes feels that he is working harder than his pupils in lessons. He wants to improve his use of questioning as a way to stimulate pupils to think, talk and write more in lessons. Following a meeting with the Assistant Head for Teaching and Learning, Mo decides to undertake a practitioner inquiry to help him improve and evaluate his use of questioning in lessons.

To begin, Mo writes two exploratory research questions:

What kinds of questions do I typically ask in lessons?

What kinds of questioning are effective for teachers to use?

Mo's school has video cameras installed in classrooms for professional development purposes so, to answer the first question, Mo decided to film himself teaching a typical lesson and then watch it back with the Assistant Head for Teaching and Learning. (If the technology had not been available, nor a colleague free to observe him, he could instead have trained a pupil to observe him for how he asks questions.) He made a tally of the kinds of questions he asked during the lesson, and brief notes on the way pupils responded to his questioning. He made the following observations:

- Mo asked a total of 23 questions in the lesson
- of these, 17 were to do with classroom management, rather than content – e.g. “Are you OK?”, “Have you got what you need?”, “Do you know what you’re supposed to be doing?”
- when he did ask questions about the content of the lesson, they tended to be closed questions (e.g. “Can you name the three bones in the ankle?” “Who can tell me what the difference is between concentric and eccentric muscle contractions?”)
- of the 6 questions he asked about lesson content, 3 were addressed to the whole class, rather than directing them at particular pupils
- of 3 questions he directed to particular pupils, Mo did not give the pupils much “wait time” – if they paused for more than a second or two, he would ask another pupil in order to maintain the pace of the lesson, and to avoid the pupil feeling

embarrassed if they did not know the answer

- on one occasion, Mo gave the pupils the opportunity to look up and discuss a question before asking them publicly. When he did this, the pupil was able to provide a much more in-depth answer-however, Mo did not ask the pupil to elaborate further on the answer they provided
- during the observation, the Assistant Head for Teaching and Learning noticed that:
 - o boys spoke more than girls in the lesson
 - o 5 pupils did not speak at all, other than to their table partner
 - o of these, 4 were Pupil Premium girls

To answer the second question, Mo spoke informally over lunch to some experienced colleagues in other subjects. He looked back in his Learning Log from Module 3, and re-read the Research and Practice Summaries from weeks 3 and 4, paying particular attention to the example of Christine, teaching metacognitive strategies to her class. Through this, he identified three key ideas he wanted to explore further – direction, elaboration and metacognition. In order to develop a more dynamic, responsive approach to questioning, Mo wrote a plan based around these three key ideas. In particular, he planned the following:

- direction - direct questions at particular pupils, having given them time to prepare and discuss and answer (4n)
- focus on the ‘third turn’ (i.e. what he says in response to a pupil’s answer to a question), asking follow-up questions to encourage pupils to dig deeper in their thinking, and to build on one another’s ideas (5k, 6f)
- ask questions that promote metacognition, asking pupils to reflect on their existing (and emerging) knowledge and understanding, and helping them plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning (4.5, 4l)

What alteration to his approach to questioning might help Mo to stimulate his pupils to think, talk (and write) more in GCSE PE lessons?



Mo's use of direction and elaboration to improve questioning

He printed out a set of prompt questions and left them on his desk, so that he could refer to them at a glance during the lesson if he needed a reminder. (E.g. What if I told you the opposite was true? Why does that answer make sense to you? How do you know? How might you argue against this? Which ideas make the most sense and why?)

Mo understands that questions can be used for many purposes (4.6) therefore, the kinds of questions teachers ask need to be adapted in relation to the purpose of the questioning. As a general guide, Mo creates a list of principles of 'responsive questioning' that he can draw on at different times, to suit the aims of the lesson:

- organise the class into pairs
- when I ask a question, give each pair 2 minutes to discuss it, and to consult their notes / the textbook if need be (4.7, 4n)
- use a class list to make sure I direct at least one question at each pupil at some point in the lesson (direction) (5.3)
- ask a variety of questions: open, closed, content-based, process-based, exploratory, retrieval, checking, linking ideas... (4m)
- where appropriate, give up to 10 seconds of wait time before moving on (e.g. if they haven't had time to prepare an answer in advance) (4n)
- where possible/appropriate, ask pupils to elaborate on their answers on the 'third turn' (elaboration) (6f)
- use the question list to build on each pupil's answer, reframing questions and directing questions to other pupils in the class (5k)
- ask pupils questions that help them see the constituent parts, to encourage them to plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning (metacognition) (4e)

Mentor Meeting Activities

Review and Plan 5 mins

Invite your mentee to read the case studies on this module's topics, or the one or two that are most relevant to their own chosen area of development and the exploratory question they are investigating. As they read, reflect on:

1. how similar this scenario is to their own situation
2. how, despite any differences there may be to their own context, this case study may still be relevant to them
3. what lessons there might be for the way they conduct their own inquiry

Theory to Practice 40 min



1. Analysing artefacts and data

Ask your mentee to share with you the simple evidence statement they wrote following their rapid collection of data on their exploratory inquiry question. They may also share with you the evidence itself (e.g. comments from pupils, or analysis using the school's data management system, or notes on an artefact such a school policy or curriculum plans.)

To guide them, they had two model statements arising from the case studies.

Andy, in Case Study A, said:

'At the start of the year with my Year 1s, I arranged my groups randomly because I did not know them very well. I found in my exploratory inquiry, by talking to my TA, that some pupils were apparently reluctant to work with others because they didn't know them, and others were worried about what the other children might think if they make a mistake with their learning. I realised also that my TA and I were unable to give our pupils the levels of support and challenge they needed. I have decided that I need to build their confidence to work with others, not just their friends. I also need to group them so I can better tailor my support to them.'

Louise, in Case Study C, said:

'I teach 9 different history classes so it can take me up to 10 hours a week to mark their books according to the department policy. I spoke to other teachers in my department and found that they were keeping within their policies but taking other approaches, like whole-class verbal feedback. They also told me about something they called 'minimal marking' whereby the teacher provides feedback in the form of abbreviations and codes, rather than making corrections and writing out 'what went well / even better if' comments in longhand. I definitely need to try methods like these, to see if my pupils can maintain their current progress without me marking so much.'

Your mentee's statement will not be definitive; it is likely that they have used tentative language, such as 'seems to indicate' and 'may suggest'. This is appropriate, but you should now gently probe them to support their statement with evidence. Remember, they were exploring the impact upon pupils of their normal practice. E.g.

- about their normal practice (this might also prompt your mentee to think about how they could introduce an alteration to their practice)
 - standard 4: Give me an example of how you normally try to use modelling, explanations and scaffolds. How sure are you that you have secured foundational content knowledge, before expecting pupils to engage in critical thinking and problem solving? What do your pupils tell you about how effective you are at breaking down tasks into constituent parts before you set up independent practice? How often do you plan (e.g. through scripting) to narrate your thought processes when modelling how experts think?
 - standard 5: What examples of good advice have you had and have you applied from the SENCO or the SEND Code of Practice? What good ways have you found of collaborating with teaching assistants – and how do you know? How often do you adapt textbooks, etc. to use in your lessons, and how often do you invent your own resources? Do your pupils make better progress when collaborating with others, or when working alone? What tells you this?

- standard 6: What does your assessment over time tell you about the patterns of performance of particular pupils? How many seconds do you typically wait between asking a question and allowing an individual pupil to answer it? How much time in lesson – and in what parts of your lesson – do you allow pupils to respond to specific feedback? What difference has your marking of their work made to the progress of particular pupils?
- about the evidence they collected
 - how did you ensure it was reliable? Does the data reflect a true picture for the pupils you were interested in?
 - did you collect enough, but not too much?
- about their (tentative) conclusions
 - were you surprised?
 - did you find out something you did not already know?
- about their next steps
 - does your evidence suggest to you what your next steps might be?



2. Discussion with mentor

It is likely that you will agree with your mentee that there is some useful alteration to their normal practice that they can now make. When discussing these adjustments, you should always refer first to the research within the ECF. The best place to look may be the Research and Practice Summaries across the modules of Year 1. You can navigate to an overview of these summaries in the Glossary. Even better, use the module overviews to locate a particular session material – the summaries and real-teacher examples there offer lots of guidance as to how to make the ECF statements work in practice. Finally, your mentee may have made notes in their Learning Log then that will be useful again now.

For example, returning to our four case studies

<p>To group his pupils more effectively</p> <p>5.5 5n 4o</p>	<p>Considering the factors that support effective collaboration; changing groups regularly; and ensuring that, when based on attainment, they are for subject reasons</p> <p>Look back at what Andy did</p>
<p>To improve her pupils' writing using modelling and scaffolds</p> <p>3r 3s 4a 4c 4d 4g 4i 4p 6k</p>	<p>Giving novice learners more scaffolds and models at early stages; and removing these as they become more confident and successful</p> <p>Look back at what Vashti did</p>
<p>To make her marking more manageable</p> <p>6h 6k 6m 6n 6o 6p</p>	<p>Working with colleagues to discover alternative efficient approaches; using verbal feedback in place of written feedback; and reducing the opportunity costs of marking</p> <p>Look back at what Louise did</p>
<p>To use questioning to stimulate his pupils to think, talk and write more in lessons</p> <p>4m 4n 4e 5k 6f</p>	<p>Including a range of question types; providing enough wait time; reframing questions; and prompting pupils to elaborate</p> <p>Look back at what Mo did</p>



3. Collaborative planning

Finally, you will decide what evidence your mentee would need to collect to tell them that the alteration they had agreed to make to their normal practice had in the end led to improvement. They can collect evidence in a similar way to before. Note that all of the evidence examples below occur naturally: they are easy to get hold of in the normal course of a teacher's day.

Here is a useful way to visualise this:

What I hope to see (e.g.)	How I would know it (e.g.)
Because I have used questioning to stimulate my pupils to think, talk and write more in lessons	Improved progress data (you might see this over time) Pupil work – written work meeting the exam board/ success criteria, and reflecting the more elaborate answers the pupils are able to give verbally Pupil response – all pupils are answering questions, all are able to elaborate upon their answers, more overall involvement and engagement in lessons Pupil voice – ‘I sometimes feel under pressure when asked a direct question, but I know that sir will give me enough time to think’ ‘there is more “talk” in our lessons now; we are expected to justify our answers much more.’
Because my marking is more manageable	Improved – or maintained – progress data (you might see this over time) Pupil work – pupils are expected to correct and improve work in lessons, so there is much better response to feedback

What I hope to see (e.g.)	How I would know it (e.g.)
	<p>Pupil voice – ‘Miss talks to us more in lesson about our work – either to the whole class or individually, and so I have a clearer idea of what I need to do to improve’ ‘The feedback we get now is probably better than when Miss marked everything’</p> <p>Teacher voice – ‘The time I used to spend marking I now spend planning better lessons’ ‘I no longer feel guilty because I have not managed to mark everything my pupils have done’</p>



4. Action planning

Now work with your mentee to create an evaluative inquiry question, that will sustain them for the rest of this module.

Your Practitioner Inquiry Handbook offers these templates for writing your evaluative question:

Template A

To what extent does [teaching strategy], implemented for [duration of intervention], improve [measurable outcomes] among [target pupils]?

Template B:

‘How can I do [teaching strategy] well for [target pupils] so that they improve [measurable outcomes]?’

To help you, here is how the teachers in the 4 case studies framed their evaluative inquiries:

Andy: How can I use group activities over two half-terms to improve the engagement and attainment of my Year 1 pupils?

Vashti: How can I use ‘speaking sentences’ well, over the space of two terms, to reduce the prevalence of basic errors in written literacy among pupils with SpLCN in Year 4?

Louise: How can I implement codes and verbal feedback well, so that my Year 9 History pupils are able to correct misconceptions and make progress, and I am able to reduce the amount of time I spend marking?

Mo: How can I best adapt the way I ask questions, implemented every lesson for one term, to improve the quality and amount of talk among Pupil Premium girls in Y11 GCSE PE?

Your mentee will try to implement this change over the remainder of this module. They need to collect evidence of any impact upon them and their pupils. In two weeks' time, at your next mentor meeting, you will consider whether any adjustments to the inquiry need to be made.

Next Steps 5 mins

Agree with your mentee how they will now put their learning from this week's session into practice in their teaching. Help your mentee to clarify:

1. the action(s) they will take and how these action(s) are expected to contribute to improving pupil learning
2. what success will 'look like' in relation to these action(s)
3. how they will evaluate their success in taking these action(s)