



Hounslow Education Partnership

Develop your A level Teaching

Evaluation 2022/23

Meeting 1 - Wednesday 23rd November 2022 - held in person across various HEP schools

Keynote: A reflection on the 2022 A level exam season, what were the trends locally/nationally in results and what are the challenges ahead for 2023. It also included strategies used at Chiswick to boost results.

Pre task: Teachers were asked to submit 3 slides, using recalled exam papers from the summer exam season, focussed on:

- Where did students fall down and what were the misconceptions evident?
- How does this impact my teaching moving forward and what will I do differently?

Subject breakout: Groups reflected on their students' results from the summer and the keynote content. They then presented their slides completed as a pre task and discussed next steps.

Feedback form (completed by 74 delegates, 52% of those who attended)

	% Agree & Strongly Agree
Keynote	
The keynote was applicable and relevant to my teaching	60.3%
Subject breakouts	
The discussions were productive and collaborative	83.6%
I have clear actions I can take forward to incorporate in my lessons	76.7%
The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was valuable	83.6%

Suggestions/improvements for future DAT meetings suggested by delegates were:

While one delegate questioned the meeting being delivered in person, *'The location was hard to get to and get home from, I was in the car for as long as I was there!'* others felt, *'The return to an in-person, face-to-face meeting was welcomed'* or requested that future meetings also be in person.

The nature of the pre-task was appreciated, *'I thought the presentation aspect worked well having people prepare for the meeting'* and HEP noted, from a DAT wide perspective, was really well engaged with. In future meetings, teachers want to focus less on 'what went wrong' and more on next steps *'show a resource that you will use to close the gap'*. Or breaking down the groups further, *'Smaller groups would give a chance for all members to have more meaningful discussion'* *'Fewer people presenting/fewer slides, more chance for discussion of fewer ideas.'*

'If the STEM Learning collaboration is to be effective, facilitators MUST have engaged with the purpose of HEP as improvement for A LEVEL teaching.' There were a number of similar comments relating to STEM led groups. As a result we moved back to a HEP facilitated model for Biology and Chemistry for meeting 3 onwards.

Who attends the meetings, and the need for there to be a mix of experience 'around the table':

'As a very experienced A-Level teacher I felt that it was left to the teachers to discuss, but since most of them were new and developing their teaching of A-Level they would and should have had more help and direction with this, I was trying to do that on my table, which from feedback from them were grateful of'

Attendance by subject:

	Expected	Attended
English	20	18
Maths	29	25
Biology	20	19
Chemistry	16	13
Physics	16	14
Geography	14	13
History	17	16
French	10	10
Spanish	5	5
Economics	10	7
Politics	5	5
	162	145 (89.5%)

Apologies for absence sent in advance by 8 teachers, 4.9% of teachers who did not attend.

Meeting 2 - various rescheduled dates from Wednesday 22nd February

This meeting was focussed solely on subject knowledge enhancement (as requested within delegate feedback from 21/22). As such there was no pre recorded keynote used across all subjects, pre task or a common breakout agenda. Some subjects had access to pre-recorded webinars (English, Politics & History), some joined externally delivered training (Economics & Geography) and some were delivered live by an external speaker. As such collating attendance data for all subjects was not possible. Naturally due to the date changes, attendance at those sessions that were delivered live was impacted.

Attendance by subjects that were delivered live:

	Expected	Attended
Maths	28	14
Biology	24	9
Chemistry	17	12
Physics	17	5
MFL	15	12

Feedback forms:

History: The webinar from the Historical Association was so well received the group asked for further webinars to be made available.

Physics: Four evaluation forms completed, all agreed or strongly agreed the session was 'useful and effective for my professional development' and that they had 'clear actions I can take forward and incorporate in my lessons'.

Biology: Two evaluation forms completed, one rated all questions 'strongly agree' and the other 'strongly disagree'.

Chemistry: Four evaluation forms completed, half agreed that they had 'clear actions I can take forward and incorporate in my lessons'.

Maths: Six evaluation forms completed, more than half stated that they were neutral/disagreed/strongly disagreed that the session was 'useful and effective for my professional development' and that they had 'clear actions I can take forward and incorporate in my lessons'.

MFL: 10 evaluation forms completed, equal proportions agreed/strongly agreed and disagreed/strongly disagreed that 'Overall the session was effective and useful for my professional development'.

Given the low completion of evaluation forms rate vs. number attending and varied feedback on those that were, HEP will not be booking these speakers again (with the exception of Physics STEM Facilitator).

Meeting 3 - Wednesday 22nd March 2023 - held online

Keynote: A compilation of revision tips and strategies from HEP expert practitioners across a variety of subjects with a view that they should be adaptable.

Pre task: Delegates were asked to share a revision strategy/resource they had made (rather than a website) so they could be adapted to other topics.

Subject breakout: Reflections on the keynote, which revision tips could be adapted to where in the specification, post mock analysis, sharing of best practice revision strategies from the pre task.

Feedback forms (completed by 52 delegates, 47% of those who attended):

	% Agree & Strongly Agree
Keynote	
The keynote was applicable and relevant to my teaching	78.8%
I have more revision strategies and techniques I can use	80.8%
Subject breakouts	
The discussions were productive and collaborative	90.4%
I have clear actions I can take forward to incorporate in my lessons	88.5%
The opportunity to discuss with colleagues was valuable	92.3%
The online logistics met my expectations	92.3%

Attendance by subject:

	Expected	Attended
Maths	28	17
English	23	14
Biology	24	16
Chemistry	17	6
Physics	17	12
Geography	15	10
History	17	11
MFL	17	11
Economics	11	7

Politics	6	6
	175	110 (62.9%)

Apologies for absence sent in advance by 18.3% of delegates who did not attend.

Suggestions/improvements for future DAT meetings suggested by delegates were:

Engagement and input was highlighted as an issue by many:

- *'It's tough to facilitate good quality collaboration and the sharing of best practice when so many people are missing from the call. We ended up having good discussions but it meant that there had to be a lot more input as a facilitator.'*
- *'Very few schools were present so there weren't many ideas shared'*
- *'These sessions work best when everyone turns up'*

In conjunction with this, there were also comments about teaming up with others that use the same exam board, which would be more possible with greater numbers attending.

While one delegate preferred the ease of an online meeting, many felt that there would be greater accountability if the meeting was held in person:

- *In person would have been good to make it feel more collaborative*
- *As a facilitator I find in person works better as a number of my group did not have working cameras or microphones today.*
- *Having these online makes it extremely difficult to have discussions. The facilitator makes every attempt to encourage discussion however those who are present are not responsive.*
- *More insistence on 'cameras on' for more participation from other schools. Continue to cold call those who are not participating to increase participation and share best practice.*

'The meeting is too long and too often.' Given attendance and engagement with the pre-task dwindled from meeting 1 to meeting 3, should the calendaring of 3 meetings across terms 1 and 2 be reconsidered? Would a summer term meeting, once papers have been sat, be more powerful in terms of planning for the following academic year?

There were comments relating to the pedagogical, evidence based approach of DAT in previous years and the deviation from that this year making the meetings less effective *'The keynote is most useful when it is based upon education research that is generally applicable to teaching'*.

Idea moving forward, either for inclusion in DAT or as a separate resource:

'More input from those who have acted as A level examiners would be invaluable.'

To be raised at SLTL in May, HEP would like to collate a bank of examiners (both A level and GCSE) and ask each to create a short recording following exam season. This would focus on what those teachers intend to do differently as a result of having read multiple answers to the same question.

- How did the experience change your outlook on how you teach that topic?
- How will you set tasks up differently?
- How will they address misconceptions that were clear from the student answers they repeatedly marked as incorrect?

This strategy was used within the DAT Politics group as a result of the date change for the February meeting. The facilitator, having examined in summer 2022, kindly offered to record his reflections and next steps in lieu of meeting. His 20 minute recording was well received by the group and served as a stimulus for resource sharing and their discussions in the March meeting.