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The International PGCE context

- British teachers’ standards course: awards PGCE (not QTS)
- International school market: 60 countries
- 5000th trainee in 2019-2020
- Target: 650 trainees per year; multiple cohorts
- Team of about 20 tutors
- One assessed teaching practice module (two placements)
- One professional studies modules
- Two MA-level modules
Team Research

• Goal: supporting students
• Process: 100% online
• MA modules:
  • Proposal (10%) – 1000 words
  • Final report (90%) – 4000 words
• Focal area: feedback
  • Written feedback
• Multi-stage research
# Teaching and Learning Toolkit

An accessible summary of the international evidence on teaching 5-11 year-olds

## Filter Toolkit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter results by keywords</th>
<th>Toolkit Strand</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Evidence Strength</th>
<th>Impact (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Metacognition and self-regulation</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Reading comprehension strategies</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Homework (Secondary)</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Mastery learning</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Collaborative learning</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>Early years interventions</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>One to one tuition</td>
<td>££££</td>
<td>🗝️agina3</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download Toolkit

[Image of a website with a user interface for a teaching and learning toolkit.]
Why is this important...for us?...for you?

We are the ‘experts’

• Expert teachers;
• Expert teacher educators;
• Expert academics;
• Expert distance learning tutors;
• Expert at giving feedback;

AREN’T WE?
Back to the literature…

Hattie and Timperley (2007):

1. Power of feedback – **differentially effective** – considerable variability
2. Most powerful when it addresses **faulty interpretations** and when it aims to **move students up** to the next level (e.g. task to processing; specific to general)
3. Can be accepted, modified or rejected (**ignored or not understood?**)
4. Influenced by **difficulty of goals** or tasks: most impact when goals are specific and challenging but task complexity is low
5. H&T’s questions: Where am I going? How am I going? Where next?
6. Must **target feedback** at students at the correct level
7. **Inefficient learners** need **elaboration**
What does the data say?

• Three years of assessment data
• Approximately 1000 students
• Assumptions:
  • Only data from students with at least 35% in formative assessment
  • Working hypothesis is that formative feedback leads to improvements in summative outcomes – is that true? Always?
The big picture

• Paired samples data allowed $t$Test in SPSS to confirm statistical correlation.

• We can confirm that formative and summative marks are **positively correlated** to varying degrees depending on the granularity of the paired samples.

• Taken as 2000 pairs, the correlation is weaker, but drilling down shows stronger correlation and more interesting patterns.
EDPM01 MEAN AVERAGE PER YEAR

**n=1129**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Formative</th>
<th>Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDPM97 MEAN AVERAGE PER YEAR

- FORMATIVE
- SUMMATIVE

n=1104
2015-2016 BAND COMPARISON ACROSS BOTH MODULES

Band1: Formative mean = 72, Summative mean = 62
Band2: Formative mean = 63, Summative mean = 62
Band3: Formative mean = 55, Summative mean = 57
Band4: Formative mean = 42, Summative mean = 51
EDPM01 3-YEAR COMPARISON BY GRADE BAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band1</th>
<th>Band2</th>
<th>Band3</th>
<th>Band4</th>
<th>Band1</th>
<th>Band2</th>
<th>Band3</th>
<th>Band4</th>
<th>Band1</th>
<th>Band2</th>
<th>Band3</th>
<th>Band4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015-2016

2016-2017

2017-2018
EDPM97 3-YEAR COMPARISON BY GRADE BAND

Formative mean | Summative mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band1</td>
<td>Band2</td>
<td>Band3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answers or more questions?

• We know that internal issues such as scale, staffing, CPD and moderation have impacts on grades;
• We know that formative feedback in the 40-49 band (band 4) has the biggest impact on summative outcomes;
• We know that the impact seems to shift to one of grade maintenance rather than extension on middle- to higher-ability students
• What does this mean? Why does this happen? What have we learned?
A model of feedback to enhance learning. Hattie & Timperley (2007)
In summary

• Our data shows that we need to dig more deeply to understand
  • the nature of the students at each band – what variables can we control for?
    What is the ‘diagnosis’?
  • the type and purpose of feedback we give – exploring feedback as a
    continuum – what is the correct ‘treatment’?

• Institutional impacts need to be controlled for:
  • better CPD for staff in relation to the type of feedback required – less ‘gut
    feeling’ and more ‘expertise’?
Next steps

• Stage 2 of our research will be undertaken at the qualitative level – analysis of formative feedback and resulting comments on summative work.

• Stage 3 involves researching the impact of the feedback-feed-forward model, where staff give three bullet points for improvement and students must reflect in the next assignment and show how they have responded to the feedback.
Thank you
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