



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



School and University Partnership for Peer Communities of Learners

Project number:

573660-EPP-1-2016-1-EG-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP (2016-2516/001-001)

Project Monitoring and Evaluation

UoL site visit report (PME10)

University Visited	Alexandria
Dates of Visit	2-3 December 2018
Members of UoL team attending	Andy Atkins Chris Wilkins
Members of host FoE team attending	12 members
Other attendees (EU partners, AUC)	██████████
Focus of visit (related to project sub-objectives)	<p>Report on progress towards Quality Plan:</p> <p>Sub-Objective #1 Sub-Objective #3 Sub-Objective #6</p>
Sources of evidence	<p>Sub-Objective #1 <i>Development of PCLs in FoEs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with AU Lead team (+UoN) • Records of FoE PCL meetings • PME4 & 5 (████ & █████) <p>Sub-Objective #3 <i>Development of PCL culture/practices in PD schools</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with UoN Lead team (+UoN) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion of evidence of reflection in schools/changes in school policy • Baseline assessment data • PCL Surveys • Weekly School visit reports <p>Sub-Objective #6 <i>Develop school mentors in PD schools</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with AU Lead team (+UoN) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion of evidence of mentoring skills being developed ○ Evidence of impact on teaching styles? • Analysis of PCL Surveys • Weekly School visit reports • Discussion of school policies/development planning • Evidence of dissemination of mentor training materials

Progress on Sub-objective #1	<i>Development of PCL in FoE</i>
Indicators of achievement	<i>FoE team demonstrates key characteristics of PCL</i>
Achievement criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared values • Mutual trust • Collaborative/egalitarian climate • Focus on reflection • Policy/practice influenced by PCL culture
Brief outline of evidence collected (for example): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with AU Lead team (+UoN) • PME4 & 5 (█ & █) 	<p>Meeting and discussion with 6 x (AU) colleagues and █ and █ (UoN) Prof Chris Wilkins (UoL) chaired the discussion.</p> <p>Evidence base referred to PME4 & 5 (█ & █), 1AE impact report, Reflective journals, Case Study dimensions (a research design map)</p>
Overview of progress on sub-objective: (narrative summary of outcomes of site visit) <u><i>*specifically, reporting on progress since Baseline Assessment</i></u>	<p>Shared values</p> <p>The values of PCLs have been developed in the FoE and there is good evidence these values is shared by the staff in the PCL. Evidence from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the beginning, understanding the values of a PCL was a little bit tough, things were not clear, one felt a bit of an outsider. There was originally a discussion of the values of PCL, we became closer over time. Values are predominantly implied through action rather explicitly discussed • There has been an improvement in communications. Previously sometimes email and Whatsapp had been used, but there were some misunderstandings as a result. New lines of communication have improved this (including face-to-face, telephone, Facebook). • An example of developing shared values was given: Subgroups lead the discussion in weekly meetings, and feed back and think aloud about ways to do things. e.g how to support PCLs in schools? They try things out in each school, to create differently adapted approaches. There is an increasing confidence in running meetings in that way [overall agreement] • Two new people hadn't worked together with the team before, and had to be inducted into the values of PCL. The PI approached these new people and knew they would have similar values – they had been using the values in their work for years implicitly but now there was a new language and by being included they were more conscious of the values and approaches. Listening to the u/g students one could also hear new language e.g. empowerment • AU have talked regularly about the values with UoN, because every month there is an hour and a half text meeting using private Facebook chat. Frequently there is discussion and summary of where they are with developing PCL values and where they want to go. • Typically, if one reads manuals about PCLs there should be initial understanding of the PCL values at the beginning. Here the values have been built into the PCL as it has developed and the actions have made the values explicit. There has been more talking about values as the PCL has developed. It seems to work. This is a valuable outcome on the case study. This seems to work in the Egyptian context and this model of working might be publishable.

Mutual trust

There is good evidence of increasing mutual trust in the PCL. Ideas about mutual trust were expressed freely in the discussions. There was a good awareness shown that developing mutual trust is a long process and is not something that is done in a systematic way, but done informally. Discussions about learning about communication, leadership, about giving positive feedback and being encouraging to others were held freely and without reserve. Further evidence from the discussion

- “Sometimes we disagree, but we do have to find a way to negotiate ways forward. Some conflicts are inevitable but better awareness of how to solve these”
- “We have to break the barrier between university and teachers. [By being a PCL we can now bring teachers along with us.”
- Checking others work, chatting and showing each other work and checking that it made sense.
- Risk taking in developing PCLs is important.
- People can challenge each other, this doesn't take away from peoples respect for each other.
- I feel more open to work as a team and to working with people from other depts. I can now communicate with people in other depts that I have not done before.
- “Trust has come through commitment, hard work, leadership and working through hard times”

Collaborative/egalitarian climate

Reflections on this were frank and open in the discussion. The following are evidence that there is increasing breaking down of restrictive hierarchical relationships, which would hinder the mentoring process in the PCL and work against the shared values and mutual trust which are characteristic of PCLs.

- There was a bit of stress initially [about hierarchical working] but increasingly the views and ideas of juniors in the dept are respected and being listened to
- It was readily acknowledged that “this is the great challenge, to accept to be mentored and be open to others ideas”.
- We are open to being open and values are being discussed.
- After having differences, we are now supporting each other more
- We don't disregard ideas from any source in the team but discuss them openly.
- “I am part of the decision making process now”
- No one has left the team – if people have not attended a meeting, they receive a quick update on the phone.

Focus on reflection

There is extensive evidence of reflective practices in the PCL. The following were exemplifications of reflective ways of working evidenced in the discussion and in other M&E instruments.

- We have adopted a new practice – regular meetings, which are recorded and outcomes are circulated. [These could be useful case study data]. There is quite a set structure, as the topics are discussed, strictly for one hour. Documents are prepared in advance and are sent with the agenda of the meeting.
- Meeting every week has been very helpful. It was not easy to schedule and some had to give up their own time. The PI was assertive and said this must happen – so brought in Monday meetings.

- We try to avoid the meetings looking like a normal business meeting but use a PCL /reflective dialogic approach/process. It's not always easy, trying to keep some time for PCL business, especially open discussion. Every meeting has to have an agenda, and it is the focus of the agenda ensures the meetings have a PCL flavour. Over time these have been community based and reflective.
- Importantly a compelling PCL case study is in evidence through the reflective journals. Analysis of these has been done (by one person) more than 3 months ago, which evidenced clearly the development of the PCL. Many things changed. Reflective journals have been collected twice, giving up to 12 questionnaires the first collection, with some others to be collected second time round. A presentation has been given within the PCL about this.
- Some of the PME4 will be in soon, which will give further evidence of the development of the PCL. A comparison will be a good indicator of coherence between what is said in the questionnaire and the reflective journal analysis.

Policy/practice influenced by PCL culture

Evidence for Policy/practice change is through discussions with the AU team and other M&E instruments

- We haven't reached other people with the project yet. We might start to work together – a bit slow but the idea is there. There are other professors doing PCLs on their own - this could be brought together.
- The small group working, with feedback to the larger group is evidence of practice change
- There is a "focussed perspective on teaching style change, developing relationships and mutual interdependence".
- "People see that we are progressing."
- Evidence of Policy practice change in Report form Impact 1EA
- The Case Study dimensions – a research design map - is evidence of policy/practice change
- Further evidence of policy/practice change in the case study data
- There are plans to disseminate the project wider.

Other impacts

Leadership

- PI explained that she had developed her leadership skills and styles particularly in asking people to express themselves and ask other people to explain their reasoning for their ideas.
- PI has developed skills in encouraging reflection and developing a PCL type meeting.
- There is evidence that communications are now less formal, which encourages better and more open communication
- "I have been able to learn from everyone else. If I was approached by other dept member now, I would now take a risk to work in this way"

Barriers

- At the beginning there was the hierarchy – there is still some way to go but definite signs of progress there. For example – accepting colleagues work and giving praise.
- Having a place to meet is an issue, as there is a need for some space for meeting and working together.
- "We don't really work with other depts, except at exam time" This might limit the opportunities to expand the PCLs

	JU: This is a self-critical community. It can now influence other PCL communities in the project and elsewhere. There is clarity in the vision for the ongoing development for the PCL.
Agreed current Level of Achievement* <i>0 = no progress</i> <i>5 = objective fully met</i>	4

**to be discussed and agreed by Case Study FoE teams and UoL*

Progress on Sub-objective #3	<i>FoE to develop PD schools with PCL culture/practices</i>
Indicators of achievement	<i>15 PD schools operating with characteristics of PCL</i>
Achievement criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared values • Mutual trust • Collaborative/egalitarian climate • Focus on reflection • Policy/practice influenced by PCL culture
Brief outline of evidence collected (for example):	<p>Interviews with undergraduate focus group (6 present, 4f, 2m). 8 staff watching and interpreting for ■ and A O'S.</p> <p>Meeting with AU Lead team (+UoN) - Discussion with cross-section of the FoE teams working with 5 schools. Reference to Weekly school visit reports, analysis of the case study data, teachers reflections and the analysis of these</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of evidence of reflection in schools/changes in school policy • Baseline assessment data • PCL Surveys • Weekly School visit reports

**Overview of progress on sub-objective:
(narrative summary of outcomes of site visit)**

***specifically, reporting on progress since
Baseline Assessment**

Started with 5 schools, with 2-3 faculty in each PD team – selected largely because of their experience with practicum (this gives them credibility in schools and builds on existing relationship)

- Full range of schools (from kindergarten to secondary)

Initially visits were regular weekly, with a written report on each visit (providing case study date of the 'journey' of PCL development). DE monitored these reports

After March 2018, weekly visits were changed to a more flexible approach (largely subject-based, and focused on needs of each team)

- This is a challenge for FoE team to fit with timetabling, but has been effective

Progress on PCL culture?

- Needs assessment was useful in customising support – a good investment of time

Key findings of Needs Assessment (and early meetings)?

- teachers were dissatisfied with existing CPD
- some scepticism that FoE really wants a genuine partnership
- Culture was individualised...most teachers work outside school doing private tutoring (means teachers may be reluctant to stay outside of school hours)

Initially some resistance to SUP4PCL initiative, for a number of reasons:

- not enough time for meetings
- PCL is another burden rather than support
- Hierarchical approaches to decision-making

In one school teachers had experience of the *Teachers First* scheme – involves some training on Communities of Practice. This was thought to be helpful, because it meant teachers had some knowledge of the principles and language of PCLs

FoE teams worked closely with school to share knowledge of PCL

Set up series of meeting (x 8) -*focused on teachers needs*

- Set targets
- Reflect on learning

In the KG, the introduction of new KG/EY curriculum (Sept 2018) has given them incentive to collaborate

- This was thought to be good evidence of the importance of context-relevant model of TPD

Initially there was a lack of trust...but after a year of regular meetings this is growing

- Some teachers still reluctant to share, but most are more confident (collaborative culture developing?)

Encouraging teachers to record their reflection

- These are signed off by ■ and ■ This is a cultural expectation according to AU colleagues (gives 'status' and evidence of leaders' support for the initiative)

Informal networks are effective

- Whatsapp used to keep the group communication flow (all 5 schools) – also school facebook

	<p>Possible key Case Study finding? There needs to be a blend of both formal and informal communication/recording</p> <p>Some challenge when other FoE are in schools (different understanding of partnership, more 'traditional' power relationships and approach) – perhaps causing confusion and mismatched expectations for teachers?</p> <p>One school resistant because they are a NAQAA 'accredited' school (who weren't sure what they had to learn, but they came round over time). It took some time to overcome that (getting them to think about how they share their outstanding practice)</p> <p>Some change in hierarchical thinking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [redacted] is always invited to PCL meeting to keep them involved and 'on board' - Using these [redacted] to help with the cluster development <p>Shared vision emerging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terminology of PCL being used in schools <p>Cluster model? November 2018 permission for another 10 schools to begin. Severely restricted by need to get permission for access through Directorate (10 months for 1st five, 6 months for 2nd)</p> <p>Policy/practice change? Some teachers asking about Action Research/Lesson Study Inviting supervisors into participate in meetings/training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permission for clusters to work together has now been achieved (currently for life of SUP4PCL, but working for this to be extended)
<p>Agreed current Level of Achievement* 0 = no progress 5 = objective fully met</p>	<p>4 (for the 5 Lead schools already established) Consensus was that it was too early to give meaningful assessment of cluster schools' progress</p>

**to be discussed and agreed by Case Study FoE teams and UoL*

Progress on Sub-objective #6	<i>Develop school mentors in PD schools</i>
Indicators of achievement	<i>25 mentors trained (5 in each Lead School)</i>
Achievement criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mentor skills are enhanced and developed</i> • <i>Reports and surveys evidence coaching and mentoring techniques in practice in schools</i> • <i>School mentors train new mentors in schools</i> • <i>Teaching materials are effectively and sustainably disseminated to teachers in schools</i> • <i>Establishment of sustainable clusters of PD schools</i>
Brief outline of evidence collected	<p>Mostly based on discussion of case study data analysis during meeting with AU Lead team and FoE mentors (+UoN)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion of evidence of mentoring skills being developed ○ Evidence of impact on teaching styles? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCL Surveys • Weekly School visit reports • School policies/development planning • Dissemination of mentor training materials?
<p>Overview of progress on sub-objective: (narrative summary of outcomes of site visit) <i><u>*specifically, reporting on progress since Baseline Assessment</u></i></p>	<p>Mentor skills are enhanced and developed</p> <p>No guarantee that the mentors will stay in schools. Some mentors have been lost, or some replaced.</p> <p>School 1 – 4 mentors, 1 lost (moved to another school) School 2 – 5 mentors, 1 of these replaced School 3 – 5 mentors, 1 has been lost and replaced School 4 – 5 mentors School 5 – 5 mentors (one lost in last 3 months, gone abroad) 95% retention rate</p> <p>The starting level point was maybe 2-3 teachers working as “mentors”.</p> <p>They don’t know the word “mentoring” but they would have been doing some aspects of it. However they tend to do training, rather than mentoring.</p> <p>Now they are aware of the steps of mentoring but yet still do training. It is challenging to correct this [general agreement].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the work of the PCL the understanding of mentoring has seen a big shift. But the skills and practice are still developing. <p>One school: They have an experienced teacher who has been trained by MoE, not really mentoring others, but has a role working with teachers, who monitors lesson plans with reports to headteacher. – not mentoring.</p> <p>Mentor selection</p> <p>They have had to ask the principals to select mentors and so it wasn’t not done in the right way, where there was no clear criteria for selecting mentors.</p> <p>This gets the principal’s buy-in but mentors with the effective attributes were not really chosen. Therefore the rest of the teachers did not feel it was a clear</p>

process. Principals selected people who they trusted, even though some people did not act as mentors. Some replacements were then selected.

Principals were then more amenable to using different criteria to select mentors – however mentor selection had to be done through the principals.

There is a strong and persistent belief that the only (or main) criteria for selecting mentors is experience/seniority.

- Cadre for teachers (hierarchy for teachers). Expectation is that these are responsible for 'supervision' of teachers, but they describe this as mentoring. Mentors were selected from the Cadre teachers.
- However, general agreement that getting criteria for selection right is vital to try and shift this belief.

Question of scale, selecting 5 mentors from a small cohort, is different to a large staff body. A suggestion that it would be more appropriate/effective to select a percentage of the teacher cohort, rather than a fixed number.

Hierarchical culture is still strong, where leaders assume expertise. In the main the hierarchy idea still exists

- We need examples of junior mentors who are effective (so seeing mentoring as an authentic activity, not just something done for formal accreditation)
- We also need to show recognition of passion. – this would be effective for mentoring.
- *In FoE PCL we do have professors consulting less experienced colleagues but this idea has not been taken up by schools yet.*

However, some progress is being made – lots of the PD school mentors are junior teachers (all of the 5 SD mentors in one school). This is a big achievement

Key points

1. Leadership buy-in – really important.
2. Selecting people on experience, or being an expert teacher, is not the only prerequisite for being a mentor.

Reports and surveys evidence coaching and mentoring techniques in practice in schools

- Some FoE school visit report record training
- Surveys have not been used for schools, instead they have used qualitative data collection. Impact 1EA could be used with teachers, to record coaching and mentoring practices. This could also be recorded in weekly evidence reports.

Some mentors have made records, where there is informal mentorship between teachers, e.g. Technology teacher, English teacher.

Concept of mentorship has been introduced by FoE. Idea has been established, the mentors have been given responsibility to use this. Progress is starting to be evident. Some meetings here in Faculty. Time is a factor.

School mentors train new mentors in schools

	<p>This will happen very soon, as a result of the summer training. Shared materials and resources, now for the 5 schools to take over. We will start something in the midterm holiday UoN and UoL will revisit this in subsequent visits</p> <p>Teaching materials are effectively and sustainably disseminated to teachers in schools</p> <p>When FoE go back into schools they will find out whether dissemination is happening (in February). Mentors will be giving training through QA unit. Knowledge exchange is the focus. Some mentors are developing own training to develop mentoring. What is the point of “materials” for mentoring? Reflected as a development of the project. Maybe as they go into the cluster model further, there may be a need for materials</p> <p>Egyptian Knowledge bank (EKB) – does this come out in the case study. Could be revisited in future visits. Schools can’t have access to some of the online resources. Many schools don’t have the facilities – this would be worth following up on.</p> <p>Establishment of sustainable clusters of PD schools No judgement possible yet</p>
<p>Agreed current Level of Achievement* 0 = no progress 5 = objective fully met</p>	<p>In terms of skills, techniques and materials 3 – some progress</p> <p>In terms of training new mentors through the clusters 1 – too early to see real evidence of change</p> <p>Looking at the <u>values</u> of mentoring is not part of this assessment, but it would be a strength (4+)</p>

**to be discussed and agreed by Case Study FoE teams and UoL*