Teaching A-level pupils "skills for learning"

An evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching "skills for learning" to enable lower prior attaining A-level pupils to make good progress

Dr E Lockley, P Newman, V Rundle-Brown

Ashby School

September 2020

About IEE Innovation Evaluation Grants

The first four IEE Innovation Evaluation Grants were awarded in February 2017. Funded by the Institute for Effective Education (IEE), these grants supported pilot evaluations of innovations of teaching and learning approaches based on the Research Schools Network's goal of improving the attainment of pupils by increasing the use of evidence-based practices. Since then a further 26 projects have been successful in their application for an IEE Innovation Evaluation Grant, bringing the total number to 30. The applications we received included a wide range of interesting, school-led innovations – from after-school film clubs to improve the creative writing of Year 5 pupils, to the use of audio feedback with Year 12 pupils – and we were really impressed with the thought that applicants had put into how these innovations could be evaluated. The evaluations are small-scale, and test the kinds of innovations that schools are interested in. This is very much a "bottom-up" exercise, allowing schools to get some indicative evidence behind real-world initiatives. Many evaluations are now coming to an end, and we are starting to publish reports on the findings. It is important remember that these are small-scale projects, often carried out in one school, so it is not possible to generalise their findings. In fact, the main benefit of the Innovation Evaluation projects may be in the process, rather than the findings.

Contents

Executive summary

Pupils progressing to A-level studies at our school with relatively low prior attainment (GCSE APS 40–46) make significantly lower progress at A-level than their higher prior-attaining peers and achieve poorer outcomes than similar pupils nationally. We believe that this disparity arises as these low prior-attaining pupils struggle to adapt to the rigours of the more independent, self-motivated study required for success at A-level. During their GCSE courses, these pupils receive more teacher support and targeted intervention than their higher-attaining counterparts. This enables them to be successful at GCSE and therefore meet the entry requirements for A-level studies at sixth form. However, we believe that this extra support during GCSEs may have a negative impact on the evolution of the pupils into independent learners and the development of the study skills required to be successful at A-level.

Description of the innovation

This innovation strives to teach these pupils the non-subject-specific 'skills for learning' required to be successful at A-level if used consistently. The intervention was implemented in a controlled manner to allow for the quantitative assessment of any impacts on attainment and progress. Participating pupils took part in a launch day which included a motivational speaker from outside the school. They were then taught non-subject-specific 'skills for learning' required to be successful at A-level, in nine after-school twilight sessions delivered by lead teachers. The pupils also attended fortnightly mentoring sessions with a high-attaining Year 13 pupil.

Summary of the evaluation

Ashby School is an age 14–18 school with approximately 1,700 pupils. There are approximately 600 pupils in our sixth form. Two cohorts of Year 12 pupils were selected to participate in the innovation. All pupils selected had a GCSE prior-attainment score of APS 40–46. They were paired in terms of GCSE attainment (APS score) and choice of A-level subjects, and then split randomly to ensure that the cohorts were balanced and therefore comparable. Cohort 1 received the innovation in the autumn term and cohort 2 received the same innovation in the spring term. Progress was assessed for each pupil at various internal data collection points and then analysed to produce an ALPS score (see https://alps.education) for the cohort for direct comparison.

Summary of findings

The results do appear to show a slight improvement in ALPS grade at the spring assessment for the cohort receiving the innovation (cohort 1), suggesting that the innovation may have been successful in improving progress. However, with the relatively small sample size, this small improvement is not statistically significant, preventing us from drawing any firm conclusions.

Similarly, the fact that cohort 2 had a lower ALPS score than cohort 1 at the spring assessment, but following their intervention, at the summer assessment point, had an ALPS score above cohort 1 is encouraging. This suggests that the innovation may have been effective and may also be more efficacious when delivered during the second term of an A-level course. However, these differences are not statistically significant precluding the drawing of firm conclusions.

Overall, the results are mildly encouraging suggesting that the innovation may have had a positive impact on pupils' progress. However, the improvements are not as large as was hoped, and too small to be statistically significant and allow us to draw firm conclusions from this relatively small sample size.

Introduction

The problem

Throughout GCSE courses many pupils receive high levels of teacher support and intervention. To be successful at A-level, pupils are required to be far more self-motivated and independent in their learning, as a large proportion of their study time is unsupervised. Pupils progressing to A-level studies at our school with relatively low prior-attainment (GCSE APS 40–46[1]) make significantly less progress than their high prior-attaining peers and achieve poorer outcomes than similar pupils nationally. We believe that this disparity arises as these low prior-attaining pupils struggle to adapt to the rigours of the more independent, self-motivated study required for success at A-level. During their GCSE courses, pupils targeting grades around the 'standard pass' grade of a 4, receive a disproportionately high level of support and targeted intervention when compared with their higher attaining counterparts. This enables them to be successful at GCSE and therefore meet the entry requirements for A-level studies at sixth form. However, we believe that this extra support during GCSEs may have a negative impact on the evolution of the pupils as independent learners and the development of the study skills required to be successful at A-level. Currently sixth-form pupils are not routinely offered support in developing these non-subject-specific 'skills for learning'. We believe that in order for all sixth-form pupils to be successful, they need to possess these skills. We believe that failure of lower prior-attaining pupils to develop these skills during their GCSE studies may be a significant factor in their relatively poor progress and attainment at A-level.

Review of existing research

Much of the research literature available focuses on the transition from primary to secondary school and sixth form to higher education institutions. Common themes include: social difficulties (particularly when moving between different institutions), personal issues (including day-to-day organisation, travel and funding) and academic issues.

Numerous authors report that pupils find the transition from Year 11 to Year 12 more difficult than they anticipated (for example, Hope 2007 and Nash et al 2015). A number of school-based action research projects have investigated how academic issues contribute to the difficulties that Year 12 pupils experience. The authors frequently cite a lack of effective study skills, poor ability to self-evaluate and failure to become an independent learner as key obstacles to pupil progress at A-level. A typical example of these reports is the work of Robert Butroyd at Heckmondwike Grammar School (University of Huddersfield repository). Butroyd observed that high prior-attaining pupils clearly recognise the importance of developing a range of study skills in Year 12 and these pupils quickly develop proficiency in areas such as independent research, analysis and critical thinking. Meanwhile low and middle prior-attaining pupils appear to lack awareness of the importance of study skills and tend to attribute success to other factors such as motivation and interest in the subject.

The wealth of literature that identifies development of study skills with success at A-level frequently recommends that these skills are specifically taught as part of an induction, or ongoing programme (an example is Hodgson and Spours, 2014). However, there is little

---

[1] The APS score is an average QCA (Qualification Curriculum Agency) score calculated based on pupil performance at GCSE. Under the QCA model GCSE grades were assigned points (A*=58 points, A=52 points, B=46 points, C=40 points, D=34 points, E=28 points, F=22 points, G=16 points). The QCA APS score is calculated by taking an average of each individuals GCSE results.

published quantitative evidence that such programmes have a measurable impact on outcomes or how large that impact may be. This lack of quantitative data from controlled studies makes it hard to justify investment in such programmes.

For our pilot study (2016–2017) we selected 37 Year 13 pupils who were struggling with the rigours of academic A-level study. After an initial launch, pupils were allocated a staff mentor to meet with regularly. They were then allocated workshops to attend based on their identified areas of weakness. The workshops included 'skills for learning' such as organisation, revision and growth mindset. The pilot study proved inconclusive. Some pupils reported that they felt that they had benefited from the programme, however some of these pupils still made poor progress. We did, however, learn that this type of intervention can be well received when sessions are high quality, when mentoring is regular and when the pupil's attendance at the sessions is good. We used this information to carefully plan our innovation.

Innovation overview

Once the pupils were identified and split into two cohorts we carried out the innovation twice; cohort 1 received the innovation in the autumn term and cohort 2 received the innovation in the spring term.

Each innovation consisted of the following:

- a one-day inspiration launch conference (to include two workshops, an outside speaker and lunch)
- nine twilight workshops delivered by lead teachers after school (focusing on the 'skills for learning' that we had identified as important)
- fortnightly mentoring with a high attaining Year 13 pupil.

Each workshop was evaluated by the pupils and then a more in-depth evaluation was completed at the end of the innovation to gain their thoughts on the overall programme. Year 13 pupils involved in the mentoring were given training ahead of their first meeting delivered by our director of teaching and learning. They were also given the opportunity to meet the Year 12 pupil(s) that they would be mentoring at the launch conference.

Research questions

1. Can the progress of Year 12 A-level pupils with a GCSE APS of between 40–46 be significantly improved by providing an intervention over a term that is focused on teaching the pupils skills for learning and providing mentoring to support the transition from GCSE to A-level?
2. Does the intervention have more impact if delivered during the autumn term or the spring term of Year 12?

Method

Description of the school and pupils

Ashby School, formerly known as Ashby Grammar School, is a co-educational, non-selective day and boys' boarding, upper school, with academy status in Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire. The school is in the centre of Ashby on two sites. At the time of the study 3.8% of pupils had English as an additional language (EAL) (compared with 16.1% nationally), and 12.3% of pupils were in receipt of the Pupil Premium grant (compared with 29.1% nationally).

A letter from Ofsted following a short inspection in April 2018 stated the following:

- outcomes in our sixth form are just above the national average
- quality of teaching seen by inspectors was consistently good
- pupils make good progress and are well prepared for their next steps in education, employment or training
- you need to build further upon the success of the sixth form by focusing on improving progress outcomes for pupils with lower prior-attainment on entry.

The criterion used for selection of pupils in the study was that they should have a GCSE average point score (APS) between 40–46. In total 59 pupils were selected who had GCSE APS ranging from 42.64 to 44.86. The gender split was 29 males and 30 females. All pupils attended the one-day inspiration launch conference but, disappointingly, for a variety of reasons several pupils then withdrew from the innovation. In the final sample cohort 1 contained 19 pupils (7 males and 12 females). Cohort 2 contained 17 pupils (6 males and 11 females). More males than females withdrew from the innovation.

Assignment to condition

The 59 participating pupils were sorted in order by their GCSE ALPS score of 42.64 to 44.86. They were then paired to those of similar GCSE attainment based on APS. To ensure that the cohorts were evenly balanced and therefore directly comparable, one pupil from the pair was put into cohort 1 and the other was put into cohort 2 on a random basis.

Description of the innovation

At the start of the autumn term all pupils in cohort 1 were invited to attend a meeting during registration. During this meeting they were given a brief overview of the innovation and a letter to take home to parents explaining the innovation and inviting the pupil to attend the launch day the week after.

The one-day inspirational launch conference consisted of the following:

- a more in-depth introduction, rationale and contents of the innovation
- pupils were provided with a resources folder containing a detailed log book to support them throughout the innovation
- a workshop on 'getting organised' led by our lead practitioner
- a workshop on 'brain training' led by our director of teaching and learning
- a motivational session on 'developing independence' delivered by an external speaker; Dave Keeling from Independent Thinking
- opportunity to meet their Year 13 mentor and arrange a regular meeting
- a buffet lunch.

Following the launch conference, pupils attended a series of nine weekly twilight sessions (see table 1 below) delivered by our lead teachers. Each one had been carefully prepared to develop a non-subject-specific 'skill for learning' that we felt would help pupils to improve progress across all of their subjects.

TABLE 1: TITLES OF TWILIGHT SESSIONS

Using study periods effectively
Literacy – reading / exam paper focus
Staying positive / Growth mindset (session 1)
Health and wellbeing / Dealing with stress
Staying positive / Growth mindset (session 2)
Literacy – writing focus
Literacy – speaking focus
Revision advice
Building a portfolio / CV

Attendance at these sessions was monitored rigorously and the parents of any pupils who failed to attend were contacted immediately to ensure that they didn't miss any further sessions.

Pupils met with their Year 13 mentor on a fortnightly basis. The Year 13 mentors had been carefully selected from our high-achievers programme. The high-achievers programme is based on having obtained an APS of 52–58. They were then matched to a Year 12 pupil who we felt they would work with effectively. Training from our director of teaching and learning was given to all mentors and they were given a structure to follow to minimise inconsistencies across the cohort.

A brief evaluation was completed by all pupils following every session to capture the pupils' initial perception of its effectiveness in supporting them. At the end of the innovation, pupils completed a more detailed evaluation to assess their perception of the overall impact.

The whole innovation and evaluation process was repeated in exactly the same way for cohort 2 during the spring term. In total there were 16 mentors.

Length and duration

The innovation for cohort 1 ran for 13 weeks in the autumn term (from mid-September to mid-December 2017). The innovation for cohort 2 ran for 13 weeks in the spring term (from mid-January to mid-April 2018).

Each twilight session lasted one hour and was delivered by one of our lead teachers. They were given time to research developments in that particular field and put together an effective session. All sessions were checked by the director of teaching and learning and her lead practitioner team prior to delivery.

Training, ongoing support and educational resources

Prior to the innovation, the lead teachers involved in delivery met to plan and prepare the innovation. The content and sequence of sessions was discussed and agreed. Following this meeting the lead teachers were then given the time out of class and resources required to ensure they had planned a high-quality session based on the latest research in each topic area.

The Year 13 mentors were given two training sessions on mentoring and coaching by our director of teaching and learning, one at the start of the autumn innovation, and one at the start of the spring innovation.

Control group

During the planning of the innovation, senior leaders within school were uneasy about providing an extensive support package to one cohort of pupils but denying it to another cohort so they could act as a control group. Therefore the innovations were carefully planned so that the two cohorts could effectively act as each other's control while enabling all qualifying pupils to receive the innovation. Our selection process ensured that both cohorts were evenly matched prior to the innovation. Cohort 1 received the innovation during the autumn term, the initial assessment point was during January, prior to cohort 2 receiving the innovation. Therefore, cohort 2 acted as the control for cohort 1's innovation at this point, to demonstrate whether the innovation had a significant impact on pupils' progress. Cohort 2 then received the innovation during the spring term. No additional mentoring with cohort 1 occurred during the spring term. The final assessment point was at the end of the summer term so direct comparison of the two cohorts at this stage could indicate if the timing of such an innovation had any impact on pupils' progress.

Outcome measures

Based on GCSE results, pupils are assigned a target grade by ALPS[2] (national benchmarking organisation, details of which can be found at https://alps.education). A school-wide formal assessment takes place for all Year 12 pupils at the start of the spring term and towards the end of the summer term. In these assessments staff are asked to give the pupils a current working-at grade based on the following statement: *"If the pupil continues to work to the same standard and manner as now and show the same commitment and effort for the rest of the course this is the grade they are most likely to achieve".* Although there is variation across subjects most subjects use formal summative assessment through rigorous testing to come to conclusions about these current grades. Where this is less applicable subjects may use assessments of coursework, homework and portfolios to come to conclusions. Teachers making the assessments were blind to which pupils were taking part in the innovation thereby helping to ensure objectivity. At both assessment points ALPS scores were generated for each cohort and these can be compared to evaluate the effectiveness of the innovation and answer the research questions.

Process evaluation through pupil survey

Following every twilight session pupils were asked to answer nine simple questions using Survey Monkey (see Appendix 1). Pupils also completed a questionnaire at the end of the intervention (see Appendix 2).

Outcomes: data analysis methods

Initially we compared our measure of pupil progress (ALPS scores https://alps.education) for both cohorts at the spring assessment point. We looked to identify any statistically significant

---

[2] ALPS target grades at A-level are generated from the complete national data base and are based on correlations between performance at GCSE and subsequent performance at A-level. Individual pupil target grades are calculated based on the performance of pupils at the 75th percentile (ie top 25%) for their particular prior attainment.

differences between the two cohorts using a t-test. Because the two cohorts were so well matched we were also able to compare the progress of the two groups. This showed us whether the timing of the innovation was a critical factor.

In summary with our data analysis we wanted to:

- quantify the size of the effect of the intervention
- establish if the timing of the intervention was important.

Cost analysis

External motivational speaker	£2,000
Consumables	£ 750
Cover costs for teachers, planning sessions, meetings, delivering sessions	£2,250
Total	**£5,000**

Results

Outcome findings

A preliminary analysis of pupil performance was carried out using ALPS. This compared the average total expected UCAS points for the cohort with the grades predicted by their teachers in the spring and summer of 2018 (using the 75th percentile for progress benchmark, please refer to https://alps.education). These expected UCAS scores are produced with respect to both subject point scores and pupil point scores. Had every pupil achieved their predicted grades, a score of 1 would result from this analysis.

TABLE 2: ALPS ANALYSIS FOR COHORT 1 (AUTUMN INTERVENTION) GROUP (N = 19)

	ALPS score
Expected UCAS points compared with grades predicted by teachers in spring	0.84
Expected UCAS points compared with grades predicted by teachers in summer	0.84

TABLE 3: ALPS ANALYSIS FOR COHORT 2 (SPRING INTERVENTION) GROUP (N = 17)

	ALPS score
Expected UCAS points compared with grades predicted by teachers in spring	0.82
Expected UCAS points compared with grades predicted by teachers in summer	0.87

As can be seen from Tables 2 and 3, the ALPS score for cohort 1 (0.84) was slightly higher than for cohort 2 (0.82) at the spring assessment point. However, subsequent statistical analysis (t-test) showed that, with this small sample size, the difference is not statistically significant. Please refer to table 4 for p-values.

The results for cohort 1 remained the same (0.84) at the summer assessment point indicating no further improvement.

As can be seen in Table 3, the results for cohort 2 show an improvement between the spring and summer assessment of 0.82 to 0.87. However, statistical analysis (t-test) again showed that this improvement is not statistically significant (p=0.93).

Comparing the summer assessments for the two cohorts, the ALPS score for cohort 2 (0.87) is slightly higher than for cohort 1 (0.84). However, statistical analysis has shown that this difference is not statistically significant.

	Cohort 1 (autumn intervention group, n = 19)	Cohort 2 (spring intervention group, n = 17)
P-value spring vs summer predicted grades	0.83	0.93

Process evaluation findings

Responses to pupil questionnaires showed that 80% of pupils from cohort 2 believed the programme had helped them make progress in Year 12 compared to 39% from Cohort 1. Although 55% of cohort 1 said they would take part in the programme again compared to 46% from cohort 2.

The session the pupils reported enjoying the most was the external speaker. To quote participants it was "something completely different" and "added some humour to the whole process". Pupils reported enjoying being spoken to about life by somebody other than a teacher. 89% from cohort 1 rated this session as either excellent or good compared to 66% from cohort 2.

Cohort 1 rated four other sessions similarly to each other. These were: Getting organised; Brain training, Staying positive and Health and well-being. One pupil comment stated that the school should focus more on pupil mental health because "it is a lot easier to work when in a happy mindset".

Cohort 2 found Brain training and Getting organised the best sessions.

There was no one session that the pupils reported finding the least helpful, but there were some sessions in which attendance was lower. For example 73% of cohort 2 failed to attend or comment on the Health and well-being session, compared to 77% of cohort 1 who rated it as a good/excellent session.

However, comments received about the intervention included that some of the topics were repetitive; pupils felt patronised and were left feeling stupid; and there was not enough opportunity to be reflective. Pupils also suggested that having sessions scheduled for different times of the week rather than having to commit to one specific day would have helped.

Reasons pupils gave for not attending sessions included being ill, doctor/dentist appointments, work commitments, school trips, forgetting the sessions were weekly and dropping out of the programme altogether.

More pupils from cohort 2 than from cohort one failed to attend sessions. The session that was least attended, for both cohorts, was "Building a portfolio".

The pupils who dropped out of the programme were not directly asked why they had done so.

The top three aspects of the programme that pupils reported liking/finding effective were: the external speaker; that the teachers were engaging and the meetings with their Year 13 mentors.

The top three aspects of the programme that pupils reported they would have changed were: more interactivity/energy within the sessions - maybe in the form of role play or activities, (a

number of pupils felt they were being talked at too much); a greater variety of staff running the sessions and that the mentors could have been better matched in relation to their subjects.

Mentor contact appeared to have been more successful with cohort 2. 33% of cohort 1 didn't meet their mentor, 33% met their mentor once and 16% met with their mentor four times or more. 20% of cohort 2 didn't meet their mentor, 13% met their mentor once and 40% met with their mentor four or more times. Reasons for not meeting mentors included illness on either side, dropping out of the programme before a mentor was assigned, or the mentor didn't turn up as arranged.

The majority of pupils who did meet their mentor agreed that they were easy to talk to, well prepared for the meeting, genuinely interested and gave good advice/support that they subsequently used, particularly when it came to revision tips. Those pupils who disagreed had mentors who were studying different subjects and reported that they struggled to find commonalities.

Some pupils have reported that since participating in the programme they can now manage their time more efficiently by prioritising and organising, they make better use of the library, it has given them a new perspective towards learning and that it has made them more motivated to work.

Although observations were made throughout the sessions no notes were made because they were of an informal nature. No concerns were raised by observers.

Discussion/Conclusion

The results do appear to show a slight improvement in ALPS grade at the spring assessment for the cohort receiving the innovation (cohort 1), suggesting that the innovation may have been successful in improving progress. However, we were hoping for improvements of the order of 0.1 in the overall ALPs grade of the cohort whereas the improvement was only 0.02. With the relatively small sample size, this small improvement is not statistically significant, preventing us from drawing any firm conclusions.

Similarly, the fact that cohort 2 had a lower ALPS score than cohort 1 at the spring assessment, but following their intervention, at the summer assessment point, had an ALPS score above cohort 1 is encouraging. This suggests that the innovation may have been effective and also that the innovation may be more efficacious when delivered during the second term of an A-level course. However, again we were hoping for improvements of the order of 0.1 in the ALPS score for the cohort, whereas the improvement was only 0.05. These differences are not statistically significant precluding the drawing of firm conclusions.

Overall, the results are mildly encouraging suggesting that the innovation may have had a positive impact on pupils' progress. However, the improvements are not as large as was hoped, and too small to be statistically significant and allow us to draw firm conclusions from this relatively small sample size.

Limitations

We are aware that we have used a fairly small sample of pupils and that they are all from one school.

Some pupils in cohort 1 struggled to fully engage with the innovation as they felt like they were being told they were going to fail before they had even begun. There were some parents who were not supportive of the innovation and this made it hard to motivate the pupils to fully engage with and attend all sessions. Some pupils were simply reluctant to embrace the opportunity. Quite often they cited a lack of time due to other commitments. Finally, many of the pupils selected had poor organisation skills and so struggled to remember to attend both the twilight sessions and the mentoring meetings.

As a result of this attendance to both the after school twilight sessions and the mentoring meetings was not as high as we had hoped. This could have influenced the final results. On reflection, it appears that the delivery of the innovation as a predominantly after-school activity for a targeted minority of pupils may have had a detrimental impact on the engagement of the pupils. We are considering experimenting with delivering the innovation as part of the normal school day during tutor time for the whole year group.

Also, using teachers' predicted grades is problematic because these are somewhat subjective measures of pupil performance. Furthermore, teachers made grade predictions shortly after the conclusion of the intervention periods. It may be too soon to see any significant improvement in pupil performance.

Implications for further evaluation

Since the innovation aimed to change attitude and study habits, any impact on performance may only be seen over a longer period of time than this study allowed. Therefore it would be useful to continue to track both cohorts as they progress through Year 13. As more internal progress data, and ultimately, final A-level results, become available, it may be possible to draw

some firmer conclusions about the effectiveness of the innovation. Based on these analyses, we would like to explore whether we should invest in a similar innovation, a modified innovation or whether we should expand the innovation to more pupils in subsequent years. It may be that we decide that the intervention is required much earlier, possibly at Key Stage 4.

In order to investigate whether the innovation can be effective, it would need to be repeated with larger numbers of pupils, preferably in different settings. It is felt that there is sufficient encouragement in these results to justify a larger study.

References

Butroyd R (2010). Six approaches to student transition into the sixth form at Heckmondwike Grammar School. Project report. Available from: http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/9109/ (accessed 10.7.17)

Hodgson A and Spours K (2014). 17+ participation, attainment and progression in London: Key findings and recommendations. A report commissioned by London Councils Young People's Education & Skills. Available at: www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/27700 (accessed 10.7.17)

Hope A (2007). From secondary school to sixth form: an examination of issues relating to transition and transfer from year eleven to year twelve. Summary of dissertation. Available at: www.suffolklearning.co.uk%2Fdo_download.asp%3Fdid%3D5896&usg=AFQjCNHtXNFPOAtZo zVMkpDZAZQ7QCdmoA (accessed 10.7.17)

Nash P, Naylor A and James M (2015). Understanding transitions to and from sixth form education: Student perceptions & experiences. Project presentation. Available from: http://www.higheryork.org/seecmsfile/?id=148 (accessed 10.7.17)

Appendix 1

Survey completed by pupils following each session

Questions	Responses				
1. How likely would you be to recommend this workshop to a friend?	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Unsure	Likely	Very Likely
2. How well did the content that was delivered match what you were expecting?	Not at all	Unsure	To some degree	Very well	
3. How much new information did you receive in the workshop?	None	Unsure	A Little	Lots	
4. How useful do you think the workshop content will be when applying it to your A-level subjects?	Not Useful	Unsure	Useful	Extremely Useful	
5. How engaging was the teacher?	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
6. Do you think the workshop will help you become a better learner?	No	Unsure	Yes		
7. The workshop was well prepared by the teacher	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Please use the space below to elaborate on any of the previous questions

9. Please use the space below to tell us about any other aspects of the workshop that you may feel are relevant

Appendix 2

Survey completed by pupils at the end of the innovation

Following the whole innovation pupils were asked to complete the following evaluation:

GENERAL QUESTIONS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The launch of the programme was done well				
I understood why I had been selected for the programme				
I understood what the programme involved				
The folder of resources I was provided with was useful				
I have referred to the resources on a regular basis				
My parents were aware that I was involved in the programme				
I regularly check my school e-mails for notices about the programme				

Please use the space below to comment on any of the above points

WORKSHOPS

Please rate the workshops below:

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Did not attend
Getting Organised					
Brain Training					
External Speaker (Dave Keeling) – Developing Independence					
Using Study Periods Effectively					
Literacy – Reading					
Staying Positive / Growth Mind set 1					
Health & Well-Being / Dealing With Stress					
Staying Positive/Growth Mind set 2					
Literacy – Writing					
Literacy – Speaking					
Revision					
Building A Portfolio / CV					

Please use the space below for any additional comments:

If you did NOT attend any of the workshops please explain why in the space below:

MENTORING

How many times have you met with your Y13 mentor?

5 [ ]   4 [ ]   3 [ ]   2 [ ]   1 [ ]   0 [ ]

If you have not yet met with your mentor please explain why in the space below:

If you have met with your mentor please answer the following:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My mentor was easy to talk to				
My mentor was well prepared for the meeting				
My mentor was genuinely interested in how I was doing				
My mentor gave me good advice which I have been able to use				
My mentor gave me the support that I required to make progress				
We discussed / looked at revision				

Please use the space below for any additional comments:

OVERALL

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I believe that the STRIVING FOR SUCCESS PROGRAMME has helped me progress in Y12				
I would take part in the programme again				

Three Aspects of the Programme That You Liked / Were Effective:
1.
2.
3.

Three Aspects of the Programme That You Would Change:
1.
2.
3.

Please use the space below for any additional comments that you would like to make:

Appendix 3

Statistical analysis

Pupil	GCSE APS[1]	ALPS A-level expected grade	Spring predicted grades	Summer predicted grades	Score[2] spring	Score[2] summer
1	44.2	C	MCD	MCD	-3	-3
2	42.88	C	DDC	CDD	-2	-2
3	44.68	C	DCDC	DCDC	-2	-2
4	44.5	C	DCEB	CBEC	-2	-1
5	43	C	MMD	D*MD	-5	-3.5
6	43.78	C	CCE	BDE	-2	-2
7	44.44	C	UMC	UMC	-6	-6
8	43.3	C	DBC	DBC	0	0
9	42.64	C	DCD	DDD	-2	-3
10	44.38	C	CCBB	BDCC	2	0
11	44.02	C	CCB	BCD	1	0
12	44.2	C	CED	BEB	-3	0
13	43.54	C	DEC	DED	-3	-3
14	43.12	C	DCB	DCB	0	0
15	43.36	C	DCC	ECC	-1	-2
16	44.68	C	CDC	BCD	-1	0
17	44.2	C	DBBB	DCBB	2	1
18	43	C	CDC	CED	-1	-3
19	43.54	C	CDC	CDD	-1	-2
				SD	2.06	1.73
				Mean	-1.53	-1.66

[1] GCSE average points score (*A*=58 points, A=52 points, B=46 points, C=40 points, D=34 points, E=28 points, F=22 points, G=16 points*).
[2] difference between ALPS expected grade and predicted grades (where a score of +1 indicates 1 grade higher than expected and -1 indicates 1 grade lower than expected. A U grade is scored as -4).

Grades in orange indicate BTEC level 3 courses (M merit, D distinction, D* distinction*). BTEC level 3 grades were weighted using the UCAS tariff (merit equivalent to A-level E grade, distinction equivalent to A-level D grade and distinction* equivalent to C/D at A-level and therefore scored as +/- 0.5 A-level grades).

COHORT 2: COMPARISON OF PREDICTED GRADES IN SPRING AND SUMMER

Pupil	GCSE APS[1]	ALPS A-level expected grade	Spring CP	Summer CP	Score[2] spring	Score[2] summer
1	43	C	EDB	EDC	-2	-3
2	44.86	B/C	CDCB	BDDC	-1	-2
3	44.44	C	CCC	CDD	0	-2
4	43.78	C	ECD	EBB	-3	0
5	43.78	C	DBC	DBB	0	1
6	42.88	C	CCD	CCB	-1	1
7	42.64	C	CCD	DCC	-1	-1
8	44.2	C	MCCE	DDCE	-4	-4
9	44.62	C	CCC	CBD	0	0
10	43.36	C	EDB	EDC	-2	-3
11	44.68	C	CDC	CCD	-1	-1
12	42.82	C	EDD	EBD	-4	-2
13	44.02	C	DCC	DCB	-1	0
14	44.2	C	MCD	MCD	-3	-3
15	44.02	C	CCDC	CCDD	-1	-2
16	43.54	C	CCB	ADC	1	1
17	44.68	C	CBBD	CBDD	1	-1
		ALPS A2		**SD**	1.53	1.56
		C		**Mean**	-1.29	-1.24

Contact us

+44 (0)1904 328166 | info@the-iee.org.uk
Ron Cooke Hub, University of York, York YO10 5GE
Twitter: @IEE_York | the-iee.org.uk/

The Institute for Effective Education (IEE) is an independent charity working to improve education for all children by promoting the use of evidence in education policy and practice.

In collaboration with the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) we support a national Research Schools Network and have developed resources aimed at people on the front line of education.

The Institute for Effective Education is a charity registered in England, charity number 1168744