

'Getting it Right' Symposium – Paper 3

Evaluation of the Getting it Right Literacy and Numeracy Strategy in Western Australian schools



Marion Meiers

Australian Council for Educational Research

Marion Meiers is a Senior Research Fellow at ACER. Her research interests lie in the fields of literacy and teacher professional development. She has directed the ACER Longitudinal Literacy and Numeracy Study (LLANS) since 1998. She has considerable experience in undertaking evaluations of teacher professional development, and was the project director for the ACER evaluation of the Western Australian Department of Education initiative, Getting it Right.

Marion has lectured in teacher education at Monash, Deakin and RMIT universities. She has contributed actively to the teaching of English and literacy as a secondary teacher, consultant, curriculum writer and policy officer in the Victorian Department of Education, and in leadership roles in teacher professional development. She has played an active role in English and literacy teacher professional associations, and from 1993–1996 was the Executive Liaison Officer of the Australian Literacy Federation. She is currently a member of the National Council of the Australian Literacy Educators' Association. She has an extensive record of publications, including journal articles, chapters in books, and textbooks, in relation to the teaching and learning of English and literacy.

Abstract

This paper and the paper by Dr. Lawrence Ingvarson are companion pieces to Rosemary Cahill's account of the intentions of the Getting it Right Literacy and Numeracy Strategy, and the model of professional development on which the strategy is based. In these papers, we present some findings from the ACER evaluation of Getting it Right. We provide detailed results from the surveys of principals undertaken in 2003 and 2004, including findings of the use of data to improve planning. These results provide evidence of the impact of the initiative, and evidence of an increase of the impact of the strategy over time. We identify key features of the model of professional learning that underpin the strategy, and link this to other research findings on effective professional development.

The main purpose of the Australian Council for Educational Research's evaluation was to provide the Western Australian Department of Education and Training with information about the effectiveness of the Getting it Right Literacy and Numeracy Strategy (GiR-LNS) in developing expertise relating to the teaching of literacy and numeracy. The evaluation was focused on the impact of the GiR-LNS professional development, on changes in school practices and on changes in classroom teaching practices.

Principals, Specialist Teachers and their classroom teacher colleagues were surveyed in Term 4 2003 and again in Term 4 2004. Other important evaluation information was collected from visits to a selected number of schools, and from observations of the training sessions for the Specialist

Teachers. A review of the data collected from principals presents a positive account of an initiative that provides ongoing expert help to teachers in the school, as they work 'shoulder to shoulder' in planning, and in classrooms.

Principals' perspectives

School principals were well positioned to provide information about the impact of the work of the Getting it Right Specialist Teachers in their school.

We interviewed school principals on three occasions in twenty schools, and gained a very positive picture of the responses to Getting it Right. In one school, during the evaluation team's first visit, the principal noted that teachers' confidence was 'going through the roof', and he reported that the value of having a Specialist Teacher had been mentioned during performance management reviews. The Specialist Teachers' skills and knowledge, the practicality of her advice and her 'street credibility' had impacted on the school. The Specialist Teacher's role of providing in-class support was non-negotiable in the school. He noted that finding time for collaborative planning had been difficult, particularly because of the number of teachers working in tandem pairs.

Several months later, in a second interview the same principal described the consolidation of the strategies initiated in connection with Getting it Right in the previous year:

The English policy is giving direction to the whole school ... GiR is focusing on writing as a starting point ... the Literacy Net is being taken up ... We're not trying to cover too much ...

without GiR we wouldn't have been able to implement the policy ... Our Specialist teacher works in class, providing ongoing, accessible support.

The two surveys of principals, conducted with a twelve 12-month interval, provided a range of detailed range of evidence about the impact of Getting it Right over time. The descriptive results of the evaluation questionnaires completed by principals in 2003 and 2004 show that the initiative was rated highly, and on some dimensions, rated more highly in the second survey.

School context

Principals were asked to identify the extent to which the Getting it Right strategy was connected to other funded school programs. Getting it Right is intended to bring about improved learning opportunities for students, and coherence with other school improvement programs is desirable. Table 1 shows the responses to this question. Overall, the responses indicate

that the Getting it Right strategy was closely connected with the programs listed. There were strong links, for example, between Getting it Right and the Curriculum Improvement Program, increasing over the course of a year.

In the 2003 survey, principals were asked: 'What were the most important criteria used in selecting which classroom teachers would work with the Getting it Right Specialist Teacher?' The collaborative working relationships between the Specialist Teacher and classroom teachers appears to be a critical factor in the effectiveness of Getting it Right, and it was interesting to investigate the reasons that principals gave for selecting teachers to work with the Specialist Teacher. We found that a range of reasons was cited, and constructed a set of categories from an examination of the responses. Space was provided on the survey to list three criteria, although many principals chose only to list one or two. Table 2 shows the categories and frequencies for each category, sorted according to the aspect listed first, second and third.

The most frequently cited reason for selecting classroom teachers to work with the Specialist Teachers was the year level at which the teachers taught. The needs of students was the next most frequently listed criterion. The willingness of teachers to work with the Specialist Teacher was identified by a small number of respondents. This question was not asked in the 2004 survey.

We were interested in the extent of practical support schools provided to the Specialist Teachers, and so asked principals about resources provided by the school to support the work of the Specialist Teacher. The frequencies shown in Table 3 show the levels of provision of resources. A suitable workspace was provided in almost all cases, but phone, computer and email access were provided less frequently. In both surveys, the majority of principals reported that they had made timetabling arrangements to allow for collaborative planning. In view of the importance of collaborative planning in the GiR strategy, it is interesting to note that 77% in 2003 and 83% of schools in

Table 1 Connections between GiR and other programs in 2003 and 2004

To what extent is <i>Getting it Right</i> connected to the following programs	Not at all %	To a minor extent %	To a moderate extent %	To a major extent %
a) the <i>Curriculum Improvement Program?</i> n = 142/141	1 0	5 4	26 16	68 81
b) the <i>Students at Educational Risk strategy?</i> n = 143/140	0 0	7 2	8 21	85 77
c) the <i>Commonwealth Literacy and Numeracy Program?</i> n = 123/116	11 10	7 5	24 22	59 64
d) the <i>Aboriginal Educational Operational Plan?</i> n = 132/131	9 9	26 1	33 31	31 42
e) other programs? (please specify) n = 109/108	6 6	6 3	17 12	71 79

Table 2 Criteria for selecting classroom colleagues in 2003

Selection criteria for teachers to work with Specialist Teachers	First criteria listed % n = 139	Second criteria listed % n = 103	Third criteria listed % n = 61
Year level/s	45	15	8
Teachers' willingness to work with ST (choice)	7	9	5
Teachers' capacity for collaboration	4	5	5
Needs of students in classes	11	18	8
Teachers requesting to be involved	0	1	3
Attitude to the concept of GiR	0	0	0
Teachers' interest in change in pedagogy	2	2	8
Other	3	11	10
Availability of common meeting time	1	Nil	3
Level of teachers' needs	2	8	10
Small school, all involved	2	1	0
Misread question, described selection criteria for STs	24	31	39

Table 3 Resources provided by the school in 2003 and 2004

What resources has the school provided to support the work of the Specialist Teacher? n = 144/141	No %	Yes %
a) A suitable workspace for the Specialist Teacher	6 3	94 97
b) Phone, computer, and email access for the Specialist Teacher	21 14	79 87
c) Timetabling and staffing arrangements to allow for the collaborative planning time needed by the Specialist Teacher and teacher colleagues	8 4	92 96
d) Time, in addition to duties other than teaching time (DOTT), for collaborative planning	23 17	77 83
e) A budget for the Specialist Teacher to purchase resources for literacy/numeracy teaching	20 7	80 92

2004 provided time in addition to duties other than teaching (DOTT) for collaborative planning. The results indicate that schools were providing slightly more practical support for the Specialist Teachers in 2004 than in 2003.

Setting targets

The second section of the questionnaire was designed to collect information about setting targets for improving literacy and numeracy outcomes within the school. Principals

had a key role in this process, supporting and working with the Specialist Teacher in the development of realistic and challenging targets, and negotiating these targets with the District Director.

Table 4 Involvement in target setting

Who was involved in setting targets? (tick as many boxes as apply) n = 144/141	No %	Yes %
a) The Specialist Teacher	4 11	96 89
b) You, the principal, alone	83 87	17 14
c) All members of the school leadership team	49 55	51 45
d) A literacy or numeracy working party	69 57	31 43
e) The whole staff	54 47	46 53
f) District Office staff	95 92	5 8
g) Parents	89 90	11 10
h) District Director	95 94	5 6

Table 4 shows that in both 2003 and 2004 almost all of the schools involved the Specialist Teacher in target setting. In almost half of the respondents' schools all members of the school leadership team or the whole staff were involved. District Office staff and parents were rarely involved.

The use of data to set targets to improve learning is a key aspect of Getting it Right, and so principals were asked about the data that had been used in setting targets. The descriptive results indicate that all the data sources suggested in the survey question had been used to a considerable extent. Western Australia Literacy and Numeracy Assessment (WALNA) data was used to a moderate or major extent in 74% of schools in 2003 and in 86% of schools in 2004. Eighty-one per cent of schools used Curriculum

Framework Outcomes to a moderate or major extent in both years. The most frequently used sources of information were 'other quality student achievement data' (95% to a moderate or major extent in 2003, and 96% in 2004) and the needs of students (94% (2003) and 94% (2004) to a moderate or major extent). The 2004 data confirmed the 2003 data, indicating that schools were drawing on a variety of information in setting targets.

Principals were also asked about the extent to which schools modified the targets once they had been set, and the sources of information and advice leading to modification.

Sixty-three per cent of respondents reported that the targets had been modified during 2003, and 66% reported that they had been modified during 2004. Thirty-seven per cent

reported that in 2003 the targets had not been modified, and 34% reported that the targets had not been modified in 2004. Table 6 shows the frequencies of responses to suggested reasons for modification.

The most common reasons for modifying the targets in both 2003 and 2004 were the availability of further information about student performance and further review of the data. Advice from GiR team members prompted modification in 42% of schools and 43% in 2004. Advice from District Office staff was almost never involved in either year.

The impact of Getting it Right

The third section of the questionnaire for principals included a series of questions designed to gather information about the principals' impressions of the impact of the Getting it Right strategy in the school. These responses provided insights into the initial impact of the strategy, as they refer to the end of the first or second year of operation of the strategy in the schools, and to the impact after another year had passed. The 2004 responses provided information about the longer-term impact of Getting it Right.

The first question in this section of the survey focused on a variety of outcomes in the school that had resulted from the Getting it Right strategy. These results are shown in Table 7. The greatest impact reported was in relation to teachers and teaching practices. Over 90% of respondents in both the 2003 and 2004 surveys reported that the Getting it Right strategy was, to a moderate or major extent, leading to more effective literacy/numeracy teaching practices, benefits to teachers, teachers being

Table 5 Data used in setting targets in 2003 and 2004

To what extent was each of the following important in setting targets?	Not at all %	To a minor extent %	To a moderate extent %	To a major extent %
a) WALNA data n = 139/137	9 4	17 10	25 20	49 66
b) other quality student achievement data n = 131/129	2 2	3 2	25 25	70 71
c) Curriculum Framework learning outcomes for English or mathematics n = 131/133	2 5	18 14	40 33	41 47
d) the needs, experiences and interests of those students most in need of help with literacy or numeracy n = 137/135	1 2	6 5	25 22	69 72

Table 6 Modifying targets 2003 and 2004

What led to targets being modified?	No %	Yes %
a) More information about student performance became available n = 144/141	48 52	52 48
b) Advice was provided by Getting it Right team members n = 144/141	58 57	42 43
c) Advice was provided by District Office staff n = 144/141	95 94	5 6
d) Further review of student achievement data, such as the WALNA data, or information gained from the Literacy /Numeracy Net n = 144/141	58 45	41 55

more confident about teaching literacy or numeracy, and teachers being better at diagnosing students' learning needs.

It is interesting to note the increase in the extent to which principals reported that Getting it Right had impacted on several outcomes between 2003 and 2004. These results are indicative of the longer-term impact of the initiative.

In 2004, 87% (to a moderate extent and to a major extent) of respondents

reported that a coherent whole school literacy or numeracy plan had been implemented, compared with 73% in the previous year.

Principals also reported an increase in the consistent use of the Literacy Net, from 68% (to a moderate or major extent) in 2003 to 82% (to a moderate or major extent) in 2004. The principals reported teachers' increased understanding of the English or

Mathematics student outcomes of the Curriculum Framework also increased: 73%, 2003, to 92%, 2004 (to a moderate or major extent).

The effective use of student performance data to improve planning had also increased from 84% in 2003 to 91% in 2004 (to a moderate or major extent). There was also an increase between 2003 and 2004 in the extent to which it was reported that more reflective use

Table 7 Getting it Right has led to these outcomes in 2003 and 2004

To what extent has the <i>Getting it Right</i> strategy led to the outcomes listed below?	Not at all %	To a minor extent %	To a moderate extent %	To a major extent %
a) more effective literacy/numeracy teaching practices n = 144/139	0 0	6 7	39 33	55 60
b) The implementation of a coherent literacy/numeracy plan for the whole school n = 142/138	5 2	22 11	38 45	35 42
c) Consistent use of the Literacy/Numeracy Net across the school n = 141/139	14 8	19 11	33 35	35 47
d) improved learning outcomes for students at risk n = 143/139	0 0	12 8	40 37	48 55
e) improved learning outcomes for all students n = 142/139	2 1	15 14	49 40	35 45
f) more effective use of student performance data to plan teaching and learning activities n = 143/138	0 1	16 7	43 38	41 53
g) Improved school results in WALNA testing n = 124/128	16 7	31 21	36 40	17 32
h) more effective reporting to parents on students' improvement in literacy/numeracy skills n = 141/139	11 5	38 31	39 45	12 19
i) Teachers have a clearer understanding of the English or Mathematics student outcomes of the Curriculum Framework n = 143/139	4 1	23 8	52 47	21 45
j) the teachers have benefited from working with the <i>Getting it Right</i> Specialist Teacher n = 143/139	0 0	3 4	22 15	75 81
k) teachers are more confident about teaching literacy or numeracy n = 142/139	1 0	8 6	41 30	51 64
l) teachers are better at diagnosing students' learning needs n = 142/139	1 1	11 10	48 38	40 51
m) more reflective use of performance data to improve planning at the whole school level n = 143/137	3 0	19 9	46 42	32 50

was being made of performance data to improve planning at the whole school level: 78%, 2003, to 92%, 2004, (to a moderate or major extent).

In 2004 72% (to a moderate or major extent) of principals reported that schools results in WALNA testing had improved across the school, compared

to 53% (to a moderate or major extent) in 2003.

Overall, these results indicate the principals' impressions that *Getting it Right* has led to a range of outcomes in their schools.

Principals were asked about the impact of *Getting it Right* on their own

understanding of literacy and numeracy curriculum and pedagogy, and how to link performance data to students' needs. The results are shown in Table 8. Almost none of the principals responded using the 'not at all' option. Responses to the other three options (to a minor, moderate or major extent) were spread across the options. These

Table 8 Impact on principals' knowledge and understanding in 2003 and 2004

To what extent has the work of <i>Getting it Right</i> Specialist Teacher ...	Not at all %	To a minor extent %	To a moderate extent %	To a major extent %
a) broadened your understanding of literacy or numeracy curriculum and pedagogy? n = 143/139	4 1	24 16	48 50	24 33
b) increased your knowledge of how to link your school's performance data to student needs in literacy and numeracy n = 142/139	5 1	32 22	39 45	25 32

Table 9 Impact on teachers' professional learning in 2003 and 2004

How would you rate their (<i>professional development activities in which teachers at your school have participated over the past three years</i>) relative impact, in terms of improving student learning outcomes, compared with the impact of teachers' work with the <i>Getting it Right</i> Specialist Teacher?	GiR ST much less impact %	GiR ST less impact %	GiR ST more impact %	GiR ST much more impact %
n = 139/137	1 0	3 5	42 34	54 61

Table 10 GiR strategy meeting important school needs in 2003 and 2004

Is the <i>Getting it Right</i> strategy meeting any important needs in your school? n = 123/136	Yes %	No %
	98	2
	98	2

results indicate that principals were reporting some level of impact on their knowledge and understanding, and that this had increased by the time of the second survey.

A question was designed to produce a general estimate of principals' viewpoints on the impact of the *Getting it Right* strategy on teachers' professional learning. Principals were asked to compare the impact of all the professional development activities in

which teachers at their school had participated over the past three years with the impact of their teachers' work with the *Getting it Right* Specialist Teacher. The results shown in Table 9 indicate a very strong trend to rating involvement in *Getting it Right* as having more impact (42%, 2003, 34%, 2004) and much more impact (54%, 2003, 61%, 2004). That is, more than half of the respondents indicated in 2003 that involvement in *Getting it Right* has much more impact than other

professional development activities, and this had increased to 61% in 2004.

The surveys included a number of open-ended questions, so that principals could provide their own reasons and explanations to further questions about the impact of the *Getting it Right* strategy. These responses were examined and categorised into common responses. All responses were read by trained assessors, and scored according to the described categories.

Table 11 GiR meeting important school needs

GiR meeting school needs	First need listed	Second need listed	Third need listed
	n = 139/133 %	n = 123/120 %	n = 88/86 %
Identifying, diagnosing, monitoring and assisting students at risk	18 12	15 8	13 4
Improving pedagogy in literacy/numeracy	26 17	15 8	15 11
Increasing teachers' awareness of strategies to improve learning	4 11	15 13	6 7
Improving teachers' content knowledge	4 2	5 2	5 1
Enhancing literacy/numeracy learning	6 10	6 5	3 4
Improving assessment practices	2 1	5 5	5 4
Catering better for a range of student needs	4 2	6 6	3 4
Other	3 6	6 7	7 16
Whole-school planning for lit/num development	3 6	6 14	11 12
Improving data gathering and analysis	3 6	2 4	5 7
Focused use of school budget	1 0	1 1	1 2
Helping focus teacher learning (professional development)	8 5	4 3	6 9
Availability of 'on-hand' expert support; modelling of lit/num strategies	13 11	8 7	5 8
Teachers' engagement in collaborative planning and sharing expertise	6 11	6 17	16 12
Improving home-school links	0 0	3 2	1 0

Principals were asked whether or not the Getting it Right strategy was meeting important needs in their school. As the results in Table 10 indicate, in both surveys almost all (98%) agreed that this was the case.

If the principals responded in the

affirmative, they were then asked to list how Getting it Right had helped to meet these needs. Table 11 captures the reasons they listed. Space was provided for three reasons to be listed. Respondents listed a varying number of needs, accounting for the different numbers of responses.

The responses shown in Table 11 indicate that, in 2003 and 2004, two school needs were most commonly reported as having been met by the Getting it Right strategy. The first of these was the need to identify, diagnose, monitor and assist students at risk. The second need was related to

Table 12 Better ways of meeting school needs 2003 and 2004

Yes. Better ways of meeting school needs than GiR?	First way listed n = 27/23 %	Second way listed n = 12/5 %
More opportunity for additional professional learning for all staff	19 13	8 0
Need both GiR Literacy and Numeracy STs	4 4	8 0
More FTE	22 4	17 20
More differentiated resourcing	26 0	8 20
Even more support for GiR additional assistance to schools	15 26	0 0
Linking to other agency support	0	17
Other	15 44	42 60

the improvement of pedagogy in literacy or numeracy teaching. Other needs that were identified as being met included increasing teachers' awareness of strategies to improve learning and the need for teachers to engage in collaborative planning and sharing of expertise.

Principals were asked if they thought that there were better ways of meeting their school's needs than the Getting it Right strategy. Most replied 'no' to this question (88%, n = 135) suggesting that their impressions of the value of the strategy were positive. A small number responded 'yes' – there were better ways. The results in 2004 were very similar, with 84% (n = 135) replying 'No'. The responses of the small number who answered this question negatively were categorised, and the results are shown in Table 12.

From the small number of respondents, more opportunities for staff

professional learning and more time for the Specialist Teacher were mentioned as better ways of meeting school needs.

Principals were given the opportunity to note the factors that had facilitated or hindered the Getting it Right strategy in their school.

The range of facilitating factors shown in Table 13 is of interest. They relate to the school context, the effectiveness of the Specialist Teacher, and to aspects of educational change, such as teachers' receptiveness to change. The pattern of responses is similar for 2003 and 2004. While the frequencies for many categories are small, the range of factors identified by principals provides useful insight into the operation of Getting it Right. The most frequently listed facilitating factor was the general effectiveness of the particular Specialist Teacher in that school. The next most frequently listed factor was the support and cooperation of the whole school

staff. Support from the school administration, and school organisational support were mentioned more than other factors.

Although reference to the Getting it Right training program for teachers was limited, the emphasis on the effectiveness of the Specialist Teachers implies the effectiveness of the training received by the Specialist Teachers, as well as the strength of their interpersonal skills and knowledge of literacy and numeracy content and pedagogy.

A number of factors were identified by the principals as having hindered the implementation of the Getting it Right strategy in their schools. The descriptive results are seen in Table 14, and are similar for 2003 and 2004. Two factors were mentioned more often than the others identified. Of all factors listed for the first time, 28% related to lack of time for collaboration. Staff resistance to working with the Specialist Teacher,

Table 13 Factors that facilitated Getting it Right in the school in 2003 and 2004

What has facilitated GiR in school?	First factor listed n = 131/134 %
Team approach (involving, for example, ST, SAER coord., Admin.)	2 5
Support and cooperation from whole staff	1 8
Support by school Admin.	8 10
School organisational support, including time for collaboration	5 13
System-level support for GiR	3 5
Additional time provided by school for work of GiR ST	2 4
General effectiveness of the GiR ST	39 22
Other	3 2
Use of GiR to focus whole school on improving student outcomes	2 2
Collaborative planning and review	6 7
GiR supports local needs & meets system requirements	1 4
GiR provides resource at point of teaching in the classroom	1 1
The GiR training for STs	4 2
Teachers receptiveness to change	2 1
Teachers' willingness to ask for help	0 1
Data-based incentive from need for school to improve student outcomes	8 10
Coherence with other school initiatives	1 0
Observed effectiveness of strategies promoted by GiR	2 0
ST from within school	1 1

or to the Getting it Right approach to providing additional assistance accounted for 11% of factors listed for the first time in 2003, and this increased to 26% in 2004.

Sustaining changes to teaching practice brought about by the Getting it Right strategy

Finally, principals were asked about plans that schools had made to sustain changes that may have brought about by the Getting it Right strategy. The range of plans reported was categorised. The descriptive results for the first and second plans listed are shown in Table 15. The most interesting result is the increase in reports between 2003 and 2004 that collaborative planning and in-class support will be continue: from 9% in 2003 to 24% in 2004. This suggests increasing recognition of the value of this key aspect of the Getting it Right strategy, affirming one of the strengths of the model of professional learning that underpins Getting it Right.

A positive view

Overall, the descriptive results of the responses to the questionnaires completed by principals in 2003 and 2004 present a positive view of the Getting it Right strategy. The results provide insights into many features of the strategy that principals connect to improved outcomes in their schools.

Table 14 Factors that hindered Getting it Right in the school

What has hindered GiR?	First factor listed n = 131/122 %
Lack of direction, poor administration of GiR (at system level)	2 0
Insufficient funds	7 4
Lack of time (eg, for collaboration)	28 25
Short timeline (only 2 years)	2 1
Timetabling constraints	2 0
Staff turnover	6 11
Change of ST	3 4
Other	14 19
Sharing GiR ST with another school	2 1
Inappropriate ST	2 5
Staff resistance	11 26
Difficult to change some teachers' practice	5 3
Staff not focused on students' learning needs	0 0
Principal needed more briefing at commencement	3 0
Negative effects of GiR program title	10 0
Staff misunderstanding of GiR ST role	8 1
Student transience	5 1
Unwillingness to use DOTT for GiR	0 1
Not whole school (K-7) in focus	1 0

Table 15 Plans for sustaining changes in 2003 and 2004

Plans for sustaining GiR changes?	First plan listed	Second plan listed
	n = 137/136 %	n = 83/87 %
Maintain ST role through other funding (eg, CLNP, or further GiR funding)	7 6	1 2
Providing school resources/funding	7 4	11 6
School will continue to fund ST position	5 4	4 7
Developing whole school literacy/numeracy plan	15 13	10 9
Continue to treat GiR as integral part of teachers' learning	4 10	2 1
Ongoing direct monitoring of student outcomes in all classes	1 2	6 3
Continue collaborative planning and in-class support	9 24	10 14
Other	12 4	15 24
Extend collaborative planning to whole school	4 7	5 8
Embed GiR changes in school teaching and/or assessment practices	20 16	17 12
Increase the number of teachers involved	1 2	1 7
Implement GiR as designed at system level	4 0	1 0
Introduce timetable changes	2 0	0 0
Provide more PD for teachers	9 2	18 0
Share good practice within the school (eg staff meetings, visiting other teachers' classrooms)	2 6	0 1