EAL in the Mainstream Classroom

University of York
Louise Tracey

Evaluation Summary

Age range	Key Stage 4 (Year 10)
Number of pupils	1,581 EAL pupils
Number of schools	71
Design	School-level Randomised Efficacy trial
Primary Outcome	GCSE results in the primary subject (Science)
Protocol Version	3
Protocol Date	16/03/2018

Protocol version history

VERSION	DATE	REASON FOR REVISION
3.0	24/04/2019	Trial protocol updated following the decision to not continue with a second cohort (26/10/2018).As a result of changes due to the introduction of GDPR regulations during the progress of this study and in conjunction with preparation of the Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP): • It was decided to proceed with Cohort 1 schools only; • The Research Questions were clarified in the light of the SAP; • The power analysis was re-calculated using the existing school sample; • The number of process evaluation school visits was reduced from 12 to 8 as a second cohort was anticipated and it was felt important to assess the possible differences in experience across the two cohorts (although in the event this second cohort did not occur); • Schools were re-contacted in summer 2018 to ensure the study aligned with new data protection regulations as a result of introduction of GDPR legislation; • The criteria for compliance was refined; and • The mediation analysis based on teacher confidence has been deleted due to the reduced sample size and difficulties collecting the data.
2.0	16/03/2018	Trial protocol updated following lower than expected levels of recruitment of schools with the necessary number of EAL pupils in Science and History:

		• It was decided to recruit a second cohort, to participate in the main trial during 2018-2020. • The number of EAL pupils taking History as a GCSE subject was reduced from 12 to 8 per school to facilitate recruitment. • Only one teacher per subject per school was required to be recruited to the study (and attend training where appropriate) providing the number of EAL pupils taught by that teacher in that subject (Science/History) is sufficient to meet the recruitment criteria. • Assumptions used in sample size calculations were reviewed based on EEF suggestions when the decision to include a second cohort was made. • Monitoring information to be used in the Process Evaluation was clarified.
1.0	10/05/2017	N/A

Introduction

English as an Additional Language (EAL) learners form approximately one-sixth of all pupils in the English education system. Whilst there is evidence that some EAL pupils do relatively well compared to their non-EAL counterparts, overall they are found to be behind their non-EAL peers (NALDIC). In addition, some groups do significantly less well, with a strong relationship existing between stage of fluency in English and educational attainment, strong regional differences and differences between EAL pupils from different ethnic groups in attainment (Hollingworth & Mansaray, 2012: Strand, 2015).

A review of language and literacy interventions specifically designed for EAL pupils found a lack of intervention studies within the UK context and within secondary schools (Murphy & Unthiah, 2015). It also found a lack of CPD interventions in this area, which it regarded as 'of particular concern in the UK context given (…) a significant lack of EAL pedagogy and too much overlap between Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision and the teaching of pupils with EAL' (p.iv). This evaluation of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' should help to increase the level of knowledge on possible interventions, focusing as it does on secondary school pupils, CPD and changing pedagogic practices to take account of EAL pupils' needs in relation to academic language and attainment.

The Intervention

'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' is a CPD programme for teachers to support EAL pupils in the mainstream classroom, with a particular focus on academic language. It is designed to enhance teachers' language skills and enable them to provide more focused classroom provision for EAL pupils, thus reducing the need for specialist teachers and support staff for this cohort. This is particularly important as schools cannot provide dedicated specialist support for EAL pupils who are not new arrivals. The CPD aims to address the lack of consistency in teaching for EAL pupils by improving teachers' skill with language, both general and subject specific, and provides training in how teachers can plan lessons with EAL pupils' language skills in mind, develop specific resources

relating to those skills, and differentiate between pupils with different language skills and varying prior experience of education. The training supports classroom teachers' use and understanding of grammar, core academic vocabulary, and spoken language, which are key to helping EAL pupils within a whole class context, and which are also likely to have benefits for children more broadly.

An initial London-wide pilot of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' consisted of five training modules aimed at teachers at different levels of expertise (trainees, Teaching Assistants, mainstream classroom teachers, lead teachers and trainers) and was developed by a partnership between Challenge Partners, Lampton School, and Hounslow Language Service. This pilot was tested with 58 schools. The evaluation found that all teachers reported increased levels of confidence and a wider repertoire of skills used in the classroom to support EAL pupils. Pupil surveys also showed that pupils developed their confidence in speaking in class as a result of the interventions designed by course participants (London West Alliance, 2015). However, there is little quantitative evidence in support of this programme so far.

A single unified core module is to be tested in this study that will focus on mainstream classroom teachers. As an efficacy trial this training model aimed to ensure that the programme is delivered at optimum conditions but without the complicating factor of differing levels of teaching assistant support. The training was delivered through Delivery Centres located in schools especially selected and trained by Challenge Partners for this purpose. The Delivery Centres provided 3 days' training and support in a group setting to mainstream classroom teachers within their local region in a cascade model to allow teachers' to embed new practice with support. This was a key learning development from the previous pilot which included only 1 days training. The training was particularly focused on academic language.

METHODS

Research questions

The primary research question is:

- How effective is the 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' programme in improving subject specific academic attainment when delivered to Key Stage 4 EAL pupils taking GCSE Science?

The secondary research questions are:

- How effective is the 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' programme in improving subject specific academic attainment in a second GCSE subject (History)?
- How effective is the 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' programme in improving Academic attainment in English (as measured by GCSE English Language) when delivered to Key Stage 4 EAL pupils?
- What is the impact of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' when pupils receive the approach from more than one teacher in more than one subject area (ie. when pupils are taught by

trained ‘EAL in the Mainstream Classroom’ teachers in both Science and History GCSE subjects)?; and

- What is the impact of ‘EAL in the Mainstream Classroom’ on non-EAL pupils within the same classrooms.

The research will also assess the impact of the programme on pupils with differing baseline fluency levels and on EAL pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM).

Pilot Year

The main trial of the intervention was preceded by a pilot year. During this year the development team (Challenge Partners) recruited 12 schools to act as Delivery Centres for the main trial. These formed the delivery sites for the main trial, providing support and ongoing training for intervention schools involved in the main trial. Emerging leaders within these schools were recruited to deliver this training and support. Pilot schools had to have sufficient capacity to provide this ongoing support and training, be located in centres with sufficient number of schools locally with large numbers of EAL pupils who could potentially be recruited to the trial and have sufficient number of EAL pupils in Year 10 taking GCSEs in the specified trial subject specialisms. Due to developer capacity, 6 delivery schools were be recruited to trial the programme in November 2016 and 6 in Spring 2017. This phased approach was designed to enable the delivery team to learn and refine the programme over the first year of the project.

During the pilot year, the evaluation team attended two training sessions of the programme to more fully understand the model and used this to assist in the development of instruments to be used in the main trial. In addition, 4 delivery schools from the first (November) cohort were recruited by the Evaluation Team. These schools (Delivery Centres) were sampled to encompass a variety of geographical and school-level contexts. In each of these schools delivery teachers participated in classroom visits and teacher interviews, and completed teacher surveys. Facilitators in each school were also interviewed. The Delivery Centres also shared routine data relating to programme delivery and pupil profiles. The evaluators used this pilot year to determine the viability of the main trial and to pilot the measures to be used in the main trial. In addition, the decision to proceed to main trial and the primary and secondary subject specialisms was determined during this pilot year.

Validity of the main trial

The validity of the main trial was evaluated by assessing the feasibility of the main trial; readiness for trial; and evidence of promise of the programme.

Feasibility of the main trial. This covered an assessment of the delivery model, the capacity to recruit schools to the trial and release teachers for the necessary CPD and teacher engagement with the programme (including fulfilment of training requirements and implementation in the classroom). These were assessed using routine programme data, teacher surveys, classroom visits and teacher and facilitator interviews. The feasibility of the current trial design was also considered. This included the numbers of EAL pupils reached and type of EAL pupils reached, in terms of both receipt of EverFSM (as indicated in the National Pupil Database) and in terms of range of fluency of EAL pupils (as indicated by the fluency indicators collected annually for the school census).

Readiness for trial. In order to assess readiness for trial the evaluation team used the teacher and facilitator interviews to assess whether the necessary processes and resources were in place to proceed to the main trial. In particular, the ability of the proposed Delivery Centres to deliver CPD to trial schools, including having the capacity to do so to scale and with the necessary resources and materials in place.

Evidence of promise. The pilot year was also designed to determine the perceived potential for effectiveness of the programme. Teacher interviews and surveys were used to explore the extent to which teachers felt that 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' improved their understanding of the linguistic demands of their subjects and changing pedagogic practice in the classroom. Classroom visits assessed the extent to which the programme was being implemented in the classroom and the fidelity of programme implementation.

The decision to continue to main trial was be made by 18th April, 2017 by the project funders based on the promise of the programme, feasibility of the main trial and readiness for trial. The criteria used for continuing to main trial are outlined in the table below:

Area of Evaluation	**Evidence Criteria**
Evidence of Promise	• 75% of participating teachers report an improvement in understanding of the linguistic demands of their subjects • 75% of participating teachers and programme facilitators express confidence in the programme being able to impact positively on pupils outcomes
Feasibility	• evidence of programme implementation in more than 75% of classrooms • evidence that it is implemented with high levels of fidelity, ie. 75% attendance at CPD and 75% completion of tasks
Readiness for Trial	• evidence that the Delivery Centres have the ability to deliver CPD to trial schools (including necessary materials and resources in place) and recruit delivery schools

A report on the pilot findings relating to these criteria was presented to the funders by 4th April 2017. This report found that, although recruitment had not been as high as anticipated at that point, the criteria to proceed to the main trial had been met and the decision to proceed to main trial was made.

Piloting and Refining Measures

This year also allowed for piloting and refining of the measures to be used in the main trial, in particular the teacher surveys, and interview schedules. The Evaluation and Delivery teams worked closely to refine routine-level data collected by the development team to ensure that it was fit for

purpose, ie. would meet the needs of the delivery team and provide informative data to the Evaluation Team in order to minimise the burden placed on schools taking part in the research.

Main trial

Design

This is a two-armed school-level randomised efficacy trial. Randomisation between, rather than within, schools was preferred because it minimises the risk of diffusion, which is considered to be quite high, given that the programme focuses on an approach to lesson planning and teaching with EAL pupils in mind. The secondary research question relating to the impact of the programme on a second subject-area also means that children could be allocated to different conditions across subjects, if a within-school design was adopted. Schools were recruited to start participating in the evaluation in the academic year 2017/2018.

The evaluation focuses on Year 10 pupils. This gives the programme sufficient time to be firmly embedded prior to the end of Key Stage 4 assessments. It also allows the researchers to avoid introducing any additional burden on classes and teachers relating to those classes in the crucial GCSE year although trained teachers may, of course, introduce the approach to their Year 11 (and other) classes if they wished to do so.

Control schools will receive a financial incentive (£1,500) on completion of all data requirements (ie. after summer term 2019) which can then be used to buy the intervention after the end of the trial if they wish. This avoids potential problems such as ethical issues if the intervention is not shown to be effective and, as the outcome measure is taken at the end of Year 11, prevents an unnecessary time delay involved in a waitlist design if contamination (crossover) effects are to be avoided. Intervention schools received the 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' training and support free of charge.

'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' is designed to be taught across subject specialisms and it is recommended that teachers are trained with teachers from different subject areas/departments to ensure the best training conditions and discussion of language. However, for the main trial it was agreed to have a single subject specialism (Science) as the main focus of the evaluation, with a second, different subject specialism (History) in order to assess the impact of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' as a cross-curricular programme. Science is a core part of the curriculum and its study is compulsory to 16 (and therefore is more likely to reach a larger number of EAL pupils). It also has a range of components that will provide different challenges to EAL pupils, who may understand key scientific concepts but struggle to verbalise them. History was chosen because this subject is high in contextual language and reasoning and since it is an optional subject it is less likely to be set by ability. Also, analysis by NALDIC for 2011 indicates that History is one of the subjects where bilingual pupils had lower average point scores at GCSE level compared to other GCSE subjects (NALDIC website, accessed 10 May 2016).

Participants

Eligible schools were recruited by the Delivery Centre schools in summer/autumn 2017 with assistance from the developer and evaluation teams. Recruitment was targeted at schools with high proportions of EAL pupils. The initial intention was to recruit 100 schools to participate in the trial. However, there were lower than anticipated recruitment numbers (71 schools). Initially a second cohort was proposed to boost the recruitment numbers, however, the decision was taken not to proceed with this strategy (26/10/2019) given that schools continued to struggle to meet the eligibility criteria, despite the addition of some flexibility (eg. A lowering of the number of EAL History pupils). The eligibility criteria were, however, driven by the need to ensure that the trial was sufficiently powered to provide robust results.

Recruited schools were required to:

- Release at least 1 teacher in each of the two subject specialisms who will be teaching Year 10 GCSE classes containing at least 12 EAL pupils expected to enrol on a GCSE Science programme and, ideally 12 EAL pupils taking a GCSE History programme (although 8 EAL pupils taking GCSE History was deemed sufficient);
- Be located close to Delivery Centres; and
- Not be implementing the programme or intend to acquire the programme until after summer 2019 if allocated to the control condition.

Participating pupils are those EAL pupils enrolled in Science and History GCSE classes, taught by the EAL in the mainstream classroom trained teachers in September 2017 and their non-EAL peers in the same classes. Pupils had to be in the English education system at the end of Key Stage 2. EAL pupils are those defined as EAL using the DfE binary designation (Yes / No). Since 2016/2017 additional data has been collected for EAL pupils in the school census relating to their fluency level (on a scale of A-E). This fluency measure was collected from schools at the beginning of the academic year in which participants were in Year 10 and will be taken into account during the analysis.

If feasible, participating teachers (ie. Science and History teachers) were to be trained alongside teachers from additional subjects (not included in the trial). Emerging leaders were to be particularly targeted as the ideal candidates for training. Training was to be delivered by the Delivery Hub schools recruited in the pilot year.

Randomisation

Schools were only eligible for randomisation after:

- The Head teacher signed a Memorandum of Understanding
- Teacher consent was obtained
- Pupil details for the trial teachers (UPNs, pre-specified demographics, trained teacher and subject details) were provided.
- Completion by all participating teachers of a pre-randomisation teacher survey.

Parents were given the opportunity to withdraw their child's pupil-level data from the study under GDPR regulations after schools had been recruited.

Randomisation was conducted at the school-level using minimisation. Minimisation uses algorithms to ensure balance at baseline and permits ongoing allocation so schools know which condition they have been assigned to soon after recruitment. The only covariate at baseline was region to ensure Delivery Hub capacity to deliver training and ensure comparability within each Delivery Hub region. Randomisation was conducted by the Evaluation team using MinimPy software (MinimPy, 2013).

Outcome Measures

The proposed primary outcome is attainment by EAL pupils in GCSE in the primary subject specialism (ie. Science).

Secondary outcome measures are:

- EAL pupils GCSE results in the second subject specialism (History)
- the results of EAL pupils taught by teachers trained in the approach in Science and/or History in GSCE English Language. These would assess the impact of pupils being taught by trained teachers in more than one subject specialism and the impact of the programme on more general academic language attainment.

All suggested measures are of key interest to schools and recognised as national markers of achievement.

The primary pre-test measure are the KS2 SATs results as these are high in contextual validity and are highly correlated with attainment at the end Key Stage 4. It is recognised that this does exclude pupils from the trial who have since entered the English education system. However, this is not the case for the majority of EAL pupils in schools in England and those new to the system with low levels of fluency are regarded as needing additional help beyond mainstream classroom support.

The EAL fluency descriptors from the school census were collected at baseline to carry out a subgroup analysis of the differential effects of the intervention. From September 2016 all schools are required to return this information, recording level of fluency (graded from A -E, A being new to English and E being fluent), annually for all EAL pupils. Although we recognise that there are limitations to the fluency indicators as they stand (namely, that they are teacher assessed and are unmoderated) we feel that they do, however, reflect teachers' perceptions of pupils' fluency at a given time point and are the only available proxy for students' fluency that is available without additional testing.

Using primarily nationally collected data minimises the costs and the burden on schools and pupils. All teachers (control and intervention) will receive £25 for completing extra administrative tasks required by the evaluation, including completion of teacher survey's and return of the proposed fluency measure. This will be administered by the Evaluation Team at the end of the main trial (ie. when all requirements have been completed).

Sample size calculations

The statistical power of the proposed analyses was estimated based on figures agreed in the collaborator group. Statistical assumptions are as follows:

- Intra-class correlation $\rho = 0.19$
- Since no data are available for the correlation between the pre-test (KS2 SATs) and the Science test, a conservative estimate of explained variance was agreed both at the **pupil** and **school** level ($r = .50$ or $R^2 = .25$).

The formula presented in EEF (2013) was used to estimate the minimal detectable effect size. Based on the proportion of EAL pupils, recruited schools would need to have at least 107 pupils in Year 10 to cover for approximately 20% student dropout during the study. Both are likely to be conservative assumptions, although currently no empirical estimates are available. At protocol stage it was noted that this was an optimistic estimate, since recruitment already showed that the sample sizes within schools varied quite strongly and the design would have no room to compensate for further drop-out. In version 2 of this protocol it was agreed that an agreed sample size of $N = 120$ schools, with an average of 14 Year 10 EAL pupils (about 16% of the population; Strand, 2015) in the primary subject specialism (GCSE in science) would potentially detect an effect size of $MDES = .22$ (significance level $p < .05$, statistical power of 0.80, two-sided test; calculated with formula presented in EEF, 2013). However, given under-recruitment and the decision to not recruit a second cohort for this study the realised sample size for the study was recalculated with an estimated minimal detectable effect size of $MDES = .31$.[1]

Analysis plan

The impact analysis will use Hierarchical Linear Models (HLMs), which model the pupils as nested within schools and make it possible to separate within school variation in the outcome from between school variation. The analyses will use an intent-to-treat-design which means that outcomes data will be treated in the main analysis according to the condition allocated (control or intervention), not that actually received. The main analysis will include all eligible EAL pupils (ie. those for whom KS2 SATS results will be available) enrolled in Year 10 GCSE Science subjects in September 2017 and taught by teachers enrolled in the trial. Pupil data received by schools prior to randomisation was updated in the following September (2017/2018) to ensure all eligible pupils are included in the main analysis. The KS2 attainment pre-test will be used as the covariate. Effect sizes will be calculated using Hedge's g.

[1] Since the inception of the project, the EEF guidance on statistical analyses has changed. Originally it was envisaged to control for school-level variation in achievement in the analyses. This would have boosted the trial's statistical power, but would have made generalisation of the results more difficult (since they would have been conditional on between-school variation in prior achievement). When the changes for the cohort were agreed, it was also agreed in line with the statistical guidance to no longer control for between-school variation in the analysis. The minimal detectable effect size (MDES) with the original assumption of a between-school correlation of $r = .50$ and with the realised sample size in cohort I would have been 0.27.

After the main analyses secondary analysis will be conducted for EAL pupils taking History GCSE. A sensitivity analysis will be conducted that uses an implementation fidelity rating derived attendance at training as a proxy measure. This will be derived from the routine monitoring information collected by the Delivery Centres and programme developers to reduce data collection requirements.

Since the programme is delivered on a class basis, we will also evaluate what, if any, effect the intervention has on non-EAL pupils in the main trial participants peer group.

In addition to the intention to treat analysis, subgroup analysis will be conducted based on prior fluency level of EAL pupils and for EAL pupils who receive teaching from Science and History teachers trained in the CPD (ie. the effect of double dose).

Due to the small numbers in the primary population (EAL pupils), the trial is not powered for subgroup analysis based on EAL FSM pupils. Consequently, a subgroup analysis for FSM status can only provide broadly indicative results regarding the effect in this specific subgroup. To our knowledge no estimate of the share of year 10 pupils who fulfil both FSM and EAL criteria exists. We therefore expected conservatively about 20% of the EAL pupils per school to fulfil both criteria. For our 71 recruited schools with three FSM+EAL pupils each, the minimal detectable effect size for this sub-population is estimated at MDES = .38.

Implementation and process evaluation methods

The process evaluation will seek to answer the following key research questions:

- To what extent was the programme implemented with fidelity and what modifications were adopted
- The impact of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' on the classroom experience.

In order to do this a light touch process evaluation is envisaged to minimise the burden on participating schools whilst enabling the evaluation team to quantify processes to inform the impact evaluation outcomes and provide explanatory variables for these outcomes. This process evaluation will focus primarily on teachers and pupils in the primary outcome subject specialism (ie. Science), with some additional data collected from the Delivery Centres.

Monitoring Information - Given that this is an efficacy trial we anticipated a high level of monitoring and mentoring with schools to be conducted by the developers. The Evaluation Team worked with the Developers during the additional development phase to ensure that any such monitoring met both evaluation and developer needs and the protocol has been updated accordingly to clarify which monitoring information would be used. The following, routinely-collected data, is being shared with the Evaluation Team: attendance at training sessions, post-workshop evaluation forms, pre-workshop and between workshop teacher task completion records. This data will be used for any sensitivity (implementation) analysis conducted as part of the impact evaluation. In addition to the monitoring information a small number of interviews have beenconducted with the lead teachers in the Delivery Centres (approximately 4 Delivery Centres) to understand the training model in practice and the implementation of 'EAL in the Mainstream Classroom' in trial schools. These interviews and

routinely collected data will also include information relating to other forms of support provided to EAL pupils and the level of that support within schools.

Classroom visits - Classroom visits have been carried out with a small number of intervention schools (approximately 8, one from each Delivery Hub). They encompass a lesson observation and post-observation teacher discussion in the primary outcome subject. They will help to inform an analysis of implementation fidelity and the translation of the CPD into the classroom context. In addition to implementation, pupil confidence and engagement will also be assessed. Observation checklists will be used and checked for inter-rater reliability. These classroom visits will be developed into case studies to be reported alongside impact findings.

Teacher survey - An on-line teacher survey is being administered to all intervention and control teachers in the primary subject specialism (ie. Science) using Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, 2015) both before and after the intervention. This will provide the evaluation team with a comprehensive picture of the teaching of EAL pupils and school and class context in the trial schools alongside understandings, adaptations and experience of the programme and training (intervention-only schools), any other strategies or programmes used by teacher in the trial, teacher profession knowledge and experience. These could be quantified and provide validity to the generalisability or otherwise of the case studies. A further follow-up survey is being administered in May/June, 2019 to assess the longer-term impact of the CPD.

Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the process evaluation data will be conducted. The interviews will be transcribed professionally and coded using NVivo software (NVivo, 2012). In addition to analysing the data separately we will triangulate the findings to inform the impact analysis and understand the outcomes of the evaluation more fully. As this is an efficacy trial case studies will be developed to provide high quality, in-depth study to understand the implementation of the programme within the classroom context. Process evaluation data will also be used in the impact evaluation analysis in particular in the sensitivity analysis, with attendance at training being used as a proxy measure for implementation fidelity.

Costs

Following EEF guidelines, the evaluation team will provide a cost per pupil per year for the first year and potentially subsequent years of the intervention (following years will be less expensive due to non-recurrent costs being excluded, eg. lower training costs in subsequent years to cover new staff or top-up costs only). Costs of implementation will be systematically identified in the process evaluation and are likely to include training days (paying trainers, cost of materials, printing, venue, refreshments, travel) and resources. Opportunity, rather than financial costs, will be split out separately, eg. teacher time for training and planning. Cover costs for training will also be identified separately because some schools will pay for a supply teacher whereas others will manage by reallocating existing staff or using training days. Cost implications will be identified through discussions with the project team and teacher feedback from the survey, interviews and school visits.

Ethics and Registration

Ethical approval for this study was obtained through the Ethics Committee of the Department of Education, University of York (31/01/2017: Ref: 17/01). Initial consent for participation in the trial was be through Head teacher opt-in and teacher consent. The use of pupil data was through parental information sheets, including use of NPD data, and opt-out consent.

Due to the introduction of GDPR legislation during the process of this study ethical approval was re-requested (03/09/2018) and an Addendum to the original Memorandum of Understanding sent out to all schools setting out the basis for sharing and processing personal data. The University of York will process this data under Article 6(1)(e) and Special Category data under Article 9(2)(j) of the GDPR. In line with this schools were requested to:

- Sign and return the Addendum to the MOU;
- Distribute updates information sheets to parents/carers. This information sheet restated the nature of the intervention and the research, provided a GDPR compliant set of FAQs and reiterated the steps to follow if parents/carers objected to their child's data being shared and wish to withdraw. This withdrawal process replaced any reference in the MOU to opting-out, which is no longer applicable; and
- Sign and return a Data Sharing Agreement.

All outputs will be anonymised so that no schools will be identifiable in the report or dissemination of results. Data will be handled in accordance with Data Protection Act regulations and the GDPR. Statistical databases will hold non-identifiable data. All coding will subject to checking and data will be input twice to ensure accuracy. Confidentiality will be maintained and no one outside the evaluation team will have access to the database. The trial database will be securely held and maintained on the University's research data protection server, which is regularly backed up.

The trial is registered at http://www.isrctn.com/ (Study ID: ISRCTN15266150).

PERSONNEL

Evaluation Team

Dr Louise Tracey (Principal Investigator), Department of Education, University of York.

Dr Jan R. Boehnke (Co-Investigator), Dundee Centre for Health and Related Research and School of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Dundee.

Louise Elliott (Co-Investigator), York Trials Unit, University of York.

Dr Pam Hanley (Consultant), Pam Hanley Consultancy.

The Evaluation Team will be responsible for the design, randomisation, data collection, analysis and reporting of the evaluation.

Delivery Team

Challenge Partners (Project Management, recruitment, Quality Assurance, monitoring, admin)

Stefani Shedden, Programme Director

Roisin Killick, Programme Coordinator

Laura Lewis-Williams, Director of Partnerships and Programmes

Jacquie Smith, Consultant Content Director

Hounslow Language Service (Training design, content development and training delivery)

Li Yen French, Director

Rehana Ahmed, Managing Director

Manny Vazquez, EAL specialist

Andy Harvey, EAL specialist

Lampton School (Training design, content development and Quality Assurance and support services)

The Delivery Team will be responsible for school recruitment, intervention development, training and delivery of the programme.

RISKS

Risk	Preventative measures	Likelihood
Insufficient schools recruited	• emphasise promising intervention, not very disruptive on the curriculum • emphasise evaluation not very onerous • outcome measures are routinely collected data (GCSE results)	Low
High attrition from evaluation, especially of controls	• initial recruitment to clearly explain RCT and value of controls • regular “newsletter”/contact • financial incentive to controls • over-recruit by 15% • pre-test and interim measure results could be provided to all schools	Low
High attrition from intervention or poor implementation	• as this is an efficacy trial we anticipate high levels of mentoring and monitoring by trainers	Low
School staff turnover	• system for notification of teacher turnover or sickness so new staff get trained quickly	Medium
Managing a team across departments and disciplines	• responsibility for co-ordination with PI (Louise Tracey) who has extensive experience of project managing similar teams • regular meetings and updates by team members • clear differentiation of responsibilities and roles	Low

TIMELINE

	School Year 2016-2017			School Year 2017-2018			School Year 2018-2019			School Year 2019-2020		
	Autumn Term	Spring Term	Summer Term	Autumn Term	Spring Term	Summer Term	Autumn Term	Spring Term	Summer Term	Autumn Term	Spring Term	Summer Term
PILOT												
Recruit delivery sites to trial												
Trial measures												
Collect pilot data												
Determine trial viability												
MAIN TRIAL												
Recruit schools												
Randomise												
Collect school data												
Collect pre-test data (KS2)												
Attend training												
Collect fluency measure												
Conduct observations and Interviews												
Collect process evaluation data												
Collect survey data												
Intervention												
Collect post-test (GCSEs)												
Conduct Analyses												
Main report												

References

Education Endowment Foundation, 'Pre-testing in EEF evaluations'. Dated 31.10.2013

Hollingworth, S. & Mansaray, A. (2012). Language Diversity and Attainment in English Secondary Schools: A Scoping Study. London: The Institute for Policy Studies in Education (IPSE).

London West Alliance (2015), London Schools Excellence Fund. Self-Evaluation Toolkit. Final Report.

Murphy, A. & Unthiah, A. (2015). A systematic review of intervention research examining English language and literacy development in children with English as an Additional Language (EAL). London: EEF.

NALDIC, http://www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-statistics/ealachievement/ (Accessed 10 May 2016)

Raudenbush, S.W., et al. (2011). Optimal Design Software for Multi-level and Longitudinal Research (Version 3.01) [Software]. Available from www.wtgrantfoundation.org.

Strand, S., Malmberg, L. & Hall, J. (2015.) English as an Additional Language (EAL) and educational achievement in England: An analysis of the National Pupil Database. London: EEF.