DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 218 CS 511 701

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Department for Education and Skills, London (England). |
| PUB DATE | 1997-09-00 |
| NOTE | 21p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Department for Education and Skills (DfES), PROLOG, P.O. Box 5050, Sherwood Park, Annesley, Notts NG15 0DJ. Tel: 0845 6022260; Fax: 0845 6033360; e-mail: dfes@prolog.uk.com. For full text: http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/literacy/publications/?pub_id=116&art_id=540. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Gender Issues; Leadership Effectiveness; *Literacy; *Program Evaluation; Reading Tests; Student Attitudes; *Student Improvement; *Teacher Effectiveness |
| IDENTIFIERS | *National Literacy Strategy (England) |

ABSTRACT

The National Literacy Project was implemented in its first cohort of schools from autumn 1996 to summer 1998. Participating schools introduced a Literacy Hour, based on specific learning objectives, as the main means of literacy teaching. The project was evaluated by the National Foundation for Educational Research, by means of: tests of reading; a survey of children's attitudes to reading; and questionnaires completed by participating headteachers. Project consultants supplied additional information on the characteristics of teaching, learning, and management within project schools. The test results revealed a significant and substantial improvement in children's scores in the course of the project. Girls had higher average scores than boys and made more progress in the course of the project. Children eligible for free school meals, those with special educational needs, and those leaning English as an additional language had lower average scores, although all these groups nonetheless made significant progress. The role of the headteacher in successful project schools was crucial, in providing committed, engaged, and informed leadership. Effective teaching within the literacy hour was characterized by consistency, clear structure, high quality interaction, good pace, and thorough planning. Includes 4 references and an appendix which details data sources. (PM)

# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report.



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Executive Summary: Evaluation of the NLP

1. The National Literacy Project was implemented in its first cohort of schools from autumn 1996 to summer 1998. Participating schools introduced a literacy hour, based on specific learning objectives, as the main means of literacy teaching. Specialist consultants provided support in the form of training and advice on the management of literacy within schools. Approximately 250 schools in 18 local education authorities took part.

2. The project was evaluated by the National Foundation for Educational Research, by means of: tests of reading; a survey of children's attitudes to reading; and questionnaires completed by participating headteachers. Project consultants supplied additional information on the characteristics of teaching, learning and management within project schools.

3. The test results revealed a significant and substantial improvement in children's scores in the course of the project. Pupils in participating schools had scores below the national average at the outset. Final test scores had improved by approximately six standardised score points, so that they were still below, but significantly closer to, the national average.

4. Girls had higher average scores than boys and made more progress than boys in the course of the project. Children eligible for free school meals, those with special educational needs and those learning English as an additional language had lower than average scores, although all these groups nonetheless made significant progress.

5. The role of the headteacher in successful project schools was crucial, in providing committed, engaged and informed leadership in the management of the new initiative. Successful schools gave the implementation of the project a high priority in their development plans.

6. Effective teaching within the literacy hour was characterised by consistency, clear structure, high quality interaction and good pace, underpinned by thorough planning.

7. Headteachers regarded the introduction of the literacy hour overwhelmingly positively, whilst pointing out that it had major implications in terms of management and resourcing.

8. Children gained in reading confidence in the course of the project, saying that they needed less help with their reading at the end than they had initially. Their levels of enjoyment of reading were high.

9. The project schools offer a valuable model for schools currently implementing the National Literacy Strategy.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

**Marian Sainsbury**

National Foundation for Educational Research
December 1998



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## The Project

The National Literacy Project (NLP) was set up in the spring of 1996. The project aimed to improve standards of literacy both by supporting individual teachers and by bringing about institutional changes at school level, so that its practices became an established way of working. The means of bringing about these changes were set out in the *National Literacy Project Framework for Teaching.* Essentially, the project consisted of three elements.

The first of these elements was a detailed scheme of term by term objectives to cover the range of required work. For each term of the primary years, a range of texts, drawn from the required range in the National Curriculum programmes of study, was specified. Teaching objectives at three levels, text level, sentence level and word level, were set out, for both reading and writing, to match the text types studied.

The second element consisted of common procedures for planning and the use of time. The objectives were taught by means of a daily literacy hour, in which there was a stress on direct instruction by the teacher. The hour started with a 10-15 minute session of shared reading or writing for the whole class. This was followed by 10-15 minutes of whole-class teaching of word or sentence work. The children then split into groups and undertook a range of directed activities for 25-30 minutes. Finally, the whole class came together for a plenary session to report back on achievements and review teaching points. The literacy hour structure was supported by weekly planning sheets, in which the range of whole-class and group activities was to be specified. There were also half-termly planning sheets and weekly evaluation sheets. A pupil assessment sheet recorded a half-termly target for each child in reading and in writing, and progress towards the achievement of these targets.

The third element of the project was training and support through a national network. A national centre was established, linked to local centres, to support the teaching of literacy and disseminate the work. This centre was responsible for the production of training materials and the *Framework for Teaching.* In each local centre, a team of consultants was available to provide models of effective literacy teaching, and advice and training for schools. A five-day intensive training course was provided for two key teachers in each school, with further INSET also available. Advice was offered to school managers on auditing and managing their school's literacy provision, to identify needs, set targets, and plan appropriate action to meet them.

The project was established in 14 centres covering 18 local education authorities (LEAs):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Newcastle-upon-Tyne | Manchester | Sandwell |
| Sheffield | Liverpool | Bristol |
| Hampshire, The Isle of Wight, | Essex | Southwark and Lambeth |

Related Items

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Portsmouth and Southampton | Norfolk | Islington |
| Newham | Waltham Forest | Tower Hamlets (associate centre) |

In each of these centres, a cohort of approximately 20 schools was selected to implement the project from autumn 1996. Training began in that autumn term and schools were expected to adopt the NLP approaches from January 1997 onwards. Each school would be directly involved in the project for two years, with the expectation that it would continue to implement the project's approaches once the two years had elapsed. This is the summary report into the evaluation of these first cohort schools, about 250 in number, which participated in the project from autumn 1996 to summer 1998. The full report is available from the NFER publication unit.



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## The Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research. Its aims were to assess the success of the project in terms of:

- children's progress in reading over the two years of the project;
- children's attitudes to reading;
- how well the training and support met the needs of participating schools.

This report also draws upon evidence provided by the project LEAs on:

- the characteristics of teaching, learning and management in schools implementing the project.

Details of all the data sources are given in the Appendix.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Children's Progress in Reading

In order to assess children's progress in reading over the two years of their participation in the project, they were tested at the outset, beginning from October 1996, and close to the end, in March 1998, using standardised tests of reading, which are listed in the Appendix. The children tested were in Year 1, Year 3 and Year 5 for the initial test, and in Year 2, Year 4 and Year 6 for the final test. The results reported here therefore represent the progress made over a period of just under a year and a half.

When tests are standardised, they are taken by a large national sample, so that a reliable estimate can be obtained of national average performance. By using standardised tests, therefore, it was possible to compare the performance of the project children with national average performance, as established in the standardisation. The national sample can be considered as a proxy for a 'control group' for comparison with the project pupils. In the standardised tests used, the national average standardised score was set at 100, with scores on a scale from 69 to 141. The scores reported below are on this scale. Each child's age, in years and months, was taken into account in calculating his or her standardised score.

Table 1 shows the initial average score, the final score, and the average increase in score, for each year group.

**Table 1: Reading test scores**

| Year group | Average initial standardised score (autumn 96) | Average final standardised score (spring 98) | Increase in standardised score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Year 1/2 | 85.6 | 97.0 | 11.5 |
| Year 3/4 | 89.2 | 95.6 | 6.4 |
| Year 5/6 | 90.0 | 96.2 | 6.2 |

Children in project schools started at a point some way below the national average as readers, as the first column shows. This reflects the nature of the target group for the project. Scores for all year groups were below the national average of 100. Scores in Year 1 were particularly low, but this may to some extent be accounted for by features of the test used with this age group.

In the course of the project, there was a significant improvement in children's reading test scores. In all three year groups, there was a rise in standardised scores from the initial to final test. This was substantial, at around 6 points of standardised score for the Year 3/4 and 5/6 groups and over 11 points for the Year 1/2 group. This last figure may, though, have been exaggerated by the possibly artificially low initial score.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

With the large sample size involved, all of these changes are statistically significant. More importantly, perhaps, a rise of six points of standardised score, for these tests, is equivalent to about 8 to 12 months' progress, over and above what is expected. Alternatively, the changes can be expressed in terms of the 'percentile rank' of the average pupil. For the Year 1/2 group, the average pupil started at a point where they would be ranked 83rd out of 100 pupils nationally. This increased to 58th out of 100. Similarly the Year 3/4 group increased from 76th to 61st out of 100. The Year 5/6 pupils increased from 74th to 60th out of 100 pupils, on average.

Hence it is clear that pupils in general made greater than expected progress over less than two years of involvement in the National Literacy Project. However, it remains important to examine whether this was the case for all types of pupil and school. Background information on all the children tested and on all the schools in the project was collected in order to investigate this. Average scores for different groups of pupils can then be compared. In order to provide a full and accurate picture, a statistical technique known as multilevel modelling was used. This technique allows a full analysis of the ways in which the various background factors interact. That is, it makes it possible to say whether a difference is significant, once all the other factors have been taken into account. The results of these analyses are set out below. In the following tables, the scores for all three age groups have been combined to give an overall average for the whole sample of children.



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Gender

The scores of boys and girls may be compared for the initial and final tests and also in terms of the increase in scores. These results are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Results for boys and girls**

| | Average initial standardised score (autumn 96) | Average final standardised score (spring 98) | Increase in standardised score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 86.6 | 94.3 | 7.7 |
| Girls | 90.0 | 98.3 | 8.3 |

Both boys and girls made significant progress. For all the age groups, the mean scores for girls, both initially and finally, were higher than those for boys. All differences were statistically significant, and were around two to three points of standardised score, representing around three or four months of development. Both boys and girls benefited from the scheme in the sense that their standardised scores rose. The multilevel analysis revealed that girls made significantly more progress during the project than did boys.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

One approximate measure of socio-economic status or of poverty is to ask whether children are eligible for free school meals. To fall into this category, pupils' parents must generally be receiving income support.

In England as a whole 21 per cent of pupils are eligible for free school meals. For this sample of schools involved in the National Literacy Project, the proportions varied from 43 to 45 per cent across the three year group samples. This is considerably greater than the national proportion, reflecting the make-up of the schools and authorities targeted for this project.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Free school meals**

| Eligible for free school meals | Average initial standardised score (autumn 96) | Average final standardised score (spring 98) | Increase in standardised score |
|---|---|---|---|
| No | 90.7 | 99.1 | 8.4 |
| Yes | 85.2 | 92.7 | 7.5 |

Pupils eligible for free school meals had lower scores than those not eligible. This was consistent across the three year groups and for both the initial and final test scores. Both groups of pupils made progress in terms of their test results, with increases in mean scores. However, the multilevel analysis revealed that children not eligible for free school meals made significantly better progress in the course of the project than those who were eligible. The proportion of children eligible for free school meals within a school also emerged as a significant factor related to lower scores.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Special Educational Needs

**Table 4: Special educational needs**

| Special Educational Needs Stage | Average initial standardised score (autumn 96) | Average final standardised score (spring 98) | Increase in standardised score |
|---|---|---|---|
| No SEN | 92.4 | 100.9 | 8.5 |
| Stage 1 | 81.2 | 89.0 | 7.8 |
| Stage 2 | 78.1 | 84.9 | 6.8 |
| Stage 3 | 76.0 | 81.0 | 5.0 |
| Stage 4 | 75.3 | 77.6 | 2.3 |
| Stage 5 | 73.8 | 76.9 | 3.1 |
| Statement | 74.5 | 77.3 | 2.8 |

For all three year groups, there was a clear hierarchy of scores from those with no special educational needs to those who had statements. This hierarchy was present in the initial scores and remained or, in fact, was increased in the final standardised scores. All groups increased their scores, but there were differences among them in the extent of the change. Statemented children and those at stages 3 to 5 had consistently smaller gains in score than children with no special educational needs or those at stages 1 and 2. This tendency for children with more severe special needs to make less progress was confirmed by the multilevel model.

The project approach is to include all children in the literacy hour. In the whole-class parts of the hour, teachers should adjust their questioning and comments as they interact with individual children. The group work should be planned to provide a close match to the attainments of the children in each group. The positive result of the analysis is that all groups of children benefited from their inclusion in the project, in terms of improved standardised scores. That is, they all, even those with the most severe special needs, made more progress than expected. However, those with the greatest special needs, children with statements or those at stages 3 to 5, benefited to a lesser extent than others. It is not clear whether the performance of these groups of children could be improved still further by fine tuning the teaching within the literacy hour.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Pupils with English as an Additional Language

Schools were asked to provide information on their pupils as to whether their first language was English, or if it was an additional language for them. Those for whom it was additional were further categorised into four stages: 1) new to English; 2) becoming familiar with English; 3) becoming confident as a user of English; and 4) a very fluent user of English in most social and learning contexts.[1] Table 5 gives the results.

**Table 5: English as an additional language**

| Stage of English Fluency | Average initial standardised score (autumn 96) | Average final standardised score (spring 98) | Increase in standardised score |
|---|---|---|---|
| English first language | 88.6 | 96.7 | 8.1 |
| Stage 1 | 76.7 | 87.2 | 10.5 |
| Stage 2 | 81.3 | 88.3 | 7.0 |
| Stage 3 | 86.7 | 94.1 | 7.4 |
| Stage 4 | 92.9 | 100.1 | 7.2 |

The initial standardised scores followed almost the same pattern for all three age groups. Pupils for whom English was an additional language but who were categorised as very fluent had the highest scores, then came children with English as a first language. This perhaps reflects greater language skills amongst fluent bilingual children. Amongst those not yet fully fluent in English, scores increased with the stage of fluency.

All groups had significant positive changes in average scores from the initial to the final standardised scores. In the multilevel analysis, it emerged that children at stage 2 on the fluency scale made less progress than other groups, once other factors had been taken into account. This suggests once again that differentiation within the literacy hour may need fine-tuning for those children who are only just becoming familiar with English.

[1] These categories were developed in: Centre for Language in Primary Education (1991). *Patterns of Learning*. London: CLPE.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Other findings

Because of the nature of the areas selected for inclusion in the National Literacy Project, large numbers of pupils were from ethnic minorities. The percentages of the sample were 23 per cent, 28 per cent and 27 per cent for the Year 1/2, Year 3/4 and Year 5/6 groups respectively. This compares to the national figure of nine per cent of children in primary schools as a whole in England.

The data collected used the conventional census categories and hence 'Black' was made up of 'Black African', 'Black Caribbean' and 'Black Other'. 'Asian' was made up of 'Indian', 'Pakistani', Bangladeshi' and 'Chinese'. The multilevel analysis indicated that, of these groups, those classified as Black African, Black Other, Indian and Chinese had significantly higher scores relative to other groups. No ethnic group showed significantly lower performance than the average. There were no significant differences in the progress made by different ethnic groups; all benefited equally from the project.

The analysis investigated the progress made by higher and lower attaining children within the sample. This proved a complex matter, with different patterns emerging according to the exact nature of the analysis. Overall, however, when all other variables were taken into account, the analysis revealed that greater progress tended to be made by high attaining children.

The progress made during the project was examined separately for each of the LEAs taking part, using the multilevel analysis. This revealed that similar levels of progress were made across all the participating LEAs. Although there were some minor differences between them, none of the differences was statistically significant.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Views of Consultants

The LEA consultants reported a number of features that typified those schools in which implementation had been most successful.

The role of the headteacher was generally seen as crucial. One LEA report described the ideal headteacher as 'committed, engaged, informed', which summarises well the comments of others. Headteachers were considered most effective when they managed the initiative themselves, rather than delegating its overall management to a deputy. Roles and responsibilities were clearly defined, and in some schools a 'project team' undertook responsibility for the initiative, thus spreading the workload beyond the key teachers. In successful schools, the project was identified by the head as a clear priority: it occupied a central place in the school development plan, and the head communicated a clear message about its importance. Similarly, successful headteachers set clear timetables and expectations for the implementation of the project, and involved their whole staff in the initiative. Headteachers were also responsible for ensuring that timetabling within the school supported the structure of the literacy hour. Often, schools were organised so that the literacy hour took place at different times for different classes, in order to optimise the use of staff and resources.

The choice of key teachers was also identified as a factor in the success of the project. To be most effective, key teachers, too, needed clarity of direction and visible commitment, together with the ability to motivate staff and the authority to influence their colleagues. The key teachers needed to be released regularly to work with colleagues by giving demonstration lessons, leading planning sessions and observing the literacy hour in the classroom.

The monitoring of the implementation of the project within school also emerged as an important feature. In successful schools, the headteacher was involved in monitoring teachers' planning, and also in classroom observations. Key teachers, too, regularly observed other members of staff as they taught the literacy hour and gave constructive feedback. Following on from this systematic monitoring, frequent whole-staff reviews of progress also helped to establish priorities.

Adequate resourcing was clearly necessary for the successful introduction of the project, and the resourcing implications of the literacy hour were found to be considerable. These consisted mainly of sets of books for guided reading, as well as suitable texts for shared reading and such things as whiteboards, task boards and laminating equipment. As well as the provision of resources, however, there was a need for active and systematic management and review of resources within schools. Some successful schools had organised a central resource area for the project.

At classroom level, the project depended heavily on effective planning. Successful teachers planned consistently and systematically, often using team approaches to share the workload. Within effective schools, individual teachers who showed strengths were recognised and given greater responsibility for leading the planning process. Termly plans were closely linked to weekly plans. The most successful teachers had a good knowledge of a wide range of texts, to help them in their selection of suitable materials for the week's work. To be effective, planning needed to

Related Items

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

include a clear focus for the independent group work and for the final plenary, as well as the other elements of the literacy hour. An avoidance of decontextualised work sheets and an encouragement of interactive group activities were identified as important factors. The most successful teachers evaluated each week's work thoughtfully in terms of their teaching objectives, and built this reflection into their planning.

Effective teaching within the literacy hour was characterised by consistency, clear structure, high quality interaction and good pace. A wide range of texts and a wide range of reading skills were included. Successful teachers had high expectations of their pupils and based their teaching upon clear learning objectives, not just upon the routines and structures of the literacy hour. Good classroom management skills were important, and teachers needed to have high expectations of children's ability to work independently. Additional adults were often deployed in the classroom during the literacy hour, and the most effective teachers planned their deployment carefully and offered mentoring and support to maximise their effectiveness.

In the summer term of 1998, the LEA consultants evaluated each of the project schools in the light of the description of good practice outlined above. They identified only 13 per cent of schools where the project had not been implemented satisfactorily. Thirty-six per cent of schools were judged 'good' and the remaining 51 per cent 'satisfactory'.

The National Literacy Strategy



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report





## Views of Headteachers

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

The introduction of the literacy hour attracted overwhelming approval from headteachers. Eighty-six per cent of them rated it 'very useful' as a focus for teaching in the classroom, and 77 per cent rated it 'very useful' as a means of managing literacy at school level. Almost all the other respondents regarded it as 'quite useful' in both respects. Nevertheless, its introduction was not problem-free, and around half of the headteachers surveyed reported that they had encountered some problems in establishing the teaching of the literacy hour. There was some evidence that the assessment and target-setting elements of the project were less successful than the literacy hour itself, and that schools tended to adapt the project's approaches in this area.

Headteachers of project schools were asked to describe in more detail the nature and cause of any problems encountered in implementing the project. Most of the problems reported were 'minor' rather than 'significant' in nature, but a majority of heads said that they had had some difficulties with each of: staff turnover, staff absence, staff competence or understanding and staff resistance to the project. In view of the ambitious scope and considerable challenges represented by the project, the high level of satisfactory implementation in the face of these difficulties would seem to bear witness to the success of the national and local support mechanisms and to the commitment of participating schools.

In providing support, the role of the consultants was viewed by headteachers as crucial. Successful consultants applied their knowledge of the school context to provide practical and realistic support with a degree of flexibility, and thus to inspire confidence. Their training input was stimulating and knowledgeable, and they were able to provide constructive feedback on the classroom teaching they observed. School visits also offered the opportunity to talk to heads about management issues.

Headteachers were asked for ratings of various aspects of training and support: the five-day training course; school-based training by consultant; classroom support from consultant; school-based dissemination by designated teachers; other INSET - networks, twilights, etc; and support and leadership from the LEA. These responses are set out in Figure 1. The greater the amount of dark shading on each bar of the graph, the greater the level of satisfaction. As the figure shows, all aspects of training and support received positive ratings, with perhaps most doubt about support and leadership from the LEA itself. This latter aspect may have been less visible to schools than their contacts with the appointed consultants.

This image needs to be placed here
< img src="/images/NLSfig1a.gif" height=387" width="433" >



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Children's Attitudes to Reading

In order to give the children in the project some voice in the evaluation, a questionnaire was devised to address their attitudes to reading. This was administered to the older age groups only - Years 3, 4, 5 and 6 - at the same time as they were tested. The questionnaire asked them to tick 'agree', 'not sure' or 'disagree' in response to a variety of statements such as 'I like reading stories' or 'I think reading is difficult'. The analysis combined the children's responses into three factors:

- needing help with reading
- enjoyment of reading
- preferring comics and magazines to stories and other books.

Children's need for help with their reading was shown where they responded that they thought reading was difficult, or that an adult regularly helped them with their reading. This factor showed a significant decline in the course of the project. As children's ability to read independently increased, their need for assistance declined correspondingly, and this was reflected in their questionnaire responses. For all age groups, girls were more likely to say that they needed help with reading than boys. The survey did not provide any evidence as to why this might be the case; it is possible that girls were more willing to admit to a need for help than were boys. Children with special educational needs and those learning English as an additional language also, understandably, needed more help with reading than the average.

Generally, children in the project expressed positive attitudes to their reading at the beginning and at the end, with substantial majorities of all year groups agreeing with statements such as 'I like reading stories'. There was a tendency for some groups of children to prefer comics or magazines to books. This was particularly the case for boys, and also for older children. There were indications that children in Year 3/4 had a preference for comics, whereas the Year 5/6 group preferred magazines, probably a reflection of changing tastes as children grew older. Girls were more likely to enjoy reading than boys. The older children - Years 5 and 6 - enjoyed reading rather less than the Year 3 and 4 group. However, reading enjoyment scores did not change significantly in the course of the project: children in both year groups enjoyed their reading just as much at the end as at the beginning.

The attitude survey overall, therefore, revealed a picture of children as enthusiastic readers, and whose confidence in their reading ability had increased substantially over the course of the project.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Conclusion

A National Literacy Strategy was introduced in all schools from the autumn of 1998. This has a central role in government policies aimed at meeting the national literacy target in the year 2002. The report of the Literacy Task Force referred to a 'long tail of underachievement' in Britain and the aim of the National Literacy Strategy is to improve this picture by enhancing children's achievements in reading and writing.

The National Literacy Strategy is very similar in its objectives and structure to the National Literacy Project. Support from the government for this initiative includes the appointment of some 200 literacy consultants nationally, a training programme, additional resourcing and an enhanced role for a literacy co-ordinator within each school. All schools are required to set their own targets and expected to timetable a daily literacy hour as part of the strategy.

The evidence from this evaluation is that pupils who participated in the National Literacy Project made substantial progress in literacy. The children in the cohort 1 schools, who started below the national average as readers, made significant improvements in reading, as measured by test scores. Their enjoyment of reading was sustained over the two years of the project, and they needed progressively less help with their reading. These improvements took place in schools that were not fully representative of the national picture, as the discussion above has shown. The project schools were selected for participation. They were more likely to be situated in economically deprived areas, and the children's reading scores were below the national average.

The evaluation evidence also showed that involvement in the National Literacy Project proved a major undertaking for these schools. To implement the project properly, it had to be the main priority for the school's development. It necessitated substantial changes at management and at classroom level, and constant monitoring and review. Its resource implications were considerable. These findings echo the advice of the Literacy Task Force to schools implementing the National Literacy Strategy. The evidence is that the overwhelming majority of schools in cohort 1 of the National Literacy Project were willing to take on this commitment, and were successful in making the project work, often in the face of difficulties of various kinds. These achievements were supported by an intensive programme of training, advice and resources from the project LEAs and their specialist consultants. The project schools therefore offer a valuable model for all those implementing the National Literacy Strategy.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## References

*A Reading Revolution: How we can teach every child to read well.* Preliminary Report of the Literacy Task Force, February 1997.

*The National Literacy Project Framework for Teaching (Draft),* March 1997.

*The Implementation of the National Literacy Strategy.* Final Report of the Literacy Task Force, August 1997.

*The National Literacy Strategy Framework for Teaching,* March 1998.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report



# Evaluation of National Literacy Project: Summary Report

download/order



## Appendix

This summary report was prepared by Marian Sainsbury of the National Foundation for Educational Research, with the help of Neil Hagues, Mary Minnis, Ian Schagen and Chris Whetton. The data sources are detailed below. The full report is available from the NFER publication unit.

**Section 3** is based on the sample of pupils for whom both initial and final test scores were available:

- scores on the *Primary Reading Test* for 6851 children in Year 1/2;
- scores on *Progress in English 8* and *9* for 6898 children in Year 3/4;
- scores on *Progress in English 10* and *11* for 7297 children in Year 5/6.

The *Progress in English* series tests mainly reading comprehension, but also spelling and punctuation.

**Section 4** is based on:

- descriptive reports from 17 project LEAs in summer 1997;
- descriptive reports from 13 project LEAs in summer 1998;
- LEA ratings of how well the project was implemented in 146 schools in summer 1997;
- LEA ratings of how well the project was implemented in 245 schools in summer 1998;
- responses from 186 headteachers to a questionnaire in spring 1998 concerning the usefulness of various elements of the project and its support mechanisms;
- responses from 154 headteachers to a questionnaire in summer 1998 concerning the effectiveness with which they considered they had implemented the project, and any problems that arose.

**Section 5** is based on:

- the responses of 7053 Year 3/4 children and 7559 Year 5/6 children who completed questionnaires at both time points.

**Related Items**

Implementation of the NLS: Final Report

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

# NOTICE

## Reproduction Basis

| | |
|---|---|
| | This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form. |
| X | This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket"). |