# Comparative Case Study Proforma 2024 – *partially-completed example*

**Research Question/Area of Focus**

|  |
| --- |
| How do primary schools overcome barriers to sustain teaching for mastery? |

**Why did you choose this?**

|  |
| --- |
| As a MHLMT we are increasingly interested in the profile of our Sustaining schools. And particularly in how schools we have worked with for a number of years have overcome a range of barriers to sustain teaching for mastery. |

**How and why did you choose the case schools?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| We chose two contrasting schools based on intelligence held by our LLME and MHLM Team. Both schools are in the sustaining phase and participants from these schools play a full part in Sustaining Work Groups and report positively about the continued impact that sustaining teaching for mastery is having. We hope that these two schools will provide an illuminated comparison to inform future work. | |
| * School A has a Primary Mastery Specialist. * School A has had a large turnover of staff in the last few years, including a new headteacher. * School A is a single form entry primary with significant levels of disadvantage. | * School B does not have a Primary Mastery Specialist. * School B’s staffing has remained stable in recent years. * School B is a two-form entry primary with a lower proportion of disadvantaged pupils. |

**Brief description of activity**

|  |
| --- |
| MHL and AMHL communicated with headteachers and maths lead from both schools to set up the school visits. They then visited each school for half a day. There was a consistent programme in both schools:   * Meeting with the headteacher * Meeting with the Maths lead and participants * Learning walks across year groups * Pupil voice * Staff voice   Verbal reflections were also discussed at the end of the visit and a thank-you email was sent following the visit. |

**Themes and Implications**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Theme** | **School A commentary** | **School B commentary** | **MHLMT Implications** |
| Having a school ethos and vision that resonates and aligns with the principles of teaching for mastery is a major factor in overcoming barriers. | School leadership articulates a vision for maths which broadly aligns with teaching for mastery. The new headteacher and maths lead appear firmly committed to a scheme which is limiting opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively and for pupils to deepen their understanding of maths.  There are also examples of pupils being withdrawn from whole-class teaching to work on different, less-demanding work with teaching assistants. | We found that there is a shared belief across the school, and trust, which aligns with the Maths Hub and the NCETM vision that education is transformative. Teaching for mastery feeds into this belief. There is a common vision that all children can learn maths, and this is widely articulated. | Develop opportunities for all Mastery Specialists to build their knowledge of Mastery Readiness would help them to support schools at different stages of the pathway, even in Sustaining, where there has been a change in staff and therefore a need to focus on school vision.  Consider opportunities for a relevant member of the MHLMT to visit LLMEs’ schools to model behaviours to influence headteachers and senior leaders. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Summary reflections and next steps (process and implications)**

|  |
| --- |
|  |