



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A review of progress in implementing the 1+2 languages policy

Citation for published version:

Christie, J, Robertson, B, Stodter, J & O'Hanlon, F 2016, *A review of progress in implementing the 1+2 languages policy*. Association of Directors of Education in Scotland.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





A Review of Progress in Implementing The 1+2 Language Policy

John Christie
Bruce Robertson
John Stodter
on behalf of ADES

Dr Fiona O'Hanlon, The University of Edinburgh

March 2016

1 Context

The Scottish Government Learning Directorate has commissioned ADES to conduct research on the implementation of the language learning policy, the '1+2' approach. This is an appropriate time to seek an independent view of state of implementation as we approach the mid-way point in the implementation (to be achieved over the course of two Parliaments). The research was carried out between December 2015 and February 2016.

2 The 1+2 Approach

Scottish Government have made an ambitious languages commitment “to introduce a norm for language learning based on the European Union 1+2 model – that we will create the conditions in which every child will learn two languages in addition to their mother tongue.” The aim is to create a new model of language acquisition for Scotland over the course of two Parliaments.

Scottish Government is working in partnership with local authorities and stakeholders to enable learning of the first additional language to start from Primary One, with a second additional language to be offered by all schools from Primary Five. This is a long term and very ambitious policy. The aim is to make Scotland as successful as possible, with language capability as an important part of this success. This means that it is important that young people are attracted to learning languages, and that they become confident and competent linguists, well equipped with the skills and capacities needed globally and in the 21st century marketplace.

A Languages Working Group was set up in September 2011 to consider strategic implications for longer term delivery of the commitment and to report to Ministers. The Group's report and recommendations, *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach*, were published on 17 May 2012.

Scottish Ministers have welcomed the *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach* report and its 35 recommendations, either in full or in part, while recognising that taking these forward will require discussion, collaboration and partnership with local authorities, schools, parents and other key stakeholders. Education Scotland are supporting the implementation of this policy and support is also offered by Scotland's National Centre for Languages (SCILT) which complements the work of Education Scotland.

As a result of the report, a Languages Strategic Implementation Group was set up in May 2013 to oversee and facilitate the implementation of the recommendations.

3 Authority Strategies 2015: 1+2 Implementation

Primary schools

All 31 LA submissions (those submitted by September 2015) state that they are on track for implementation of a first additional language (L2) from P1 to P7 by 2020. While plans for implementation of the second additional language (L3) are at varying stages across the country; almost all local authorities are confident that the 2020 deadline will be met. Varying approaches are reported to support the delivery of L3 including the full P5-P7 route, the use of Modern Language Assistants to support primary staff and the delivery of a variety of languages throughout the P5-P7 experience.

L2 Languages

Where L2 is mentioned in the strategy, the following list shows Modern Languages in terms of popularity. The digit to the right indicates the number of mentions of this language in LAs. This could be in only one cluster, or across the whole LA.

1. French - 24
2. Spanish - 14
3. Gaelic (L) - 6
4. German - 5
5. Mandarin - 2
6. Italian - 1
7. Urdu - 1
8. English - 1

[* 2 LAs did not specify L2]

L3 Languages

NB a number of clusters have still to decide on L3, and did not disclose at the time of submission what their likely L3 will be.

Where L3 is mentioned in the strategy, this list shows MLs in terms of popularity. The digit to the right indicates the number of mentions of this language in an LA. This could be in only one school, or across the whole LA.

1. Spanish - 19
2. German - 16
3. French - 14
4. Mandarin - 13
5. Gaelic (L) - 12
6. BSL - 8
7. Italian - 6
8. Scots - 4
9. Latin - 2
10. Polish - 1
11. Russian - 1
12. Urdu - 1
13. Arabic - 1
14. Community/heritage languages (this area still to be determined and followed up)
15. Makaton

Secondary schools

Local authority returns offer a varied picture of current provision within the BGE. Almost all LAs have L2 provision up to the end of S3.

Where secondary schools currently do not have MLs in the core S1-S3, there are discussions/ planning underway to ensure the entitlement will be met.

L3 provision is a more mixed landscape. Some schools/LAs are looking at ways in which to deliver entitlement. Some secondary schools may need support with the timetabling of L3 as part of the BGE.

A number of secondary schools are currently providing an L3 experience by 'borrowing' time from the L2 language provision, compromising the depth of experience in L2, with concerns re sufficient readiness for NQs in MLs further up the school. This is not a recommendation within the policy.

4 The Review

The time allocated for this review allowed for visits to a cross-section of eight local authorities of differing sizes, locations, and backgrounds. Three members of the team of reviewers spent a day in each local authority apart from the island authority visited, where two members attended. We were made very welcome everywhere we visited: meeting directorate, education officers, headteacher, and teacher colleagues. The school visits were very helpful and positive in nature. One member of the team visited the national COALA meeting gaining an insight of the views of local authority representatives in attendance. We also were able to draw on the strategic plans update documentation which Scottish Government and Education Scotland had assimilated as well as documentation on policy development and implementation. We are grateful to all who participated in the review process for their openness and positive approach to our research.

All of the councils visited had allocated a high degree of importance to the '1+2' languages initiative. In almost all cases, elected members were engaged with the strategy, through papers presented at the relevant education committee. Directors had in every case delegated strategic responsibility for the languages 1+2 initiative to Heads of Service. The 1+2 modern languages development was commonly integrated into educational planning at authority, school group and individual school level.

Councils had appointed coordinators to lead the day-to-day development and implementation of the programme for the authority (with one exception where the responsibility sat with a Quality Improvement Officer and is now led by a senior education officer). Additionally, a number of councils had often located coordination and leadership responsibilities at school group, and individual school, levels.

Representative groups of primary headteachers were engaged in the planning and implementation of the local authority policies, and in some cases, secondary staff were involved too. At Associated School Group (ASG) level, local primary headteachers were involved as were, in most cases, but not all, secondary school representatives. There were good examples throughout of local primary school planning but the picture was mixed at full ASG level. In too many cases the 1+2 initiative was seen as largely a 'Primary' curricular development with the introduction of the new national qualifications in the secondary sector taking priority.

There was variation in the extent of the involvement of parents, particularly in the early stages of the development, however this is now improving and is seen as an important area for development because they have the potential to be key influencers of success. We found some good examples of engagement with local employers and local communities including with minority languages.

Communications initially had largely focused on internal school or authority staff but some good examples are emerging of communications to involve a wider group of partners in the planning and delivery of the strategies.

The successful deployment of language coordinators at area/council/cross authority level was cited as a critical feature in the success of the 1+2 development. In every case these posts are dependent on grant funding from Scottish Government.

Without this resource, local authority progress would not be so advanced. Some very innovative practice was seen and the role had provided professional development for seconded staff in particular. However, few examples of inter-authority sharing of practice and resources were seen, something that nationally the initiative would benefit from.

The choice of language 2 was largely determined in consultation with schools but constrained significantly by the existing teaching expertise in specific languages (e.g. French) in the area.

Progress on this national initiative was initially slow particularly in the first year of the 1+2 programme and at the start of the implementation in schools; however the pace of uptake increased significantly in year two particularly after the lift in national funding was announced. The authorities visited could demonstrate significant increases in the numbers of children benefiting from the initiative. Primary schools had in almost every case embraced the 1+2 initiative and were enthusiastically embedding the opportunities it afforded.

Where councils had a strong record of MLPS (Modern Languages in the Primary School), they were able to build on that expertise and capacity in developing their 1+2 policies: however, many saw the approach to be adopted in 1+2 as much more integrated into curriculum for excellence, more contextually based and more focused on communication and practical use of the target language in the process of broader learning. There has been limited formal evaluation of the outcomes from the development, with councils focusing on its management, implementation and coverage in the development phase. We did not investigate the quality of teaching and learning for this study but were generally impressed by the standards of teaching, the level of engagement of pupils, and the content and skill levels of teachers and pupils. However, there remains a challenge in ensuring consistent quality and standards in language learning, and in planning progression and continuity for pupils: this is reflected in the concerns of some secondary teachers, but was also voiced by primary teachers, headteachers and development officers.

In the context of tight timescales for implementation, financial year constraints, difficulties in recruiting appropriately skilled and language-qualified staff and lack of capacity in the existing workforce, as well as lack of available relief staff (e.g. to cover for colleagues developing the 1+2 programmes), there was little evidence of long-term strategic thinking in relation to the languages that would be best suited to meet the needs of local areas and of the country as a whole; and in particular, little consideration of English as an additional language and of how to meet the needs of pupils whose native language was not English.

It was, however, consistently reported that children whose native language was not English were often making better progress with the school's L2 than other children and also there were suggestions that these children were stronger in languages than in other curriculum areas. There was also some evidence to suggest that children with additional support needs and those with poor attainment appeared to enjoy and have success in

learning new languages. Classroom visits made by the team validated this particular aspect and it is something that is worth a more detailed research project.

In primary schools there was a high degree of engagement of headteachers, practitioners and learners. In all cases, local authorities had used resources to build capacity in school groups (particularly through training and professional development programmes) but also to buy and create high quality, interactive teaching and learning resources which in many cases were planned to accommodate learning progression and to fit the requirements of curriculum for excellence in terms of experiences and outcomes. Some innovative use of digital learning and CPD opportunities were seen.

All authorities have adopted very similar approaches to the development of materials and to curriculum planning. We saw some good examples of working across councils, schools and authorities. Although Education Scotland provided a range of support at national and local level for the implementation of 1+2 (including the development of resources, along with advice and professional development for practitioners), there was a general view that there is scope for Education Scotland to raise awareness in local authorities of the support available. There was also a desire expressed for Education Scotland to provide stronger support for the development of leadership, planning and coordination at a local level, complementing the work of SCILT

The provision and delivery of quality, practical professional development for teachers in using languages in the classroom context has been seen as a critical factor in the success of the 1+2 languages programme thus far and this continues to be the case. Teachers were universally positive about the training that has been provided and stressed the importance of the enthusiasm and expertise of trainers, and the practical and methodological nature of the training, focusing as it did on how to use high-quality resources to engage learners in the classroom. The impact of SCILT in the programme was seen by those authorities visited as a positive dimension with evidence of their involvement in a range of activities.

In most authorities visited, language learning in French is the predominant L2. One authority had elected to have Spanish as L2 in most ASG's. In one authority L2 is Gaelic for those in English medium schools, and in two authorities L2 is English for pupils in Gaelic medium education. Currently the biggest single impediment, constraint and challenge for councils in implementing the national languages policy has been the capacity of existing staff and the lack of availability of qualified language teachers. We saw some good examples of the engagement of parents, local employers and foreign language assistants to help build capacity including co-teaching and cross-curricular or extra-curricular themed events and activities.

Other languages being offered include Spanish, German, Italian, Gaelic, Mandarin and Scots. British Sign Language has also been offered in a few schools.

Although there has been significant enthusiasm for the teaching and learning of languages in the early stages of this development, there remains some nervousness about the higher level of language skills that will be required in the upper stages of primary schools for pupils who have received modern languages experiences since Primary 1. Authorities are well aware of the significant challenges involved in developing a sustainable strategy for teaching language 2 and language 3 in upper primary, and in the longer term. Different models of delivery for the upper stages of Primary schools should be investigated as a matter of urgency.

The engagement of secondary schools in the initiative is variable. In best practice secondary language staff are engaged in anticipating the L2 and L3 abilities of learners as

they progress to secondary school and in planning courses for the development of these languages. In other authorities we saw little evidence of active forward planning. However, some secondary staff are involved in developing the strategy at school, area or council level, in the implementation in primary schools and in the development of materials and staff development.

We saw a range of staffing models in authorities (and sometimes within an authority or within a school cluster) including:

- the use of generalist primary teachers with additional language skills or additional training
- the use of specialist language teachers (primary or secondary qualified), in some cases native speakers, both to help to deliver the teaching and learning but also to help build teacher capacity through co-teaching
- the use of relief teachers with a languages teaching background normally deployed to cover non-contact time across a school group.

There was limited engagement with university partnerships in the development and delivery of the modern languages programme.

A number of councils and schools had derived significant benefits from using Erasmus programmes for more intensive language experiences for teachers although this was more efficient where the bureaucratic demands of the application process had been centrally managed.

Given the scale of the task to provide all primary teachers on a continuing and long term basis with training in languages teaching, it was consistently stated that probationers and students arriving in schools lacked the skills and knowledge to become involved without support and training. Initial teacher education should now reflect on how to equip all teachers to deliver this national policy. It should also be communicated to prospective teachers that skills, experience and qualifications in languages are (at least) advantageous and sought after by employers. Qualifications and GTCS registration in more than one language for secondary teachers would also help to build capacity in Scotland for this policy.

A common concern expressed by teachers and education authorities was a fear that with so many other competing priorities from central government (for example raising attainment, closing the attainment gap, numeracy, developing Scotland's young workforce, science and technology subjects, early years etc.), the long-term commitment to languages might reduce, resulting in a reduction in the level of resources available. Clarity of the continuation of this initiative and associated funding is seen as essential at this point in the programme development if the success of the 1+2 policy is to be secured.

5 Conclusions and Observations

- The 1+2 modern languages initiative has been a popular dimension of the education programme of the Scottish Government 2011-2016. It was universally seen by those interviewed as a positive aspect of broad general education and one where the enthusiasm of teachers, parents and learners is demonstrated.
- There was a direct link between the pace of implementation and the level of funding available. There has been notable progress made since 2013/14.

- Local authorities and schools are committed to successful implementation by 2020 on the assumption that funding streams will continue.
- Some further clarity on the position of L3 is required both for primary and secondary sectors.
- Secondary schools are not yet universally embracing the initiative in a way that gives confidence for the effective planning of learning experiences across a learning community.
- There is much scope for enhanced levels of inter-authority planning and delivery of Languages 1+2 with a view not only to effective use of scarce resources but also to sharing best practice.
- Ensure better understanding at national and local level of the respective roles of SCILT and Education Scotland. Both organisations should continue to engage with local authorities to explore how best to support the implementation of 1+2.
- Resource sharing is required both in terms of curriculum and CPD resources. Digital solutions have a role to play here.
- Specifically in the case of Gaelic, where the number of learners is increasing dramatically, bespoke training and classroom resource development is required.
- There are very significant workforce planning issues to be addressed for the successful and long term implementation of this initiative.
- The role of Initial Teacher Education, the GTCS, the expectations of new teachers arriving in schools in relation to their preparedness for this initiative, as well as the interface with ongoing CPD, requires full discussion and agreement.
- Local authorities and national agencies should explore sustainable delivery models for more advanced languages learning in senior Primary classes taking into account the range of expectations of teachers at this stage of a child's learning journey.
- The need for high quality training for teachers will be a key to successful and sustainable implementation.
- The use of languages assistants could be enhanced with their input seen as adding value to the classroom experiences.
- The role of school and local authority leaders is fundamental to the successful implementation and sustainability of the languages 1+2 initiative. Options for enhanced communications and engagement should be explored. The Strategic Implementation Group for 1+2 should prioritise this as an early action point in their work plan.
- There is now a need to focus more on the evaluation of outcomes and the quality of teaching and learning locally and nationally, although the absence of a strict attainment or assessment-driven approach to the initiative is currently seen as a key factor in its success and in the appeal it has in pupils' experience.
- In conclusion, from visiting a representative sample of education authorities, we found that progress in implementing the national languages 1+2 policy has been good but that it is still some way from being firmly established in the curriculum, and that any lessening of national commitment at this stage is likely to result in regression and a switching of attention to other priorities.

Appendix A: Funding Allocation

Finance provided

Funding has been provided over the last three years to allow local authorities to further develop their approaches to delivering the 1+2 languages commitment in this financial year, and pave the way for further progress across the '2 Parliaments' timescale of the commitment. This commitment to funding has sent out a clear signal that 1+2 is not 'just another initiative' but a serious attempt to change the languages landscape in Scotland.

1+2 Language Learning - Funding Allocation 2013/14:

	Pupils in P1-S3 (inc Special pupils aged 4-14) ¹	2013/14 Allocation (£4 million) in £000s
Aberdeen City	17,475	131
Aberdeenshire	27,573	208
Angus	12,147	91
Argyll & Bute	8,293	62
Clackmannanshire	5,363	41
Dumfries & Galloway	14,996	113
Dundee City	13,829	104
East Ayrshire	12,744	96
East Dunbartonshire	12,231	92
East Lothian	10,828	81
East Renfrewshire	12,252	92
Edinburgh City	36,099	271
Eilean Siar	2,728	21
Falkirk	16,677	125
Fife	38,525	290
Glasgow City	52,039	391
Highland	24,231	182
Inverclyde	7,928	60
Midlothian	9,421	71
Moray	9,361	70
North Ayrshire	14,614	110
North Lanarkshire	38,759	291
Orkney Islands	2,051	15
Perth & Kinross	14,048	106
Renfrewshire	18,241	137
Scottish Borders	11,660	88
Shetland Islands	2,562	19
South Ayrshire	11,052	83
South Lanarkshire	34,147	257
Stirling	9,516	72
West Dunbartonshire	9,739	73
West Lothian	20,895	157
Scotland	532,024	4,000

¹ Source: September School Census 2012

1+2 Language Learning - Funding Allocation 2014/15

	Pupils in P1-S3 (inc Special pupils aged 4-14) ¹	2014/15 Allocation (£5 million) in £000s
Aberdeen City	17,662	165
Aberdeenshire	28,021	262
Angus	12,099	114
Argyll & Bute	8,199	76
Clackmannanshire	5,415	51
Dumfries & Galloway	14,889	139
Dundee City	14,028	131
East Ayrshire	12,776	120
East Dunbartonshire	12,401	116
East Lothian	11,008	103
East Renfrewshire	12,307	115
Edinburgh City	37,084	346
Eilean Siar	2,692	25
Falkirk	16,823	157
Fife	38,814	362
Glasgow City	52,452	490
Highland	24,185	226
Inverclyde	7,906	74
Midlothian	9,456	89
Moray	9,438	89
North Ayrshire	14,456	135
North Lanarkshire	38,562	360
Orkney Islands	2,073	20
Perth & Kinross	14,148	133
Renfrewshire	18,224	170
Scottish Borders	11,624	109
Shetland Islands	2,574	24
South Ayrshire	10,946	103
South Lanarkshire	34,234	320
Stirling	9,442	89
West Dunbartonshire	9,769	91
West Lothian	21,020	196
Scotland	534727	5,000

¹ Source: September School Census 2013

1+2 Language Learning - Funding Allocation 2015/16

	Pupils in P1-S3 (inc Special pupils aged 4-14) ¹	2015/16 Allocation (£7.2 million) in £000s
Aberdeen City	17,995	240
Aberdeenshire	28,552	381
Angus	12,140	162
Argyll & Bute	8,175	109
Clackmannanshire	5,396	72
Dumfries & Galloway	14,986	200
Dundee City	14,277	190
East Ayrshire	12,724	170
East Dunbartonshire	12,549	167
East Lothian	11,108	148
East Renfrewshire	12,522	167
Edinburgh City	38,140	509
Eilean Siar	2,654	35
Falkirk	17,167	229
Fife	39,199	523
Glasgow City	53,036	707
Highland	24,245	323
Inverclyde	7,810	104
Midlothian	9,618	128
Moray	9,573	128
North Ayrshire	14,489	193
North Lanarkshire	38,928	519
Orkney Islands	2,094	28
Perth & Kinross	14,217	190
Renfrewshire	18,204	243
Scottish Borders	11,614	155
Shetland Islands	2,557	34
South Ayrshire	10,937	146
South Lanarkshire	34,283	457
Stirling	9,555	128
West Dunbartonshire	9,851	131
West Lothian	21,258	284
Scotland	539,853	7,200

¹ Source: September School Census 2014