

# Global Learning Programme Year 2 Research Report



**GLOBAL  
LEARNING**  
Programme

Education for a Fair and Sustainable World



## Acknowledgements

The Centre for Global Education and Ulster University would like to extend their sincere thanks to the members of Senior Leadership Teams and to Lead Teachers who took part in the Global Learning Training Programme in 2015-16, and who responded to the questionnaires. In addition, they are extremely grateful to the Lead Teachers and the pupils in Years 6 and 9 in the six schools that took part in the interviews in Year 2 of the project.



Published in 2016 by CENTRE FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

"The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of DFID" © Centre for Global Education, September 2016

Please quote this publication as: Global Learning Programme NI, 'Global Learning Programme: Year 2 Research Report', Belfast: Centre for Global Education.



Centre for Global Education is a signatory to the Dóchas Code of Conduct on Images and Messages. Centre for Global Education is accepted as a charity by Inland Revenue under reference number XR73713 and is a Company Limited by Guarantee Number 25290.

# Contents

The Global Learning Programme	<b>4</b>
Research	<b>5</b>
Findings	<b>6</b>
Cohort 1 Whole-School Self-evaluation Survey Post-First Year of Implementation	<b>6</b>
Cohort 1 Lead Teacher Survey Post-First Year of Implementation	<b>10</b>
Cohort 1 Lead Teacher Interviews Post-First Year of Implementation	<b>14</b>
Cohort 1 Pupil Interviews Post-First Year of Implementation	<b>21</b>
Cohort 2 Post-Training Whole-School Self-evaluation Survey	<b>24</b>
Cohort 2 Post-Training Lead Teacher Survey	<b>26</b>
Discussion	<b>30</b>
Recommendations	<b>32</b>
References	<b>34</b>
Further Reading	<b>35</b>
Appendix	<b>36</b>

## 1 THE GLOBAL LEARNING PROGRAMME

The Global Learning Programme (GLP) is a three-year formal sector project funded by the Department for International Development (DFID) and managed by the Centre for Global Education. The project aims to increase and improve delivery of global learning in 50 percent of grant aided primary, secondary and special schools in Northern Ireland. It will support schools in embedding global learning as regular practice across curriculum subjects and through whole-school initiatives.

The Global Learning Programme provides an important lens through which to explore the existing curriculum in primary and post-primary schools, and forms a valuable, relevant and integral part of it. The project activities are very much grounded in the Northern Ireland Curriculum at Key Stages 2 and 3, and schools can use existing opportunities to embed global learning as a whole school approach. The training provided through the programme seeks to develop within pupils the essential knowledge, skills, values and attitudes needed to contribute toward a fair and sustainable world. It will also enable teachers to meet core curriculum targets while delivering global learning in the classroom.

The GLP involves several strands of activity designed to embed global learning in schools and monitor progress in delivery. These strands include:

- ensuring that Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs) understand the benefits of a whole-school approach to global learning and agree to commit their schools to participation in the programme;
- delivering an extensive programme of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) to teachers which will strengthen their capacity to embed global learning as a whole school approach and improve practice, in particular, at Key Stages 2 and 3;
- publishing a whole-school guidance document for teachers linking global learning to the Northern Ireland Curriculum;
- equipping schools with resources that will support classroom practice in global learning at Key Stages 2 and 3;
- providing schools with a self-evaluation tool to assess the extent of their current global learning practice, and support them to identify actions for their school development plans which will enable them to embed global learning further;
- compiling quantitative and qualitative research with participating schools to measure change in learning and practice over the three years of the project; and
- creating a web site to support interaction with schools, promote training events and share global learning resources (visit: [www.globallearningni.com](http://www.globallearningni.com)).

Researchers from the Ulster University, Lesley Abbott and Linda Clarke, were commissioned to carry out the GLP research. This report provides the findings of the research activities carried out in year 2 of the project to measure the impact of training on teachers and classroom delivery. It summarises the quantitative and qualitative data gathered through the whole-school self-evaluation and Lead Teacher questionnaires, and qualitative feedback from teachers and pupils in a sample of six partner schools. The report provides us with useful follow-up data from Cohort 1 after their first year of implementation, as well as post-training data from Cohort 2 which enables the measurement of the project's impact on enhancing global learning practice on a whole-school and classroom basis.

## 2 THE RESEARCH

### 2.1 Research aim

The aim of the research was to assess the impact of the Global Learning Programme (GLP) delivered by the Centre for Global Education (CGE) in meeting its stated aim of enhancing Global Learning (GL) practice in 50 percent of grant aided primary, secondary and special schools in Northern Ireland, specifically at Key Stages 2 and 3.

Over the 4-year lifespan of the GLP, the intention is to examine the progress of pupils in Years 5 to 10, as well as the implementation of Global Learning by the schools and Lead Teachers (LTs). In the 2014-15 school year, the research involved members of Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs), Lead Teachers and pupils in Years 5 and 8. In 2015-16, Year 6 and Year 8 pupils took part.

### 2.2 Research objectives

The objectives were to:

- assess changes and progression in pupils' knowledge, skills, attitudes and understanding of GL issues over a 3-year period;
- examine the extent to which the GLP is strengthening teachers' knowledge of GL and their implementation of it in the classroom;
- investigate the extent to which schools are developing more coherent teaching and learning strategies that address different aspects of global citizenship and GL;
- determine the extent to which the programme is supporting a cross-curricular approach to GL delivery across thematic and subject boundaries.

### 2.3 Methodology

As in Year 1, a mixed methods approach was used in Year 2 to evaluate the training undertaken by the Lead Teachers, and to assess its effectiveness in implementing GL in classrooms. Methodological triangulation (using two or more methods of data collection) within a multi-methods approach allows richer, more detailed data to be collected, as 'Exclusive reliance on one method ... may bias or distort the particular slices of reality' being investigated (Cohen *et al.*, 2011: 195). Prior to conducting the research, full ethical approval in accordance with BERA (2004) guidelines was granted by Ulster University's Research Governance Filter Committee for Education and the Research Ethics Committee (UREC). In particular, every care was taken with the considerations to observe when conducting research with children and young people (Lewis, 1992; Kellet & Ding, 1996; Hood, Kelley & Mayall, 1996; Neill, 2005; Johnston, 2005).

## FINDINGS

### 3. COHORT 1 WHOLE-SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION SURVEY POST-FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION

A follow-up self-evaluation questionnaire was sent through an online platform to 58 members of Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs) in Cohort 1 who took part in Year 1 of the Global Learning Programme (GLP). In Year 2, they attended twilight sessions, also provided by the Centre for Global Education (CGE). There was a somewhat low response rate of 22.4 percent (13 cases), one-third fewer than that of the same cohort of Senior Leaders in the Year 1 survey (71.1 percent or 39 cases). Findings must be interpreted cautiously and comparative data construed in the light of two different 'n' values (Year 1 - 39; Year 2 - 13).

As in Year 1, the responses were based on the self-evaluation tool within *A Whole School Approach to Global Learning: Guidance Document* (Appendix 8) (CGE, 2015), with its six criteria (or indicators) to describe each school's current level of involvement in global learning (GL), whether in Key Stage 2 or Key Stage 3. These were 'non-engaged', 'early-engaging', 'defining', 'developing', 'expanding', and 'embedding'.

#### 3.1 Participant profile

From the 13 schools that responded to the follow-up survey, 61.54 percent were primary (8), 30.77 percent were special (4) and 7.69 percent were post-primary (1). Concerning management type, 46.15 percent were maintained (6), 38.47 percent were controlled (5) and 15.38 percent (2) were integrated. Geographically, there was again a spread across the Education Authority Sub-regions, with the North-eastern and Western areas once more represented best followed by Belfast and the South-east. There were no schools from the Southern sub-region.

#### 3.2 Extent to which Key Stage 2/3 pupils explored global poverty and inequality

Most schools said that the extent to which pupils had explored global poverty and inequality was 'developing' followed by 'expanding' or 'defining'. This showed an improvement on the previous year when most were 'early-engaging'. Just 5.13 percent were 'expanding' in Year 1, a category that markedly increased in Year 2.

#### 3.3 Key Stage 2 / 3 pupils' knowledge and understanding of the global learning concepts

Most respondents said pupils' knowledge and understanding of the global learning concepts were 'developing' followed by 'expanding', with an increase in both indicators. This, again, was an improvement from Year 1 when nearly half had rated pupils' knowledge and understanding as 'early-engaging'.



### 3.4 Key Stage 2/3 teachers' knowledge and understanding of the global learning concepts

In regard to Key Stage 2 / 3 teachers' understanding of the GL concepts, this had shifted from mostly 'early-engaging' to mostly 'defining'. Before, by contrast, almost half the schools were 'early-engaging'.

### 3.5 Key Stage 2/3 teachers' confidence in implementing the global learning concepts

As for teachers' confidence in implementing the GL concepts in Year 2, most described it as 'defining', followed by 'developing' or 'expanding'. In Year 1, confidence was mostly 'early-engaging'. One school said 'embedding' whereas none did in Year 1.

### 3.6 Extent to which Key Stage 2/3 teachers deliver global learning themes/topics through connected learning across curricular subjects

Schools in the very small follow-up group said teachers were largely 'defining' in respect of implementing GL themes in a connected way, followed by 'expanding' or 'embedding'. Year 1 responses had been largely 'early-engaging', 'defining' or 'developing', so a marked improvement was noted.

### 3.7 Schools' current understanding of how global learning can support the NI curriculum requirements outlined in the 'Big Picture'

Most schools rated as 'defining' their current understanding of how GL could support the Northern Ireland curriculum requirements as outlined in the 'Big Picture', again a higher rating than Year 1 when most were 'early-engaging'.

### 3.8 Extent to which schools have undertaken a global learning approach to whole school initiatives

Once again, most respondents chose the 'defining' category in respect of taking a GL approach to whole-school initiatives, whereas in Year 1 the majority were 'early-engaging'.

### 3.9 Key Stage 2/3 teachers' awareness of accessing resources to support global learning by year

In keeping with earlier patterns, SLT representatives rated teachers' awareness of where to access global learning resources for their own subject area(s) as mostly 'defining'. Previously, this was mainly 'early-engaging'.

### 3.10 Schools' assessment for, and of, global learning pupil outcomes

There was a less positive picture concerning schools' use of methods to monitor and track progress in GL pupil outcomes, as most schools in Year 2 located themselves at the lower end of the scale with the majority 'early-engaging' or 'non-engaged'. These scores were similar to Year 1 when the largest group was 'non-engaged' followed by 'early-engaging'.

### 3.11 Self-evaluation of senior leadership team in respect of global learning

Senior leadership's role in GL was rated by most schools in Year 2 as 'defining' or 'expanding', showing definite progress from Year 1 when most were 'early-engaging'.

### 3.12 Schools' ethos and vision with respect to global learning

In regard to ethos and vision, most SLTs in Year 2 said 'defining' or 'expanding'. This showed notable progress in the largest category, since the majority in Year 1 had said 'early-engaging'.

### 3.13 Current inclusion of global learning in school policies

Year 2 SLTs mainly described their inclusion of GL within school policies as 'early-engaging' or 'defining'. While movement to the 'defining' category was favourable, this quite closely echoed the majority finding in Year 1 when most respondents said 'early-engaging' or 'non-engaged' compared to none in the latter grouping in Year 2.

### 3.14 Opportunities for staff development in global learning

Staff development opportunities were mostly 'defining' followed by 'early-engaging' in Year 2, whereas in Year 1 the majority had said 'early-engaging'.

### 3.15 Extent to which pupil voice is considered when implementing global learning

Taking the pupil voice into account when planning to implement GL was still largely at the 'early-engaging' stage, with little obvious improvement since Year 1. There was, however, an increase in the 'developing' category.

### 3.16 Community connections

*Sharing and collaborating with other schools* was now more likely to be 'early-engaging' or 'defining', but with a small number remaining 'non-engaged' in Year 2. *Links with external partners* had been strengthened, with none now 'non-engaged' and a tendency for responses to be largely 'early-engaging' or 'defining'.

In Year 2, there was considerable progress in *helping parents / carers to understand GL*, with well over half the schools now rating themselves as 'early-engaging' compared to nearly half 'non-engaged' in Year 1. Over half, as well, were 'defining', about twice the Year 1 self-assessment.

### 3.17 School awards

In respect of school awards, a substantial majority of SLTs described their engagement with the *UNICEF Award* as 'early-engaging', yet some were still 'non-engaged'. For the *Eco Schools Awards*, again a few were still 'non-engaged', but ratings were now, pleasingly, clustered around the three highest indicators of 'developing', 'expanding', and 'embedding'.



Concerning the *British Council Awards*, a high percentage in both Years 1 and 2 were 'non-engaged', almost 80 and 54 percent, respectively. The 'defining' category, however, had improved to about one-fifth in Year 2.

In the same way, almost two-fifths remained 'non-engaged' with the *Fairtrade Awards*, but the figure had reduced from Year 1 and, again, more now rated themselves 'defining'. Engagement with the *Trócaire Awards* was, overall, still low with well over half continuing to be 'non-engaged' (previously higher at nearly 70 percent), and the main difference was a shift to the level of 'early-engaging'.

### 3.18 Usefulness and improvements

Finally, under *Usefulness and Improvements*, the qualitative responses showed appreciation of the publication, *A Whole School Approach to Global Learning* (CGE, 2015), although it was thought complex by one school and the point was made that the GLP training was still in its infancy in terms of being put into practice. Suggested improvements included a request for further support for *all* staff, not just Lead Teachers, and the linking of Key Stage-related topics to resources.

In relation to the *GL self-evaluation tool*, again there was recognition of the value of this for schools to reflect and to identify progression, even though one school admitted that global learning was not amongst its immediate priorities and another thought the tool was less than 'user-friendly'.

Additional comments on the *delivery of global learning at school level* related to time constraints (e.g., to integrate training), to the need for a programme to motivate colleagues, and to the need for the creation of a global context - *The world is a smaller place now but it is a world that very few children understand ...* (P, M).

*At classroom level*, time once more was an issue, the assimilation of global learning into the curriculum was '*a slow process*', and the message might be reinforced if both teachers and pupils could meet GLP staff.

Overall, there were some clear differences between Year 1 and Year 2 responses from SLT members belonging to Cohort 1, and there was evidence of efforts being made to convey the GL concepts to pupils, teachers and parents / carers, and to join with the wider community in so doing. Indeed, on the basis of the six criteria for assessing the implementation of global learning, schools had almost entirely moved from a position of mostly non-engagement since Year 1 to one of improvement and growth.

Essentially, the nature of such change was inevitably gradual and incremental progress from one category to the next demonstrates, in fact, a considerable achievement in schools where demands on teachers' time remain numerous and unrelenting.

*Progress is slow but there is progress* (P, M).

## 4 COHORT 1 LEAD TEACHER SURVEY POST-FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION

A follow-up questionnaire was sent through an online platform to 58 Lead Teachers who took part in the Global Learning Programme (GLP) training in Year 1 of the project. In Year 2, there was a returns rate of 22.41% (13 cases) compared to 81.35% (48 cases) in Year 1, requiring caution in the generalisation of results.

### 4.1 Participant profile

The respondents were mostly from the primary sector and from maintained schools, echoing Cohort 1 / Year 1. Geographically, an equal number were from the Belfast and Western Sub-regions in Year 2, whereas in Year 1 most were from the Western Sub-region. In both years, the Southern Sub-region was represented least.

### 4.2 Causes of global poverty

The Cohort 1 / Year 2 views of the causes of global poverty very closely resembled those given in Year 1 after Lead Teachers had taken part in the GLP. The calibre and extent of the Year 2 verbatim quotes were also comparable to those in Year 1 after the training.

### 4.3 Reducing global poverty

Similarly, the teachers' suggestions for reducing global poverty in Year 2 corresponded to those in Year 1. At that point, they had changed from mainly supporting charities and fundraising, to a greater emphasis on education, awareness-raising, and a change of attitude whereby individuals assumed a more proactive role and worked collaboratively, all of which was again reflective of Year 2.

### 4.4 Lead Teachers' understanding of global learning concepts

On a scale of '0' to '10', in respect of *global interdependence and globalisation*, the most frequently occurring score (the mode) increased in Year 2 from 7 to 8 in each case. However, with respect to *social justice, sustainable development and global inequality*, there were no changes in Year 2 with most respondents still rating themselves at the upper end of the scale (8), indicating a sustained and high level of understanding.

### 4.5 Lead Teachers' understanding and perceptions of global learning

When rating five statements about their understanding and perceptions of global learning before and after the GLP, there was an improvement in each case in Year 2. Most favourable was the Lead Teachers' growing *confidence to embed global learning* (GL) (from 5 to 8).

There was also growth in how they rated their *application of the GL concepts to achieve pupil outcomes* (from 6 to 8), and their *motivation to embed GL* (from 8 to 10). Understanding of the *aims of global*

*learning and its benefits for young people* moved from 7 to 8 as did embedding GL as a whole-school approach.

Concerning 3 aspects of their pupils' knowledge of GL, at Key Stage 2, Lead Teachers' estimated that *pupils' current understanding of the global learning concepts* had grown from 6 to 8 by Year 2. At Key Stage 3, it mostly remained at 4 or increased to 6.

In regard to the *causes of poverty and inequality*, Key Stage 2 pupils' understanding improved from 6 to 8 and, in Key Stage 3, from 3 to either 4 or 6. Key Stage 2 pupils' *understanding of how society could help reduce global poverty* grew from 4 to 8, and at Key Stage 3 from 2, 3 and 5 to either 4 or 6.

Overall, the influence of the teachers' first year of post-training GL implementation on teachers and pupils in both Key Stages showed further development in attitudes and depth of understanding of global issues, or else progress had been maintained following the training in Year 1.

#### 4.6 Implementing global learning and the support provided by the GLP

Lead Teachers *measured the development of global learning pupil outcomes* by numerous means: class discussions, the inclusion of GL in planners, awareness raising and classroom observation. They noted pupil attendance at extra-curricular GL activities and their increased interest, the discussions they had with Eco and Rights Respecting Schools Councils, and they observed how children had led charity giving.

Almost all attended two GLP twilight sessions. The majority found the *most useful aspect of the twilights* by far to be meeting other teachers, sharing resources/ideas, the re-energising experience of the facilitators' support, and the sharing of good practice. Only four suggested *improvements*, simply asking for more sessions, and working with teachers in the same sector.

The *actions implemented in global learning* by Lead Teachers' schools over the last school year within the whole-school framework related mostly to Curriculum Teaching and Learning and to Awards, Initiatives & Extra-curricular Activities, followed by Effective Leadership and Community Connections.

In respect of the *impact of global learning actions in schools*, the responses were under four headings. First, concerning pupil outcomes, most Lead Teachers spoke of pupils being able to explore, and become more aware of, a range of global issues.

Second, progress in meeting curriculum requirements was manifested in a growth in pupils' critical thinking / problem solving / collaborative working; teachers were more confident and willing to promote the GL concepts; schemes of work were being adapted to incorporate GL issues; staff were better at locating appropriate, relevant resources, in turn, benefiting students; and assemblies were linked to GL work in classrooms.

Third, the majority of Lead Teachers spoke of their increased capacity to embed global learning, attributing this to support at whole-school level and to the GLP. Fourth, teacher colleagues' willingness and ability to deliver global learning was confirmed.

## 4.7 Impact and challenges of the Global Learning Programme

All but one of the Lead Teachers had *cascaded the learning from the GLP* to their colleagues, mostly through staff meetings, sharing resources and email.

There were few responses regarding the *outcomes of cascading the GLP training*, a small number of Lead Teachers identifying the inclusion of GL in future planning, and greater engagement and motivation among colleagues to promote it.

Similar to the data in Year 1, the Cohort 1 / Year 2 Lead Teachers identified lack of time as the main *challenge to implementing global learning*, set against the essential demands of an already heavy workload, core subjects and the transfer tests. There were challenges, too, in monitoring work across different year groups, embedding GL more widely, ensuring it was being given a high profile in school, and introducing something felt to be 'new'.

## 4.8 Looking ahead

Looking ahead meant getting further support to embed GL at whole-school and classroom level, and being able to use the GLP website to maximum effect. Ongoing communication between GLP staff and teachers in schools was sought. *Action plans* related mostly to Curriculum Teaching and Learning, followed by Awards, Initiatives & Extra-curricular Activities, Community Connections and Effective Leadership.

Under *Curriculum Teaching and Learning*, greater support was needed for colleagues (raising awareness and providing resources), and there were plans to continue embedding GL across topics and year groups.

Plans for *Awards, Initiatives & Extra-curricular Activities* included working towards, or applying for, awards, and holding global assemblies.

For *Community Connections* it meant creating links with other schools (possibly internationally), and informing parents on the benefits of GL.

For *Effective Leadership*, one teacher said action plans would be in place for next year, a second proposed having planners with GL themes, and a third intended to consolidate and highlight the importance of GL with the Board of Governors.

*Further help for schools to embed global learning* meant, predictably, more time for example to meet in cluster groups and to evaluate global learning in school. Also called for were visits from external agencies to motivate and interest pupils, continued email communication with the GLP team, and more information on the GL website about shared practice.

*Further help for Lead Teachers* would ideally take the form of dedicated time to fulfil their role, more twilight sessions for continued impetus, support from senior leadership, and contact with both teachers and pupils in other schools to compare planned lessons.

Most of the 13 Lead Teachers *made use of the GLP website* with its most useful aspects cited as the resources, followed by topic and lesson ideas, and keeping up-to-date with news/events and other schools.

When asked to make *recommendations for improvement of GLP ongoing communications to schools*, seven of the 13 teachers replied, although they very largely agreed with current methods. Three preferred email, a more immediate, visible source if the website was not being used, and as a means of arranging cluster groups.

Finally, when invited to give any *further feedback on the GLP and its impact*, just six Lead Teachers responded. Most expressed appreciation, describing it as rewarding, thought provoking and enjoyable, its main impact being to foster the pupils' enthusiasm for global issues.

## 5 COHORT 1 LEAD TEACHER INTERVIEWS POST-FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION

Follow-up interviews were conducted in Year 2 of the study in the same 6 schools as in Year 1: 3 primary and 3 post-primary of which two were maintained, two were controlled and two were integrated schools (one primary, one post-primary in each case) across the 5 Education Sub-regions.

A convenience sample of 6 schools was selected in Year 1 from the first 75 who registered with the Global Learning Programme (GLP) in the 2014-15 school year. However, one school withdrew and a comparable replacement was found for 2015-16. As before, the single criterion for inclusion was that the Lead Teacher had attended the GLP's Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Training Days.

### 5.1 Participant profile

In Year 2, there were three different Lead Teachers (two primary, one post-primary). All six were female, and in the post-primary sector two taught Geography, one Speech and Drama. Semi-structured interviews were again conducted with full ethical approval. Some comparisons have been made with Year 1 data, but a range of additional questions were asked in Year 2.

### 5.2 Whole-school evaluation stage prior to GLP

The teachers were asked to estimate which of the 6 whole-school global learning (GL) evaluation stages their school was at a year ago: 'non-engaged', 'early-engaging', 'defining', 'developing', 'expanding' or 'embedding', according to the criteria in *A Whole School Approach to Global Learning* (CGE, 2015).

Overall, the tendency was towards 'early-engaging' across the two sectors, but the stages were not always clear-cut. Two *primary* schools were 'early-engaging' and one was 'defining' / 'developing'. The three *post-primary* schools were 'early-engaging' / 'defining'.

### 5.3 Actions taken to embed GL within Curriculum Teaching and Learning with Primary 6 / Year 9 pupils

Participants were asked about actions taken to embed global learning (GL) within curriculum teaching and learning at Key Stage 2 (Primary 6) or Key Stage 3 (Year 9) over the past year. One *primary* school had used an appropriate P6 thematic unit, another connected GL with Eco Schools, the topic of Water, Seas and Oceans, and the Irish Famine.

Two *post-primary* Lead Teachers had incorporated GL into Geography. One had instigated an extra lesson in this subject dedicated to GL, the other referred to a whole-school learning review to see how it could be embedded in each curricular subject.



#### 5.4 Actions taken to embed GL in the rest of the school

Key Stage 2 Lead Teachers had tried to embed GL in the rest of the school through assemblies rather than curriculum teaching, and by informing parents / carers about GL activities through the school website. Post-GLP meetings with teacher colleagues determined where GL was already being delivered (e.g., in the World Around Us) and to plan for next year. A Key Stage 3 teacher reported greater awareness of GL in Geography and Learning for Life and Work, and some opportunities had been created within Pastoral Care.

#### 5.5 Extent to which GL was delivered across Key Stage 2 subjects/ topics, examples and benefits

Delivering GL across primary subject/topics in a connected way had been done to a certain extent as in Year 1. At Key Stage 2, specific planning was in place to integrate GL at appropriate points in thematic units from the Foundation Stage. This cross-curricular approach embraced History, Geography, ICT, Personal Development and Mutual Understanding (PDMU) and Maths. Thus, 4 more subjects than last year were mentioned (apart from Geography).

The benefits of inter-connected delivery of GL at Key Stage 2 were greater scope for children to engage with topics, develop investigative skills, conduct research and present findings, all linked with literacy, communication and ICT and reflective of Year 1 responses. It generated more pupil enthusiasm, and the teachers were actively incorporating GL into their topics, two new benefits identified this year.

#### 5.6 Extent to which GL was delivered across Key Stage 3 subjects/ topics, examples and benefits

At Key Stage 3, cross-curricular delivery of GL in one school was at an information-gathering stage to evaluate what different departments were doing. Two Lead Teachers identified links with Learning for Life and Work. As in Year 1, Geography was the main vehicle, with Maths and Science (to an extent) now added.

Benefits at Key Stage 3 were pupils examining GL topics from different angles with different teachers. This cross-over of information generated greater consistency, relevance and wider applicability for pupils. One school reported a very positive pupil evaluation following a full morning devoted to GL, working across departments on a single topic.

#### 5.7 Impact of GL delivery on pupils in relation to meeting the Northern Ireland Curriculum requirements and outcomes

The 6 Lead Teachers were divided over the impact of GL delivery on pupils in relation to meeting the Northern Ireland Curriculum requirements and outcomes, echoing doubt expressed in Year 1. Three felt it was still unclear (two primary, one post-primary), although the other three said observable impacts were beginning to emerge with a cross-curricular approach (two post-primary, one primary).

Benefits at Key Stage 3 were developing literacy skills; engaging and developing mixed ability classes with activity-based GL tasks; and raising pupil awareness of their role as global citizens.

### **5.8 Actions taken relating to GL and Effective Leadership (a) regarding senior leadership, (b) school policies, (c) the school development plan, and (d) staff CPD**

#### **Global learning and senior leadership**

Four of the 6 Lead Teachers said some action in GL had been (or was being) taken by senior leadership, mostly incorporating it into the School Development Plan.

#### **Global learning and school policies**

GL could be included in the World Around Us policy, however, two post-primary teachers confirmed its inclusion in school policies, now requiring reflective practice among staff as to how they integrated it into lessons.

#### **Global learning and Continuing Professional Development (CPD)**

Three participants referred to some CPD in GL (two primary, one post-primary). Post-primary remarks revealed CPD to be small scale: included in Performance Review and Staff Development (PRSD) targets, or disseminated to departments by the Lead Teacher through the GLP, starting with Geography and Learning for Life and Work, with the intention of approaching others.

#### **Global learning and the pupil voice**

All 6 schools confirmed regular actions concerning GL and the pupil voice (e.g., the School's Council or Eco Council, or specific events like fundraising).

Key Stage 2 links between GL and the pupil voice were that awareness had grown and they might discuss it in meetings, the ethos of the Eco Schools started with the children, and pupils became involved in decisions about fundraising which they fed back to their class.

Similarly, the pupil voice figured prominently at Key Stage 3, again via the School's Council when GL was on the agenda, and a range of skills were being developed.

### **5.9 Actions taken relating to GL and Community Connections (collaborating with other schools here or abroad / external partners such as NGOs / the local community and parents / carers)**

#### **Links with the community**

Four schools referred to actions relating to community connections, but two had none this year. There was some sharing of good practice with other local schools.

#### **Links with NGOs**

None of the Lead Teachers reported any Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) connections.

### **Links with parents and carers**

Three participants reported links with parents / carers (2 primary, one post-primary), through newsletters, publicising web links, and involving them closely in school charity work.

## **5.10 Actions taken to support GL within existing Awards and Extra-curricular Activities, or any new awards**

### **Existing awards**

Four of the 6 schools had supported GL within existing awards and activities (e.g., the Eco Schools or the Lift-Off Programme). Activities related to integrated education, the Eco Club, the Green Flag Award, Fairtrade awareness, Trócaire and the International Schools Award.

### **New awards**

Most schools had taken no actions in regard to new awards.

## **5.11 Impact of whole-school GL actions on the children in relation to pupil outcomes**

All six schools highlighted the impacts of whole-school actions on children in relation to the GLP pupil outcomes, although these could be hard to quantify. Impacts included greater awareness of social justice, fairness and sustainable development, and primary pupils' greater capacity to discuss global issues and relate to them with sensitivity and caring.

Impacts at post-primary level arose from whole-school actions (e.g., awareness-raising days, assemblies, break and lunch times) when situations could 'hit home'. Pupils learned how to research numerous global issues independently and present findings, using reliable sources of information from the GLP. At pastoral level, issues like social justice and fairness linked to events reported in the media could be discussed which, although not subject-related, were considered meaningful.

## **5.12 Extent to which changes have been measured in pupils' GL knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and dispositions**

How far progression had been measured in pupils' GL knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions elicited less positive responses at both Key Stages. There was little specific measurement and Lead Teachers referred mostly to informal, common assessment. It was difficult to define any changes and help was needed in this area.

## **5.13 Extent to which participation in the GLP has had any other impacts (e.g., on the school, the pupils, the parents/the wider community)**

Other impacts of the GLP were on CPD. Teachers' knowledge had broadened - 'a more global slant' - which was conveyed to the pupils, thereby increasing understanding of their own place in the world.

#### **5.14 Global learning whole-school evaluation stage of school one year after the GLP**

Most Lead Teachers had moved forward in their self-assessment based on the 6 criteria (CGE, 2015), albeit in small, incremental steps. Year 1 entailed awareness-raising, and Year 2 meant disseminating GL using a whole-school approach, while planning ahead.

#### **5.15 Ease of accessing resources to embed GL**

Five Lead Teachers and their colleagues could gain access to the resources needed to embed GL successfully in various subjects and topics, as in Year 1.

#### **5.16 Usefulness of resources**

As in Year 1, resources were said by five of the 6 teachers to be useful or, in one case, 'fairly useful', underlining the need to locate the most sector-appropriate ones that supported GL, given the demands on teachers' time.

#### **5.17 Difficulties with resources**

Five Lead Teachers said time was the main constraint when searching for GL resources, with preference always given to core curriculum areas, points made last year too. Added in Year 2, however, was the need for time to motivate teacher colleagues to seek resources and to follow up their progress.

#### **5.18 Effect of having a Lead Teacher to support GL**

All 6 participants spoke favourably about having a Lead Teacher to support GL, reflecting last year's view, but it was not a job for one person. Post-primary respondents felt that without both a co-ordinator and a member of the senior leadership team to oversee, most departments would not engage with GL.

#### **5.19 Support in GL provided by Lead Teachers for colleagues and how it was received**

All 6 Lead Teachers had been supporting colleagues in GL. At Key Stage 2, in Year 2, Lead Teachers now cascaded what they learned at the GLP, mostly through staff meetings. Information-giving and directing colleagues towards suitable resources were key features of guidance offered.

Reactions from colleagues were mixed. It was well received by colleagues in three participants' schools (two primary, one post-primary), but perceived as an extra task in the other three, alongside teaching English and Maths (two post-primary, one primary). It was essential to reassure staff that they were 'doing it anyway'.

## 5.20 Challenges faced in GL

Lead Teachers' concerns remained the same as in Year 1: lack of time and getting the cooperation of other staff. However, fewer challenges were identified than before.

## 5.21 Actions to improve the teaching of GL in the future

Actions were yet to be taken by all 6 schools to improve the teaching of GL in the 4 framework areas.

### Curriculum Teaching and Learning

Actions for Curriculum Teaching and Learning included further 'embedding' GL and, in so doing, ensuring that topics, literacy and numeracy were cross-curricular - 'not just a throw away lesson' (P, I); the Lead Teacher examining her own schemes of work, then helping departmental colleagues to amend theirs; including GL in the School Development Plan; and the establishing of a core group of interested parties to put GL into a formal action plan.

### Awards, Initiatives and Extra-curricular Activities

All 6 schools wanted to be more involved in, for example the Fairtrade School Award, the Eco Schools Award, the Trócaire Award, after school clubs and the School's Council. Assemblies were also a means of embedding GL.

### Community Connections

Potential actions here included setting up links with the local community and focusing on something different next year, possibly with other schools.

### Effective Leadership

Effective Leadership required the support of senior management and the Board of Governors, together with input from the pupils through the School's Council, as well as whole-school planning and policy-making specifically for GL.

## 5.22 Actions to improve pupil outcomes

Key Stage 2 Lead Teachers suggested more active, pupil-led involvement in GL through all topics, promoting a whole-school approach to developing pupil awareness, and fully embedding GL in teaching so that pupil outcomes would follow.

Key Stage 3 colleagues needed to explore how to assess the global dimension and, as in the primary sector, suggested a 'formalised' approach to greater pupil awareness. They advocated using appropriate GL-related language in all departments, increasing the frequency of GL teaching, clarifying for pupils the connections across subjects, organising 'interactive' assemblies, and using calendar events as a focus for highlighting GL.

### 5.23 Additional support offered

This question applied to 5 schools only, of which 4 had this year taken up the offer of extra help from the GLP that was tailored to their school's GL needs.

### 5.24 Usefulness of additional support provided

There was high praise for the additional support provided, for instance, advice on the approach and action plan used, and resources to access including those for younger pupils. The extra help also made a valuable bridge between what the Lead Teacher was doing in school and the twilight sessions, and facilitator visits ensured that momentum was sustained in terms of time.

### 5.25 Extent to which further additional support was required by schools

Three Lead Teachers wanted more help to implement GL and three did not, two of the latter finding cluster groups more helpful and two preferring the twilight sessions. Support needed was how to put realistic action plans into practice.

### 5.26 Additional help for Lead Teachers

The perceived isolation of the Lead Teacher's role was again highlighted in regard to additional help, as were the crucial issues of pupil assessment and determining progression in GL. The essence of GL and the value of the GLP were, respectively:

*The children are very interested in what's happening beyond themselves, and how they can help with what's happening outside of their own little world. (P, C)*

*[The facilitators] allayed any fears I had that I wasn't the right person ... it was stretching me to take on something that wouldn't necessarily have fallen onto my lap. (PP, M)*



## 6 COHORT 1 PUPIL INTERVIEWS POST-FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION

Follow-up interviews were conducted in Year 2 with 90 pupils in the 6 interview schools (3 primary, 3 post-primary), representing an increase of about one-third from Year 1. The intention in Year 2 was to detect any development, change or progression in pupils' global learning knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions since Year 1. However, just 25 of the original 61 pupils in Year 1 took part in the small-group interviews (40.98%), so any claims in this regard must be cautious.

### 6.1 Participant profile

Most pupils were girls (62.22%, 56) and 37.78 percent (34) were boys. The majority were in Year 6 (68.68%, 62) with 31.32 percent (28) in Year 9. There were 2 maintained, 2 controlled and 2 integrated schools across the 5 Education Authority Sub-regions.

### 6.2 Knowledge and understanding of globalisation and interdependence

As in Year 1, the Year 2 pupils could recognise reliance on other places, and again saw trade between countries as the principal feature of interdependence, with a few referring to sporting events, immigration and being part of the United Kingdom. This year, they were asked to differentiate between 'good' and 'bad' actions.

*Primary* children saw the two main actions affecting people in other countries 'in a good way' as trade and the donation of money and clothes. Practical ways of helping people elsewhere included recycling to avoid pollution. Conversely, pollution was the action felt by primary children that most affected people in other countries 'in a bad way', as were racism or wasting food and water.

For *post-primary* pupils, the most positive effect on other countries was also trade, including buying fair trade food, clothes and products. The most damaging action was adversely affecting the environment (e.g. burning fossil fuels, and both air and water pollution).

### 6.3 Knowledge and understanding of social justice and equity

Twenty items were considered important for 'a good life' by pupils in both sectors, mainly shelter, doctors, education, food, water and clothing. Unlike Year 1, doctors appeared high on the list.

*Primary* children were unanimous that not everyone in Northern Ireland could have 'a good life', giving numerous reasons. In Year 1, inequality was mainly due to lack of money. In Year 2, however, there was a much greater awareness of homelessness as the predominant cause of social problems, followed by financial difficulties. *Post-primary* pupils identified family problems, substance abuse and lack of money.

Pupils in both sectors agreed that, as in Northern Ireland, not everyone in other countries had the essentials for 'a good life', but for very different reasons. *Primary* children focused largely on

environmental causes affecting water and food supplies. *Post-primary* pupils did not have one clear grouping, but spoke chiefly of human failings (e.g., greed) and over-population. Pupils in both sectors cited war, riots and terrorist attacks.

The *primary* pupils identified the main differences in the lives of those who did, and did not, have the important things in life. Those who did had money, food and shelter; they took these for granted and could be uncaring about the homeless. The opposite was mainly having no clean water, doctors or medicine, and having more diseases. The *post-primary* pupils saw the effects of poverty and unfairness in Northern Ireland as discrimination, homelessness, stress and resorting to begging. In other countries, the results were over-population and discrimination.

#### 6.4 Skills, attitudes and dispositions related to social justice and equity

All 90 pupils recognised the unfairness of some having much more than they needed while others had so little, as in Year 1. They pointed out quite stark contrasts between the very rich and the very poor, showing knowledge of absolute poverty and drawing on examples from their own sphere of experience.

Empathy was evident towards others both locally and globally. Concerning their feelings about inequality, the most prevalent emotion by far was sadness in Years 1 and 2, followed in Year 2 by being annoyed, angry or upset. A few felt worried or guilty. This was in contrast to Year 1 responses when the second largest category (after sad) included 'bad', 'selfish', 'greedy' and 'ashamed', feelings not identified in Year 2.

Most pupils in Years 1 and 2 had tried to make the world fairer with two discernible, broad groups across both sectors in terms of effort: donating and the more proactive fundraising. This was reflected in Year 1 responses, but verbatim comments in Year 2 showed that the Primary 6 pupils could now clearly see the *purpose* of their efforts (e.g., helping to provide water, or sending money following a natural disaster such as an earthquake).

Further ideas about making the world a fairer place for everyone included building houses for the homeless, going to other countries to bring food and water, asking the Government for help, and supporting fair trade showing awareness of ethical consumerism.

Having tried to make the world fairer, most pupils felt 'happy' and much smaller numbers felt 'proud', 'good', 'like a better person' ('less selfish' / 'making a difference') or 'kind'. These sentiments closely resembled the Year 1 responses. Several pupils in both Key Stages in Year 2 went further and explained of their own accord *why* they felt happy or proud, demonstrating a growing belief that things might be better and that individuals are able to make a difference even in a small way.

#### 6.5 Knowledge and understanding of power and governance

The majority of pupils at both Key Stages in Year 2 showed the same conviction for collective responsibility as in Year 1, stating that it was within *everyone's* power to make the world fairer. However, as before, Governments / politicians were considered equally accountable, as well as charities (primary children only).

Actions that those with power might take to make the world fairer were sought in more detail in Year 2, namely, charities, the media, businesses and the Government. *Charities* could give money; *the media* could tell the public the complete truth about poverty and raise awareness; *businesses* could support fair trade, give to the homeless and give a percentage of their profits to charity; and *the Government* could give money to countries that need it and build social housing.

## 6.6 Awareness of global learning

Pupils in both Key Stages identified the numerous sources from which they learned about world events: their schools, curriculum subjects and outside avenues of information (very largely the media). This implied a growing awareness and perception of global issues, but also the ability to isolate and identify a wide range of contexts in which they were discussed within curriculum learning, or else publicised in the case of the media.

*Post-primary* pupils only were asked how the media and charities presented poverty and unfairness. Most said through social media (e.g., Facebook) in addition to videos, TV advertisements, and through Trócaire and the Welcome Centre (supporting people in crisis). Also cited were newspapers, appeals, celebrity endorsements, posters and talks by fundraisers. There was ample awareness that poverty and unfairness were important matters to which attention was actively being drawn within and beyond the pupils' educational setting, thereby demonstrating media literacy.

Asked where they had learned about global issues in the past year, the primary children talked about projects covered in P6, rather than discrete subjects (apart from the World Around Us), in which they learned about poverty and unfairness on a global scale. They could also identify relevant class activities linked to global concepts or to whole-school efforts to raise money, and understood clearly their purpose and meaning.

The *post-primary* pupils located an array of global learning issues dealt with during Year 9 in four subjects: Geography, Learning for Life and Work (LLW), History, Home Economics (HE) and Religious Education (RE). A few spoke of whole-school assemblies and form time (with Form Teachers).

Finally, the pupils were invited to offer any further closing comments and some in two schools did so. They demonstrated considerable compassion for, and kindness towards, the less fortunate, surmising the reasons for their situation, such as eviction and homelessness in this country, and racial discrimination and perceived gender inequality elsewhere (e.g., girls in Africa). Pupils readily identified the essentials needed for a good life, and what was seen by one 9/10-year-old as a treat:

*Have a nice comfy bed to sleep in. (P, C)*

*Food and water for a lower price. (P, C)*

*Or even lemonade. They've never had lemonade. (P, C)*

## 7 COHORT 2 POST-TRAINING WHOLE-SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION SURVEY

A whole-school self-evaluation questionnaire was sent through an online platform to 98 members of Senior Leadership Teams in Cohort 2 who took part in Year 2 of the Global Learning Programme (GLP). As with Cohort 1, the responses were based on the six criteria in the Whole School Evaluation Tool (CGE, 2015) ('non-engaged', 'early-engaging', 'defining', 'developing', 'expanding', and 'embedding').

### 7.1 Participant profile

The overall response rate was 59.18 percent (58 cases). By sector, 81.03 percent (47) were primary, 12.07 percent (7) were post-primary and 6.9 percent (4) were special schools. There was a balance of controlled and maintained schools, 44.83 percent (26) and 43.1 percent (25), respectively, with 8.63 percent (5) integrated, one voluntary grammar (1.72 percent) and one Irish Medium school (1.72 percent). Geographically, most were from the North-eastern sub-region (over a third), just under a quarter from the Southern and Western areas, and 12 percent from the South-east. Fewest schools were from Belfast.

### 7.2 Curriculum and learning

As with Cohort 1, most schools rated themselves as 'early-engaging' on all but one of 9 different aspects of global learning (GL), namely, the opportunities for pupils to explore 'global poverty and inequality'; their knowledge and understanding of the GL concepts; the teachers' own knowledge, confidence, delivery and resourcing in respect of GL topics through connected learning; the schools' understanding of how GL can support the 'Big Picture'; and the extent of their GL approach to whole school initiatives. Schools' assessment of GL pupil outcomes, however, was mostly 'non-engaged'.

### 7.3 Effective leadership

Concerning the 6 elements of effective leadership, schools were again most likely to be 'early-engaging' when evaluating their senior leadership team in respect of GL, their ethos and vision, policy and planning with respect to global learning, opportunities for staff development in GL, and how far the pupil voice was heard when implementing GL. This echoed Cohort 1 findings.

A main finding, as with Cohort 1, was that the majority were 'non-engaged' in the inclusion of GL in the School Development Plan (just over a quarter compared to just over a fifth in Cohort 1). Notably, the highest indicator of 'embedding' was applied only to the self-evaluation of SLTs although by just one primary school, to ethos and vision by two, and to the inclusion of GL in the School Development Plan by one.

## 7.4 Community connections

Most respondents were 'early-engaging' in their collaboration with other schools (just over two-fifths), although almost half had already made links with external partners to strengthen GL. While most were 'early-engaging' in helping parents/carers to understand GL (over two-fifths), nearly a fifth were 'non-engaged'. One school, in each case, was 'developing' or 'embedding', somewhat more favourable than in Cohort 1.

## 7.5 School awards

Most schools were 'non-engaged' with school awards. For the UNICEF Rights Respecting Schools Award, this meant over two-fifths with just a quarter 'early-engaging'. Well over half were 'non-engaged' with the British Council's International Schools Award, with just over a fifth 'early-engaging'. There was a similar result with the Fairtrade Schools Awards since exactly half were 'non-engaged' with almost two-fifths, this time, 'early-engaging'. For the Trócaire Awards, over two-fifths were 'non-engaged' although over two-thirds 'were early-engaging'.

By contrast, and as in Cohort 1, a notable finding was that the majority were in the highest category of 'embedding' with respect to how far they had incorporated a global dimension into their delivery of the Eco-Schools Award topics (almost one-third), with almost a quarter 'early-engaging'.

## 7.6 Usefulness and improvements

In the final section, open-ended responses on the self-evaluation tool (CGE, 2015, Appendix 8), produced a range of comments and suggestions. All comments were favourable, mainly relating to the value of the self-evaluation tool as a baseline for GL, praise for its design and accessibility, and appreciation of its usefulness for future planning. The very small number of suggestions for minor improvements included wider applicability of the tool to all Key Stages, also requested by Cohort 1.

In similar vein, respondents were highly positive about *A Whole School Approach to Global Learning: Guidance for Schools* (CGE, 2015) for its clarity, comprehensiveness and structure, as a resource and, once again, as a means of baseline assessment. It served as a guide for the School Development Plan, for giving advice to staff when cascading GL throughout the school, and as a means of seeing 'the bigger picture'.

Regarding the implementation of GL at school level, diverse comments concerned enthusiasm and optimism for a new initiative and opportunities, the ability to see links between current practice and GL, but also the need for support at Government and whole-school level, as well as more time. Highlighted, too, was the desirability of a collaborative approach to the coordination of global learning: *No one person is energetic or enthusiastic enough to carry this alone* (P, M), a sentiment expressed by Cohort 1.

Further comments on the implementation of GL at classroom level were relatively few (17 out of 58) and touched on resources, constraints and ways of implementing GL, one respondent emphasising, *Important that it's not an addition to the curriculum but is immersed within it across all subjects* (PP, M).

## 8 COHORT 2 POST-TRAINING LEAD TEACHER SURVEY

A questionnaire was sent through an online platform to 98 teachers who took part in the Global Learning Programme (GLP) in Year 2 of the 4-year project, known as Cohort 2. There was a returns rate of 75.51 percent (74 cases).

### 8.1 Participant profile

Similar to Cohort 1, primary schools predominated (79.73%, 59), followed by post-primary 14.86% (11) and special schools (5.41%, 4). Almost half of the Lead Teachers were from maintained schools (48.65%, 36), then controlled schools (40.54%, 30) with 9.46% (7) integrated and one Irish Medium school (1.35%). Geographically, comparable numbers were from the North-eastern Sub-region (about a third), the Western and Southern areas (respectively, over a quarter and a fifth). A small number were from the South-eastern area and fewest from Belfast.

### 8.2 Causes of global poverty

On a scale of 'very important', 'important', 'quite important' or 'not important', the two main causes of global poverty judged 'very important' by most Lead Teachers before training were 'unjust power relations within and between countries', and an 'economic system driven by private profit rather than social need'. Rated as 'important' by half was 'climate change caused by unsustainable use of finite resources'. The other causes were deemed 'important' except for lack of initiative which was most frequently considered 'not important'.

*After training*, however, an observable shift had occurred since every item formerly rated by the majority as 'important' was now judged to be 'very important' by the majority, with corresponding decreases in the frequency of 'important' in every case.

### 8.3 Eliminating poverty

*Before training*, the only item rated 'very important' in eliminating poverty was 'challenging corruption through strengthened democracy'. Eight of the 9 other potential measures were rated 'important' by most in each case, with a relatively even distribution. Fundraising came first, then providing more government aid, then the need for quality education to increase citizen engagement and action.

*After training*, there was again a marked contrast in respondents' perceptions. Without exception, the 9 items formerly rated by most as 'important', were now judged to be 'very important'. Thus, the emphasis moved from most believing that fundraising, providing more government aid, and quality education were 'important', to the vast majority rating as 'very important' the challenging of corruption through strengthened democracy, quality education, stopping global trade agreements only benefiting an elite, and ending tax avoidance by corporations.



## 8.4 Understanding of the 5 global learning concepts

There was a comparable increase in each case in the Lead Teachers' understanding of 5 global learning (GL) concepts before and after training: global interdependence, globalisation, social justice, sustainable development and global inequality. This was measured by comparing the mean, median and mode before and after the GLP.

## 8.5 Understanding and perceptions of, and attitudes towards, global learning

As above, comparisons before and after training showed an increase in respondents' understanding and perceptions of, and attitudes towards, global learning (GL). These improvements concerned the application of GL concepts to achieve pupil outcomes, the extent to which they valued the aims of GL and its benefits, meeting the Northern Ireland curriculum objectives through a whole-school approach to GL, and their own motivation and confidence in respect of embedding it.

## 8.6 Pupils' understanding of GL concepts

On a scale of '0'-'10', Lead Teachers tended to rate their pupils '4' in respect of understanding GL concepts, with smaller numbers choosing '2', '3', '5' or '7'. At the lowest end of the scale, five in each case rated them '0' or '1', with '8' being the highest rating given by just one respondent.

## 8.7 Key Stage 2 / 3 pupils' current understanding of the causes of global poverty and inequality

In respect of pupils' current understanding of the causes of global poverty and inequality, they were again most likely to be placed at the lower end of the rating scale with either '3' or '4'. Smaller numbers said '2', '1' or '0'.

## 8.8 Key Stage 2 / 3 pupils' understanding of how society can contribute to a reduction in global poverty and inequality

Pupils' understanding of how society can contribute to a reduction in global poverty and inequality was most likely to be rated '2', followed by '4' or '5'. A few in each case said '3', '6', '7' or '8'.

## 8.9 Application of the global learning concepts in practice

On the same scale, the pattern *before training* was for teachers to rate themselves mostly '0', '2' or '5' in respect of applying GL concepts. Just two said '7' and one, in each case, '8' or '10'. *After training*, however, a major difference was that they very largely placed themselves at the top of the scale with '8', '9' and '10' most prevalent. A key finding was that, after the GLP, none gave themselves a zero rating, compared to a majority before training.

## 8.10 Valuing the aims of global learning

*Before training*, most respondents placed themselves at the middle of the rating scale with '5', '7' and

'8'. Seven, in each case, rated themselves '2', '3' or '4'. Three, in each case, said '0', '1' or '6'. A further shift again took place *after training*, when the majority assessed how far they valued the aims of GL as (in order) '10', '9' or '8'. One, in each case, said '1' or '5'.

### 8.11 Supporting the requirements and pupil outcomes of the Northern Ireland Curriculum by embedding global learning as a whole-school approach

*Before training*, most Lead Teachers placed themselves at the middle of the scale at '5', or lower at '4' or '3'. *After training*, there was once more a marked swing towards the top of the rating scale with the largest number giving themselves '10'. Nearly a quarter said '8' or '9'.

### 8.12 Lead Teachers' motivation to embed global learning

Describing their levels of motivation to embed GL across their schools before and after training, *before training* Lead Teachers rated themselves at the mid-point of the rating scale ('5') followed by '3' and at the lowest point '1'. However, as with other findings above, they perceived themselves as markedly better after training when the trend was '10', '9' or '8'.

### 8.13 Lead Teachers' confidence in their ability to embed global learning

*Before training*, confidence was low, rated as (again, in order) '0', '2', '5' or '1'. One Lead Teacher, in each case, said '8' or '10'. *After training*, however, there was a sharp rise in confidence levels with most rating themselves highly at '8', '9' and '10'. Very small numbers chose the mid-point of the scale at '5' or '6'.

### 8.14 Key Stage 2 / 3 pupils' understanding of global learning concepts

In the case of the *primary schools*, most pupils' understanding of global learning concepts was rated '4', '2' or '0'. None were allocated '9' or '10'. In the *post-primary* sector, most were rated '5', '4', '2' or '1'. Most teachers in special schools rated their pupils' understanding as '0', '2' or '3'.

### 8.15 Key Stage 2 / 3 pupils' understanding of how society can help reduce global poverty and inequality

Again, by sector, *primary school* Lead Teachers rated their pupils mostly '2', '4', '5' or '8'. *Post-primary* pupils were mostly rated '5', '3' or '4'. Most special school teachers in this case said '1', '2' or '4'.

### 8.16 Barriers to implementing global learning

Overall, 54 of the 74 teachers identified challenges to implementing GL (72.97 percent). Most emphasised the lack of time, the difficulty of enlisting colleagues to cooperate in its implementation, and some reluctance and resistance from staff in light of other demanding agendas. Dedicated time was needed, for example to review existing provision, plan, inform and reassure staff, and to show how they could effectively disseminate GL across subject areas. Smaller, equal numbers referred to obtaining suitable resources (plus money to do so), and to developing a whole-school approach to GL.

### 8.17 Impact of global learning programme on Lead Teachers' practice

Regarding the impact on Lead Teachers' practice of the GLP as a source of CPD, all but one of the 74 teachers responded, emphasising a strongly positive influence, in particular, deeper knowledge and a broader perspective about the global dimension. They were motivated, enthused and inspired to make a difference, to support colleagues and to promote good practice.

Moreover, they had a clearer realisation of the need to educate children and young people on global issues, and referred to better understanding of how to integrate and link the global aspect into their topics and their teaching. They now knew how to plan more effectively for GL, realised that global issues needed to be taken further, and that the GLP had equipped them to deal with harder concepts.

### 8.18 Most positive aspects of the global learning programme

The two most frequently cited positive aspects of the GLP were taken together for classification purposes: the high calibre of the training (well organised and well structured) alongside the support and skill of the facilitators; and the opportunities afforded to share ideas and good practice with like-minded professionals.

The bank of GLP resources made available was thought excellent although one teacher commented that they were mostly in English, not in the Irish language, and the activities were practical, hands-on and interactive. Lead Teachers could improve their understanding of how to integrate and embed GL into their teaching, they felt more inspired and confident, and praised the self-evaluation tool which could show their school's current position and the effectiveness of a whole-school approach.

### 8.19 Aspects of global learning programme that could be done differently

As for any elements of the GLP that might be done differently, 20 of the 74 Lead Teachers would change nothing or spontaneously praised it. The small number of suggested improvements were grouped under resources (including for Key Stage 1) more ideas/examples, and more material focused on post-primary subjects. Matters external to the programme and at the discretion of the schools were the need for cluster groups, and more time to implement GL.

*Resources to take away that can be used in class, starter lessons for each year group in order to help each teacher develop global learning in their own classroom. (P, M)*

*Step by step topic based approach for classes from Year 1 - Year 7. Ideas ... (P, I)*

*More emphasis on post-primary schools as it is more difficult to embed across a large number of subject areas. The CPD courses were definitely more geared to primary schools. (PP, C)*

*Create cluster groups with Lead Teachers AND other teachers from school to help in delivery of global learning within the school. (P, M)*

*More time - cover provided for the Lead Teacher in school to implement the programme properly. (PP, M)*

*Inspired to inspire children about global issues and sow seeds of change. (P, C)*

## 9 DISCUSSION

The need for global learning has, if anything, been accentuated further this year in the light of increased, large-scale, international migration and major international terrorist incidents, in addition to the public debates around both the US presidential election race and Brexit. These debates have been widely characterised as highlighting the divides between those who have benefited from globalisation and those with more negative perceptions of its impacts on their lives, described by Thomas Friedmann as the *wall people* vs the *web people* (*International New York Times*, August 2016).

Interestingly, the data showed some polarisation along similar lines particularly among individual pupils' comments, but some also exhibited a more nuanced and empathetic understanding of international connections as having both beneficial and detrimental impacts. They were clear that people should help through, for example, trade and should avoid pollution, an issue that featured prominently as a key problem. This year, pupils spoke less of negative emotions and more of a somewhat wider range of actions, although they still predominantly focused on donating to charity and fundraising. The data suggest a movement towards a more complex and open-minded perspective, showing some small resonance with that demanded by the then UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan when addressing Yale graduands in 2002. Mr Annan recognised that we ask a lot when *we encourage residents of the developed world to add citizens of poor and distant countries in our circle of concern, but coined the term 'inclusive globalization' to encourage a rethinking of what belonging means, and what community means, in order to be able to embrace the fate of distant peoples* (UN. <http://www.un.org/press/en/2002/SGSM8412.doc.htm>).

In order for pupils to engage in such re-thinking, there must be more opportunities in school, albeit within a crowded curriculum with many competing priorities, to engage in sustainable, deep-rooted actions that are closer to the values and goals of development education.

As in Year 1 of the project, pupils recognised and provided examples of the unfairness of some having much more than they needed while others had so little and, further, the majority of pupils at both Key Stages in Year 2 showed the same conviction for collective responsibility as in Year 1, stating that it was within *everyone's* power to make the world fairer, although this year 'Governments' were said to be equally accountable. Homelessness featured prominently in respect of key problems and these three direct quotes from the 9/10-year-old group when asked to identify the essentials needed for a good life, provide a concise flavour of the genuine concern and compassion for those less fortunate who were deemed to be in need:

*Have a nice comfy bed to sleep in.  
Food and water for a lower price.  
Or even lemonade. They've never had lemonade.*

Further important ripple effects were evident in respect of pedagogy. Evidence from both teachers and pupils seemed to point towards a more interdisciplinary *connected learning approach* (CCEA, 2007) to global education within an increasing range of subjects, as well as in whole school assemblies and form time. Importantly, there was some evidence that global learning was being

included to a greater extent in School Development Planning, and that efforts were being made to convey its key concepts to parents/carers, and to join with the wider community in so doing.

Nonetheless, in only the second year of the project, it is unsurprising that some challenges for schools and Lead Teachers remain uppermost in respect of the lack of time, the difficulty of enlisting colleagues to cooperate in the implementation of global learning, the desirability of its coordination being a shared role, and some continued reluctance and resistance from staff in light of other demanding curricular agendas. Whilst the GLP is aligned to the Northern Ireland Curriculum in pedagogy and focus, it is not a named part of the current curriculum.

In any future curriculum revision, a case might be made for its inclusion whilst being aware of the danger of the Global Learning Programme nomenclature being likely to be swept away in the next version of 'development education'. As noted in the discussion section of last year's report, it is important that these revisions are not an impediment to making sustained headway. Nonetheless, the teachers who did participate in the consultation appear to be displaying greater motivation and more confidence in their understanding and practice of global learning, with evidence of a definite consolidation of the progress shown in the Year 1 report.

## 10 RECOMMENDATIONS

### For the Centre for Global Education

- Schools are now further forward with the implementation of GL, but ongoing focused support (including further twilight sessions) would help Lead Teachers to extend their knowledge, cascade GLP training and sustain momentum.
- Teachers should be supported to work in partnership with pupils to develop action outcomes that are more sustainable, deep-rooted and reflective of pupils' growing understanding of global issues, as a result of their participation in the GLP.
- Concerning the completion of the Whole-school Self-evaluation Questionnaire in Year 3 of the project, some additional guidance should be given to schools in respect of assessing themselves against the six criteria.
- Training should be provided on how to integrate global learning into literacy, numeracy and post-primary subjects.
- Further resources should be identified that are sector-specific and age-specific (and that include children in younger classes).
- Support should be offered on connected (cross-curricular) learning between different learning areas and subject departments. Examples or models of how to put the theory of global learning into practice should be provided, particularly at primary level.
- Arrangements should be facilitated during training for schools to observe best practice, perhaps on a termly basis. This could take the form of a 'buddy' system where schools agree to demonstrate and share effective teaching and learning in GL.
- Schools could be allocated the support of a global educator for a set number of face-to-face or virtual meetings/ training sessions or workshops. This could be on a one-to-one basis.
- It is important that some further training is provided for assessing / measuring GL pupil outcomes, including attitudinal change, as highlighted in the teacher data.

### For schools (including Senior Leadership)

- Members of Senior Leadership Teams and Lead Teachers should aim to complete the Whole-school Self-evaluation Questionnaire collaboratively in order to provide the best possible overview.
- Lead Teachers need continuing support from Senior Leadership Teams to embed GL in the school's ethos, to disseminate its aims within and beyond the school, and to implement it within the primary and post-primary curriculum.



- Senior Leadership Teams should give Lead Teachers ongoing support by emphasising the purpose and importance of GL on a whole-school basis, and by enlisting the cooperation of all school staff to secure their involvement and generate enthusiasm.
- Schools should give some dedicated time to Lead Teachers to guide, inform and encourage colleagues in GL, to locate and share appropriate resources, and to monitor their use.
- If possible, the role of Lead Teacher should be a shared responsibility, even partially. For both sectors, this could help integrate GL across learning and subject areas, shown to have numerous key benefits for pupils.
- **For Lead Teachers**
  - Lead Teachers should assist colleagues at primary and post-primary level to plan for GL by including it in schemes of work and 6-week planners. Some differentiated support could be given to colleagues to identify how far they already deliver GL.
- **For all teachers**
  - To ensure that pupils' GL knowledge and skills become more firmly embedded as they progress through each school year, specific planning should include meaningful, age-related tasks to foster their engagement and provide continuity of experience.
  - The reasons for GL activities should be explained, to increase pupil motivation and to enable them to see how their learning has progressed.
  - Teachers should provide opportunities for pupils to explore and analyse the potential impact of a broad range of actions for responding to global poverty and inequality, and support them in choosing and carrying out their own actions.
  - Parents / carers should be helped to understand better the importance of educating for a fair and sustainable world, and to recognise that both they and their children have a role to play.
  - Teachers should provide pupils with the opportunity to interact with others locally and internationally through various methods, including carefully selected technologies where available.

## REFERENCES

- BERA (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. London: British Educational Research Association (<https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf>)
- CCEA (2007) *An Introduction to the 'Ideas for Connecting Learning' (ICLs)*. Belfast: Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment.
- CGE (2015) *A Whole School Approach to Global Learning - Guidance for Schools*. Belfast: Centre for Global Education.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education*. 7th Edition. London: Routledge.
- Hood, S., Kelley, P. & Mayall, B. (1996) Children as research subjects: A risky enterprise. *Children and Society*, 10, 129-144.
- Johnston, J. (2005) Pupil voice and research: A narrative review. *ARECLS-E Journal* 2.
- Kellet, M. & Ding, S. (1996) Middle childhood. In: S. Fraser, V. Lewis, S. Ding, M. Kellet & C. Robinson (eds.) *Doing Research with Children and Young People*. London: Sage, pp. 161-174.
- Lewis, A. (1992) Group child interviews as a research tool. *British Educational Research Journal*, 18(4), 413-421.
- Lewis, A. (2002) Accessing, through research interviews, the views of children with difficulties in learning. *Support for Learning*, 17(3), 111-116.
- Neill, S. (2005) Research with children: A critical review of the guidelines. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 9(1), 46-58.

## FURTHER READING

Niens, U. & Reilly, J. (2010) *The Global Dimension in the Northern Ireland Curriculum: School Approaches, Teaching and Learning*. Available at:  
[https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwa0-yj\\_NbZGReT0X1dSRFZTeWs/edit](https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwa0-yj_NbZGReT0X1dSRFZTeWs/edit)

Centre for Global Education (2010) *The Global Dimension in Schools Northern Ireland: Guidance for Policymakers*. Belfast: Centre for Global Education. Available at:  
[https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwa0-yj\\_NbZGS1JkdS13Uzh5VIU/edit](https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwa0-yj_NbZGS1JkdS13Uzh5VIU/edit)

Reilly, J. & Niens, U. (2014) Global citizenship as education for peace building in a divided society: Structural and contextual constraints on the development of critical dialogic discourse in schools. *Compare*, 44(1), 53-76.

Bryan, A. & Bracken, M. (2011) *Learning to Read the World: Teaching and Learning about Global Citizenship and International Development in Post-Primary Schools*. Dublin: Irish Aid.

DevelopmentEducation.ie is a web resource with cartoons, teaching packs and teaching aids at all levels of education. Available at: <http://www.developmenteducation.ie/>

Global Dimension: The World in Your Classroom is a web resource with guidance on an extensive range of resources on global learning. Available at: <https://globaldimension.org.uk/>

Alcock, H.L. & Ramirez Barker, L. (2016) *Can global learning raise standards within pupils' writing in the primary phase?*

Hunt, F. & Cara, O. (2015) *Global Learning in England: Baseline analysis of the Global Learning Programme Whole School Audit 2013–14*

Brown, K. (2015) *Young people's understandings of global poverty*

Hunt, F. & King, R.P. (2015) *Supporting whole school approaches to global learning: focusing learning and mapping impact*

Bourn, D. (2014) *The Theory and Practice of Global Learning*

Simpson, J. (2016) *A study to investigate, explore and identify successful 'interventions' to support teachers in a transformative move from a charity mentality to a social justice mentality*. GLP Innovation Fund Research Paper no. 2.

Heuberger, M. (2014) *'Worldmindedness' and Development Education: A Teacher Voice*. GLP Innovation Fund Research Paper no. 1.

## APPENDIX

CPD	Continuing Professional Development
GL	Global Learning
GLP	Global Learning Programme
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
LLW	Learning for Life and Work
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PDMU	Personal Development and Mutual Understanding
PRSD	Performance Review and Staff Development
RE	Religious Education
SLT	Senior Leadership Team

This research report summary has been published as part of a three-year initiative in Northern Ireland called the Global Learning Programme (GLP), which is funded by the UK Government and managed by the Centre for Global Education.

The GLP aims to embed global learning as a whole-school approach in primary, post-primary and special schools through the provision of a range of supports including training and resources. This document provides the findings of the research carried out in year two of the programme, and provides recommendations for the delivery of the programme going forward.

The Global Learning Programme team can be contacted at:



**Global Learning Programme**

9 University Street  
Belfast  
BT7 1FY

Tel: (0044) 28 9024 1879

E-mail: [glp@centreforglobaleducation.com](mailto:glp@centreforglobaleducation.com)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/globallearningprogramme](https://www.facebook.com/globallearningprogramme)

Web Site: [www.globallearningni.com](http://www.globallearningni.com)

Twitter: [@glpni](https://twitter.com/glpni)