`Grant Scheme on Promoting Effective English Language Learning in Primary Schools Progress Report

Please submit the completed report with Principal's signature and school chop on or before 30 November 2022.

• by post (with "PEEGS" clearly written on the envelope) to:

Funding Scheme Team,

Language Education and SCOLAR Section,

Education Infrastructure Division,

Education Bureau,

Room 1702, 17/F, Skyline Tower,

39 Wang Kwong Road,

Kowloon Bay,

Kowloon; and

• by email: peegs@edb.gov.hk

Additional reference notes:

- 1. In accordance with the Agreement under the Scheme, an approved school should:
 - ♦ complete ALL curriculum initiatives as set out in the Approved Plan (the Schedule);
 - ♦ conduct proper evaluations; and
- 2. Do revisit relevant parts of the Approved Plan and give thoughts to the following key evaluation questions before writing up the report.

| Parts | Key evaluation questions |
|---|--|
| (i) Part B - SWOT Analysis related to the lea | rning and teaching of English |
| Weaknesses and threats | How has the school-based project helped address the language learning needs at school (e.g. maximising exposure to English, enhancing academic literacy, nurturing reading habits and improving motivation)? What other development needs have been identified as a result of the project? Do you have any suggestions for future programmes? |
| (ii) Part E - How to implement the proposed | school-based English Language curriculum initiative funded by PEEGS? |
| Column #1 Proposed school-based English Language curriculum initiatives | To what extent have the stated project aims / objectives been achieved? How well did the core team carry out their roles and duties? What were the achievements and areas of improvement? What skills and knowledge have English Language teachers gained? Did the project proceed according to the Approved Plan? What were the actions different to it? Why? (Please note that prior approval should be sought for any change in the Approved Plan.) What are the successes and shortcomings of the project? What were the practices that worked / did not work well? |
| Columns #4 to 6 Expected outcomes/Deliverables/Success criteria Sustainability Methods of progress-monitoring and evaluation | Did school complete all project outputs (e.g. learning and teaching materials and activities)? Did the core team review their work against the success criteria through collecting quantitative and qualitative feedback from stakeholders as pledged? Have the expected project outcomes in terms of students' learning and teachers' capacity enhancement been achieved? What are mid-/long-term outcomes? What can be done to further enhance sustainability? |

Grant Scheme on Promoting Effective English Language Learning in Primary Schools Progress Report

(A) Name of School: Fuk Wing Street Government Primary School (File Number: C095)

(B) School Information and Approved Curriculum Initiatives

Please tick (\checkmark) *the appropriate boxes.*

| Name of Teacher-in-charge | Lee Ka Chun Stephen | School Phone No | 27287627 |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Approved Curriculum Initiative(s) | ☑ Enrich the English language environment in school through conducting activities* and/or developing quality resources* ☐ Promote reading* or literacy* across the curriculum ☐ Enhance e-Learning ☐ Cater for learning diversity ☐ Strengthen assessment literacy | | |
| Approved Usage(s) of Grant | □ Purchase learning and teaching resources (printed books/s □ Employ supply teacher(s) □ Employ teacher(s) who is/are proficient in English □ Employ teaching assistant(s) who is/are proficient in English □ Procure services for conducting activity | sh | se specify:) |

(C) Self-evaluation of Project Implementation

Schools should:

- undertake rigorous project evaluation based on prescribed performance indicators;
- * rate their performance using a 4-point scale#;
- * explain, in as much detail as possible, reasons for the ratings; and
- ❖ use the guidance notes (in BLUE) and examples (in RED) as reference.

| Criteria | Performance indicators | [#] Self-evaluation (Please put a ✓ in the appropriate box.) | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | Deliverables such as learning and teaching | Yes (Fulfilled) | (| → | No (Not fulfilled) |
| | resources of acceptable quality are produced, | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | deployed and used as well as quality English | | | √ | |
| | language activities are organised as scheduled. | Justifications: | | | • |
| | • Additional resources (e.g. printed/e-books, | • 65% of the proj | ject deliverables wer | e completed and | executed by the end |
| | teachers and teaching assistants) are suitably | of the project y | ear. | | |
| | deployed to achieve the intended goals. | • 55% of project | deliverables were ex | xecuted in class. | |
| Efficiency | Target groups as stipulated in the approved plan | • The ELTA hired | under the Scheme | was deployed fro | m Sep 2021 to Dec |
| (Cost-effectiveness: | have benefitted from the project. | 2021 (Dec 202 | 0 to Jun 2021 in the | last academic ye | ar). She taught 16 |
| production and | | P.3 and P.4 Lit | fe-wide English Pro | gramme lessons | a week within the |
| execution of project | | timetable and | ran a festive event | in 12 recesses to | KS2 classes about |
| deliverables, | | Diwali (an India | a festival). | | |
| resources deployment | | A total of 9 teach | chers and 232 studer | nts (356 students f | or the festive event) |
| and beneficiary size) | | have benefitte | d from the approv | ed curriculum ini | tiatives. Students |
| | | were engaged | in the lessons and | teachers gained r | nore knowledge on |
| | | promoting inte | ractions. | | |
| | | • The ELTA also | made reference o | f the approach i | n Life-wide English |
| | | Programme an | d ran an ECA class ca | alled English in Ac | tion where students |
| | | were asked to | complete tasks us | sing communicati | ve approach in an |
| | | authentic way. | They cooked a sir | nple breakfast and | d created their own |
| | | broad games. | | | |

| Criteria | Performance indicators | [#] Self-evaluation (Please put a ✓ in the appropriate box.) | | | iate box.) |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Effectiveness | Both observable (such as mastery of target) | Yes (Fulfilled) | + | → N | No (Not fulfilled) |
| (Goal achievement: | language skills) and measurable outcomes (such | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| improvement of students' language skills, teachers' understanding of new curriculum requirements - Major renewed emphases in the Updated English Language Curriculum ⁺ and use of evaluation instruments for ensuring effectiveness) | as improvement as reflected by formative and/or summative assessment results) are achieved. Teachers demonstrate a good understanding of new curriculum requirements⁺ in lessons, coplanning meetings and material development process. Monitoring and evaluation tools are effectively deployed for continual course corrections and outcome improvement. | Justifications: 4 teaching resord while 2 were packages, 5 were 2 festive event Although we content to the fact the teachers' observation 100% of the communicative | ource packages for a re developed for Pere carried out. Its were planned and could not show important Term 2 Assessmentation that stude ish Programme. It teachers thought e activities. | 4 modules were development 4. Among d 1 was carried out rovement in assessment was cancelled, nts had more confithat students were they had enriched to | (Diwali). ment results owing it is shown from idence in speak in |
| enectiveness) | | _ | dents' interaction. eachers in P.3 and | 4 has applied the | skills in promoting |
| Impact | Curriculum initiative(s) implemented has/have | Yes (Fulfilled) | + | → N | No (Not fulfilled) |
| (Broader and longer- | added value to the existing English Language | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| term effects on | curriculum. | | ✓ | | |
| curriculum enhancement, learning atmosphere and teachers' | • Curriculum initiative(s) implemented has/have fostered a professional sharing culture among English teachers, resulting in enhanced capacity. | environment f | or students to learn | provided a more and the language. We ped and carried or | /ith the interesting ut by the ELTA, it |
| professional capacity) | The English language learning environment has | enabled stude | nts to participate a | nd speak more in le | sson time. |

| Criteria | Performance indicators | #Self-eval | [#] Self-evaluation (Please put a ✓ in the appropriate box.) | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| | been enriched and students are more motivated | The core team | consisted of the Er | nglish panel chairs, I | English |
| | in learning English. | Department A | dvisor and target le | vel teachers. Mer | mbers planned the |
| | | lessons with th | ne ELTA, oversaw ar | nd led projects from | ideation through |
| | | to completion. | . They developed | materials for the pi | rogramme and |
| | | shared teachir | ng ideas with teach | ers in co-planning m | neetings every 3 |
| | | weeks. | | | |
| | | • Lesson observ | vations and evalu | ation meetings w | ere conducted to |
| | | improve instru | uction and dissem | inate good teachin | ng practices. The |
| | | ELTA also share | ed her ideas with al | l English teachers ir | n panel meetings. |
| | | The ELTA by he | erself, as a native-E | inglish speaker, has | provided a reason |
| | | for students to | o use the language | when communicat | ing with her. She |
| | | also made us | e of recess time t | o approach and c | hat with students. |
| | | Together with | our weekly English | Morning activity, w | e worked closely to |
| | | provide more | opportunities for st | udents to use the la | anguage inside and |
| | | outside classro | oom. Students we | ere engaged in these | e activities. |
| | • Project goals set are in close alignment with the | Yes (Fulfilled) | + | → 1 | No (Not fulfilled) |
| | school's major concerns and teachers'/students' | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | needs. | | √ | | |
| | Proper mechanisms (e.g. regular project review | Justifications: | | | |
| | meetings) are in place to ensure that project | • Life-wide English Programme was closely aligned with one of the two | | | |
| Relevance | activities and outputs are consistent with the | school's major concerns – continuing the improvement of learning and | | | |
| (Goal alignment) | overall goal and the attainment of the | teaching through diversified learning experiences and assessment, in | | | |
| | objectives. | the hope of im | proving students' l | earning ability and | interest. |
| | | We wished | to have some g | roup discussions | or presentations. |
| | | However, in v | riew of the genera | ally low English sta | andard among our |
| | | students, mor | e teacher-student | interaction and ga | mes were planned |
| | | and carried ou | t. | | |

| Criteria | Performance indicators | [#] Self-evaluation (Please put a ✓ in the appropriate box.) | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| | | Project progre | ess was regularly i | reported to senio | r management and |
| | | feedback fro | m teachers was | collected in co-p | lanning and panel |
| | | meetings. | | | |
| | • Newly-developed materials are consistently | Yes (Fulfilled) | ← | → | No (Not fulfilled) |
| | used after the implementation of approved | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Sustainability | curriculum initiatives and fully integrated with | | ✓ | | |
| (Continuation of a | the existing English Language curriculum. | Justifications: | | | |
| project's goals, | • Related students'/professional development | • Life-wide Eng | lish Programme wa | as first launched | last year. The has |
| principles, and efforts | activities are conducted after the project period | been incorpor | rated with the scho | ol curriculum. It | was refined before |
| to achieve | for sustaining the benefits obtained. | carried out in | the classroom this y | ear. The school | will continue this PIE |
| desired outcomes) | | cycle and use | the materials in the | future. | |
| | | The core team | will serve as seed t | eachers and suppo | ort the development |
| | | of similar prog | gramme in other lev | els. | |

| Other details | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | We were only able to recruit the ELTA in Dec 2020, but after a year of | | |
| | collaboration, she resigned in Dec 2021. In these two school years (2020- | | |
| Issues or problems encountered during the reporting period which have | 2021 an 2021-2022), we faced different challenges under different waves | | |
| impacted on the progress of the project and how they were/will be dealt with | of COVID. In order to keep up to the plan, we changed some mass | | |
| | programmes (festive activities) into class-based recess events. We also | | |
| | carried out Zoom lessons when face-to-face was not available. | | |
| Other areas that the core team would like to raise which are not covered above | | | |
| Good practices identified (if any) | Our school is/is not* willing to share good practices with other schools. | | |
| Successful experience (if any) | | | |

Remarks:

- * Please delete as appropriate.
- # Rating scale

| Score | Rating Scale |
|-------|--|
| 4 | Related indicators have been completely fulfilled. |
| 3 | Related indicators have been largely fulfilled. |
| 2 | Related indicators have been adequately fulfilled but corrective actions are needed. |
| 1 | Related indicators have not been fulfilled. |

⁺ For details, please refer to pages 6-9 of the English Language Education Key Learning Area Curriculum Guide (Primary 1 - Secondary 6) (2017) https://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/curriculum-development/renewal/ELE/ELE_KLACG_P1-S6_Eng_2017.pdf

| Signature of Principal: | Date: |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Name of Principal: | |
| | School chop |
| | |