

METACOGNITION AND SELF-REGULATED LEARNING

School Audit Tool

PREAMBLE

This school audit tool accompanies the Education Endowment Foundation's 'Metacognition and Self-regulation Guidance Report', which sets out seven recommendations for teachers and school leaders to support pupils to develop metacognition and self-regulation. It describes what 'ineffective', 'improving' and 'effective' practice could look like in relation to the guidance.

This tool can be used as part of an initial audit process to establish current practice (i.e. point of departure), as well as monitor progress towards the development of more effective practice (i.e. direction of travel). Given the complexity of metacognition and self-regulation, we expect that 'effective' practice is highly aspirational for almost all schools at this time and that the guidance is a support to begin to establish some of those practices.

We strongly recommend that this tool is used in conjunction with other self-audit tools and approaches, and is not deemed as a definitive document to determine what best practice should look like. We also recommend that this tool does not determine any teacher performance development/performance management judgements, or is used to set individual teacher targets in this regard.

This tool was co-developed by Alex Quigley (Education Endowment Foundation), Chris Runeckles (Durrington Research School), Jo Pearson (Oldham Research School), and Julie Watson (Huntington Research School).

SCHOOL AUDIT TOOL

Whole school approach to curriculum and teaching

Ineffective



- ✓ School leaders may exhibit knowledge of how children learn, but it is unclear in school policies and not consistently evidenced in practice.
- ✓ School leaders and teachers cannot explain the relevance of metacognition and self-regulated learning to the needs of their pupils.
- ✓ No training opportunities are available for staff to deepen their understanding of metacognition.
- ✓ Staff are not signposted to tools to support metacognition, such as the guidance report.
- ✓ There is not the infrastructure for effective collaborative planning to support the development of metacognition and self-regulated learning.
- ✓ Teacher planning shows little evidence of a coordinated approach to teaching pupils explicit metacognitive strategies to tackle complex challenges.
- ✓ When addressing curriculum design, metacognition and self-regulated learning is not considered.

Improving



- ✓ School leaders exhibit knowledge of how children learn and there is some evidence of this in school policies and practices.
- ✓ Some school leaders and teachers can explain how metacognition and self-regulated learning is relevant to the needs of their pupils, but this is not consistently articulated.
- ✓ Some “light touch” training on metacognition, such as one-off INSET, has taken place, but this has not led to a deep understanding of metacognition and self-regulation.
- ✓ Staff have been signposted to tools to support metacognition such as the guidance report.
- ✓ There is some infrastructure for collaborative planning, which sees some colleagues develop shared planning to develop metacognition and self-regulated learning, but this practice is inconsistent.
- ✓ Teacher planning takes some account of explicitly teaching metacognitive strategies to tackle complex challenges.
- ✓ When addressing curriculum design, there is some consideration of metacognition and self-regulated learning.

Exemplary



- ✓ School leaders exhibit deep knowledge of how children learn and these are exemplified in school policies and practices.
- ✓ Almost all staff can confidently explain how metacognition and self-regulated learning is relevant to the needs of their pupils and this is evident in their planning and practices.
- ✓ Staff have access to effective CPD, with sufficient time to develop a deep knowledge and understanding of metacognition and self-regulated learning.
- ✓ Staff have been supported with a range of tools for metacognition, including the guidance report, as well as other tools that have been developed by the school to support practice.
- ✓ There is a well organised infrastructure that promotes collaborative planning so that all staff are supported to develop metacognition and self-regulated learning .
- ✓ Teacher planning consistently displays attention to explicitly teaching metacognitive strategies so that pupils have high success rates when tackling complex challenges.
- ✓ When addressing curriculum design, metacognition and self-regulation is embedded consistently in plans.

SCHOOL AUDIT TOOL

Teacher knowledge

Ineffective



Teacher knowledge:

- ✓ Teachers are either unaware of or have an incorrect understanding of metacognition and self-regulation.
- ✓ Teachers are unaware of specific terminology, such as metacognitive knowledge (task, strategies and self) and metacognitive regulation (planning, monitoring and evaluating).
- ✓ Teachers are unaware of the EEF toolkit and guidance reports.

Teacher practice:

- ✓ Teachers only explicitly explain their thinking on an ad-hoc basis and without consistent planning or structure.
- ✓ Teachers do not support pupils in planning, monitoring or evaluating their learning.
- ✓ Challenge is often pitched too low or too high in lessons.
- ✓ Teachers' modelling does not take account of the need to explicitly share the thinking behind each step.
- ✓ Tasks are either scaffolded too much and reduce thinking, or are not scaffolded enough and create cognitive overload.

Improving



Teacher knowledge:

- ✓ Teachers have a partial understanding of metacognition and self-regulation. This may include some misunderstandings.
- ✓ Teachers are aware of specific terminology, such as metacognitive knowledge (task, strategies and self) and metacognitive regulation (planning, monitoring and evaluating).
- ✓ Teachers are aware of the EEF toolkit and guidance reports but they exhibit a limited understanding of metacognition and self-regulation.

Teacher practice:

- ✓ Teachers explicitly explain their thinking in a structured way for some tasks.
- ✓ Teachers provide support for pupils in either planning, monitoring or evaluating their learning, but this is inconsistent.
- ✓ Challenge is sometimes pitched too low or too high in lessons.
- ✓ Teachers' modelling sometimes takes account of the need to explicitly share the thinking behind each step.
- ✓ Scaffolding is taken into account when planning tasks, but is not consistent and does not apply cognitive load principles.

Exemplary



Teacher knowledge:

- ✓ Teachers have a deep understanding of metacognition and self-regulation.
- ✓ Teachers understand the specific terminology of metacognitive knowledge (task, strategies and self) and metacognitive regulation (planning, monitoring and evaluation) and they can explain them with sophisticated insight.
- ✓ Teachers are aware of the EEF toolkit and have read the metacognition guidance report, which leads to a confident understanding of metacognition and self-regulation.

Teacher practice:

- ✓ Teachers consistently execute an explicit explanation of their thinking for most tasks.
- ✓ Teachers consistently provide support for pupils in all facets of planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning.
- ✓ Challenge is regularly pitched in the zone of desirable difficulty.
- ✓ Teachers' modelling consistently takes account of the need to explicitly share the thinking behind each step.
- ✓ Scaffolding is taken into account when planning tasks and principles of cognitive load are applied.

SCHOOL AUDIT TOOL

Pupil knowledge and behaviours

Ineffective



Pupil knowledge:

- ✓ Pupils have little or no awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses and are unwilling to engage in and improve their own learning.
- ✓ Pupils have little or no understanding of how they learn, nor do they consider different strategies to address specific tasks.
- ✓ Pupils are unaware that planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning may differ across subject domains and for different tasks.

Pupil behaviours:

- ✓ Pupils do not plan tasks with independence
- ✓ Pupils do not engage in metacognitive talk with their peers.
- ✓ Pupils do not effectively manage their learning outside of the classroom.
- ✓ Pupils rarely engage with feedback and they are dependent upon their teacher when they are stuck or struggle.

Improving



Pupil knowledge:

- ✓ Pupils have some awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses and are willing to engage in and improve their own learning.
- ✓ Pupils have some understanding of how to learn effectively, including knowledge of themselves as learners, of available strategies and of the particular task they are completing.
- ✓ Pupils show some awareness of planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning, and the differences between subject domains and tasks.

Pupil behaviours:

- ✓ Pupils plan to undertake tasks with an increasing degree of understanding.
- ✓ Some pupils engage in metacognitive talk with their peers given teachers prompting.
- ✓ Some pupils effectively manage their learning outside of the classroom with some independence.
- ✓ Some pupils engage with feedback and use it to monitor their learning, though this is inconsistent, with pupils reliant upon teacher prompting.

Exemplary



Pupil knowledge:

- ✓ Pupils are self-regulating (aware of their own strengths and weaknesses) and can motivate themselves to engage in and improve their own learning.
- ✓ Pupils understand how they learn, exhibiting knowledge of themselves as learners, understanding how to deploy a range of available strategies for different tasks.
- ✓ Pupils show a deep understanding of how planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning is different across subject domains and tasks, as well as understanding commonalities in their learning.

Pupil behaviours:

- ✓ Pupils consistently plan for tasks with independence, reflecting upon the success of their plans.
- ✓ Pupils engage in metacognitive talk with their peers with relative independence.
- ✓ Most pupils effectively manage their learning outside of the classroom, utilising a range of strategies with increasing independence.
- ✓ Most pupils fully engage with feedback to monitor their learning with increasing independence.