



CoTIC – COLLABORATIVE TEACHING IN THE INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM

/2021-1-BG01-KA220-SCH-000031633/



Results of the Screening (PR1:A2) National Report - MALTA

2022

Follow the structure:

1. Preparation (what activities did you organise before starting the Screening?)

Before the screening was to take place, the project manager and the project co-ordinator held a meeting with the relevant school staff. The people present from the school were the head of primary school, the early years teacher assistant, the year 1 and year 2 teachers and two learning support assistants – one who assists in year 1 and the other who assists in year 2. The school staff present at this meeting, were given a full update of the screening that was to take place. It was explained that the screening was to be timed and that the pupils were expected to work on their own. The test sheets were explained to the teachers, who were informed of the rationale of the test. The manner in which the test was to take place was also explained, where the teachers were told that they would need to explain to their class that the test consisted of a set of tasks that needed to be completed on their own.

2. How the Screening was organised (in one school, in several schools, teachers involved, period, etc.)

The screening took place at Newark School Malta. Newark hosts children from pre-grade (3yrs) up to the last year of compulsory school age in Malta (16yrs). It is split into primary, middle and senior school departments. Newark is a private school with very small classes since it focuses on individual attention therefore numbers within a classroom are kept to a maximum of 15 pupils. Newark is an inclusive school that values diversity and inclusion. It was decided that the screening will take place with the year 1 and the year 2 pupils. This decision was taken, because although the project indicated year 1 pupils, in Malta, children who are in year 1 are actually a year younger than those in schools of the project partners. Therefore, it was felt that the sample would not yield the desired results. As such, the screening was done again a second time round, where the sample consisted of pupils from year 2.

The staff involved in the screening included the year 1 and year 2 teachers, the year 1 and 2 learning support assistant, the head of primary and the head of school. All these persons were present at a meeting that took place at the school for the purpose of co-ordination and team work.

3. To how many children the Screening Test was applied?

The screening was applied to the year 1 class which is made of 15 pupils and the year 2 class which is made of 15 pupils.

4. Results:

How many children showed low results – use Table 1 to show the results

How many children were recommended to be tested with Individual tests at the next stage?

YEAR 1: From the year 1 pupils, consideration must be had to the age factor, as explained above. This notwithstanding, it can nonetheless still be seen that two pupils who scored with 8.5 and 9 marks respectively, would be recommended for the individual test. The pupil who scored the highest achieved 18.5 marks.

YEAR 2: From the group of year 2 pupils, three got below 20 marks thus two scoring at 18.5 and one scoring at 19. It may be noted that the 18.5 grade for these two grade 2 pupils is the same as the highest score acquired by the top student in the younger year 1 group. This would point towards recommendation for the individual test. The remaining thirteen pupils all got 20 marks or more, with one pupil achieving 23/25 marks.

5. Any feedback from teachers who participated in the Screening.

It was noted that, in fact, the year 1 pupils were too young for the testing, since many of them in Malta would not as yet have started to read. In fact, it would be good to point out that although the test was recommended for year 1 pupils, in actuality year 1 pupils in Maltese schools are a year younger than those of European counterparts. This made it difficult for the year 1 pupils to conduct the test appropriately. In fact, the teacher



indicated that she had to help the student to quite a degree. This could also be noticeable from the fact that year 1 pupils fared much better in the numeracy exercised than the literacy ones. There was a discrepancy between the two areas where most year 1 pupils got many numeracy questions correct but did not fare well where it came to reading. With the year 1 pupils it could also be noted that with the literacy exercises, where the task involved reading by the teacher (and not by the pupil ie listening task) the students were able to answer the questions correctly. This points towards the fact that the incorrect answers in literacy tasks were the result of them not yet being of age to read. Indeed, when the passage was read to them, they comprehended the task fully, and got correct answers. In the case of numeracy, it could be noted by the teacher that the pupils found little problem to solve these tasks. She stated that she had to explain the symbols < and > since the concept had not as yet been covered in class, however after the explanation, the children fared quite well. The problem sum was difficult for them – again because the children could not read – however when this was read out to them, 13 out of 15 pupils got it correct. In general, the teacher also pointed out that the children in year 1 needed the paper to be explained to them prior to starting the test. Another point was the time factor. Low marks with the year 1 group was mainly the result of the fact that some of them did not manage to tackle all questions. This was not because of inability, but because they ran out of time.

In the case of the year 2 pupils, the jump in correct results was highly noticeable. This is the result of the fact that now at year 2 the pupils could read. Another area which saw an improvement in marks are the tasks with jumbled letters/words. The older children were now more able to tackle and solve these tasks. In general, where it came to the year 2 pupils, the teacher said that they did not need much prior explanation, but they could take the test independently. Another factor which saw a marked improvement when compared with year 1, was the time element where all the pupils were able to finish the test on time.



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

