

**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR  
INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING  
AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**



**CARRIED OUT BY THE SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT**

**FEBRUARY 2003**



**SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE**

## CONTENTS

## PAGE NO.

1.	Review of Scottish CILT	3
2.	Background	4
3.	Why a <u>Scottish</u> CILT?	6
4.	Accountability and Consultation	7
5.	Organisation and Management	9
6.	Services Provided	9
7.	Specific Tasks	11
8.	Accommodation and Resources	13
9.	Partnerships	13
10.	Financial Management and Income Generation	17
11.	Future Plans	18
12.	Conclusion	18
13.	Summary	19
14.	Recommendations	19

## 1. REVIEW OF SCOTTISH CILT

1.1 The review has been carried out to coincide with the end of a 3-year funding stream. The main objective is to consider whether Scottish CILT is meeting its aims and how its support for teachers and students is perceived in the school education system. Aims and Objectives of SCILT are as follows:

### **Mission**

*To promote an enhanced capability for modern languages in Scotland and positive attitudes towards the learning and use of modern languages*

### **Specific Aims**

*To act as the principal source of information within Scotland on relevant activities and developments in the modern languages field, and to provide support and advice for all those engaged in learning, teaching and using modern languages; for those involved in other relevant aspects of educational provision; for education and policy makers.*

*To be proactive in investigation, evaluation and debate concerning learning and teaching; assessment; structures, models or forms of provision; policy; use of modern languages, while maintaining an objective position.*

*To promote the benefits of greater levels of competence in the use of modern languages in Scotland for the economy; for socio-cultural reasons; for individuals; and to promote Scottish “success stories” in Scotland and abroad.*

### Approach

1.2 The review has been conducted to assess the impact of the 3-year funding package which increased annual funding from £46,000 to £109,000. This was linked to a 3 year development plan which expanded Scottish CILT’s range of activities in Scotland. The main aim of the review is to gauge the success of meeting its aims and thus inform decisions in respect of future funding. Additional aims of the review are as follows:

- ❑ To consider SCILT’s effectiveness and efficiency in meeting its objectives;
- ❑ To consider the quality of services provided in Scotland and satisfaction level amongst users;
- ❑ To consider value for money achieved in terms of supporting teachers and schools in their implementation of government policy ;
- ❑ To review SCILT’s forward-planning and strategy development;
- ❑ To consider success in attracting income from other sources;
- ❑ To identify, if appropriate, ways in which SCILT can improve its services, the delivery of aims and improve value for money.

1.3 The review considered documentation provided by SCILT, including development plans, advisory board papers and reports as well as finance accounts. Discussions were held with a range of personnel in Stirling University, SCILT, and the chair of the Advisory Board. In addition, a questionnaire was circulated to local authority language advisers and organisers with a request that all language teachers were given an opportunity to respond, to further and higher education institutions, SALT, members of COALA, Cultural Institutions and Advisory Board Members.

1.4 The questionnaire was designed to establish teacher awareness of and attitudes to SCILT and gauge whether they considered the support provided had an impact on classroom practice. 694 responses were received from 29 local authorities, further and higher education institutions, cultural organisations and a range of others involved in language learning and teaching.

1.5 The overall impression which can be taken from the responses is that teachers perceptions of SCILT show support for a Scottish organisation which understands particular issues associated with the Scottish curriculum, and for an organisation more accessible geographically. However, perceptions of the role of SCILT are rather mixed, with some differing perceptions of its functions. Independent schools, local authorities and further and higher education responses indicate a greater understanding SCILT and perhaps a greater appreciation of the support it can provide and how that helps in their work. SCILT may wish to consider how it can raise awareness of its functions and role among primary and secondary teachers.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

### SCILT

2.1 Scottish CILT was established in December 1991 for an initial period of three years as a project sponsored by CILT, Stirling University and SOED. The aims of SCILT at that time were to provide support for language teachers in Scotland by establishing a resources centre for languages teaching, an information service, by running conferences for language teachers and by collating and disseminating the results of research into language learning and teaching. Focus was mainly on the language teacher in school but there were proposals to enter the field of language teaching for business.

2.2 Grant is paid under the Educational Development, Research and Services (Scotland) Grant Regulations 1999. Funding continued on an annual basis until 1999 when a new three-year funding package was negotiated which substantially increased annual funding. The new funding package supported the development of SCILT as a national body for language learning, teaching and research.

### Staffing structure

2.3 Scottish CILT has expanded significantly in the past three years, due to increased core funding from SEED of £109,000 per annum and the attraction of funding of £675,000 over three years for the SCOTLANG project, further supported by additional research income.

## 2.4 Staff consist of:

Professor Richard Johnstone	Director
Joanna McPake	Deputy Director
Lottie Gregory	Administrator
Dr Jean Conacher	Research and Development Fellow
Irene Malcolm	Research and Development Fellow
Lesley Low	Research and Development Fellow (0.5)
Sara-Ann Kelly	Information Officer (0.5)
Helena Jamieson	Receptionist/Secretary

As part of the SCOTLANG project, Professor Joseph Lo Bianco, Chief Executive of Language Australia worked with SCILT for seven months in 2001.

### Staff Roles

2.5 Each member of staff has a clearly defined role within the centre and they meet regularly to ensure that all are fully aware of current work tasks and priorities. Team members would seem to work well together and work individually, collectively and in discrete teams on specific tasks. The ethos is one of inclusiveness and information sharing and all are involved in the development planning process and the monitoring of achievements.

## 2.6 Individual responsibilities are as follows:

**Professor Richard Johnstone.** Responsible for strategic management and direction of the centre and for supporting all of the centre's research. The main link with the University (including the Institute of Education and the Faculty of Human Sciences) and with outside bodies (such as SEED, European Commission, Council of Europe, Language Australia and CILT UK). Director of SCOTLANG. Writes an annual review for the Cambridge University Press of the leading research on the teaching, learning and use of languages published the previous year in the top international research journals, and as such is in a position to make international research findings available within Scotland.

**Joanna McPake:** Responsible for day to day management of the centre, including finance decisions and strategic management and development decisions. Involved in strategic management and development issues with responsibility for taking forward specific tasks such as the European Year of Languages and the Assessment of Achievement Programme for modern languages. Senior researcher on SCOTLANG project. Research activity over the past cycle includes a survey of parental perspectives on modern language provision in schools, literature review on translation, interpretation and communication support services and school-based survey to map the languages of Edinburgh.

**Lottie Gregory:** Responsible for general administration and support, finance, liaison with University management and website and newsletter publications. Lottie is also involved in the planning and organisation of conferences and links with the COALA group, FE Network and SALT as well as servicing the Scottish CILT and SCOTLANG advisory boards.

**Irene Malcolm:** Research and Development Officer and secondee from Bell College. Irene has specific business interests, such as e-commerce and links with Scottish Executive and

links with Scottish Enterprise, the Languages National Training Organisation and is involved in cultural issues. Irene is also involved in the evaluation of the Partners in Excellence project.

**Lesley Low:** Part-time Research Fellow, who is involved in conference co-ordination and support. In the recent past has been working on specific projects such as a commission from East Renfrewshire Council, the Clackmannanshire languages project a SCOTLANG seed project on intercultural communication by telephone and a European Cooperation Programme involving the development of materials for teachers of languages at primary school in five different countries.

**Jean Conacher:** Research and Development officer, on secondment from University of Limerick. Jean is involved in the editing and running of the electronic journal aimed at schools and other institutions entitled “the Scottish Languages Review”. Jean also has responsibility for conference organisation, is involved in the evaluation of the Clackmannanshire languages project and is involved in the Assessment of Achievement Programme for Modern Languages and a SCOTLANG project on intercultural communications by telephone.

**Sara-Ann Kelly:** Part time information officer. Sara Ann scans international and national press for information relevant to languages learning, researches resources, co-maintains the SCILT website, provides bibliography reference support and is involved in conference organisation.

**Helena Jamieson:** Provides secretarial support for the Director and Deputy Director of the centre, other support for particular projects and is receptionist for the centre.

2.7 Regular staff meetings are held, usually around a specific theme. Information meetings are held once a month and weekly activities circulated to all with an indication of likely support required. Away Days are held for strategic planning activity.

2.8 Staffing levels are appropriate for the tasks SCILT intends to take forward. The increase has been possible because of funding attracted from SCOTLANG and in part due to the increased funding from SEED. While Professor Johnstone remains a central part of the organisation, SCILT has become a more sustainable organisation in the last 3 years and less dependent on any one person that it was in past years. A very strong team has been gathered and works together in a structured and supportive way.

2.9 SCILT is considered a key element within the Institute of Education at Stirling University.

### **3. WHY A SCOTTISH CILT**

3.1 At the time support was agreed, the rationale for establishing a centre in Scotland focussed on 3 key points:

**Geography:** The nearest equivalent centre, CILT, was based in London and later set up Comenius centres located in various locations throughout England. Distance, time and cost

of travel would impact on the use of centres by Scottish teachers. In terms of Scottish geography, Stirling is a good central base for a wide range of locations.

**Curriculum issues:** There are many differences in the English and Scottish educational systems and curriculum. In 1991, the Modern Languages in the Primary school programme was just beginning, a move which was not replicated in England, and primary teachers could train to teach a modern foreign language in the later stages of primary school. This was a major policy initiative and a Scottish centre was better able to support teachers and schools through the development and implementation process.

**Research:** Although teachers of modern languages have excellent practical skills and are knowledgeable of learning and teaching practices, it was felt that there was less experience of academic and analytical research in language learning related issues. SCILT is greatly experienced in this area and Professor Johnstone is highly regarded for his research skills. The advantages of combining the offices of SCILT with Stirling University are perhaps most effective in this area.

3.2 These three issues are strongly supported by teachers who responded to the questionnaire. The issue of separate curriculum arrangements in Scotland and England/Wales was raised most frequently.

#### **4. ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONSULTATION**

4.1 SCILT is located within the Institute of Education within the Faculty of Human Sciences and governance of its working practices, financial management, staffing, workload rests with Stirling University through its normal management procedures. The internal audit systems include SCILT.

4.2 The work of SCILT, the formation of its development plan and achievements against that development plan is overseen by an Advisory Board, appointed by Professor Johnstone. Representatives on this Board are as follows:

Roger Breckon, Stevenson College, Further Education  
Bob Byiers, University of Glasgow, Teacher Education, CILT Governor  
Ian Lamont, Alva Academy, Headteacher, (Chairman)  
David Mallen, Scottish Borders Council  
Janey Mauchline, South Lanarkshire Council, Local Authority Adviser  
Margaret McGhie, Learning and Teaching Scotland  
HMIE  
Iain McTaggart, SCDI, Industry  
Professor Gordon Millan, University of Strathclyde, UCML Scotland  
Beth Munn, Ladeside Primary School, Primary Teacher  
Dr Remo Nannetti, Notre Dame High School, Secondary Teacher  
Chris Rolfe, City of Dundee Council, Local Authority Adviser  
Professor Richard Johnstone, Scottish CILT, ex officio  
Dr Lid King, CILT, ex officio

4.3 A representative from SEED also attends the meetings. Remo Nannetti has recently resigned from the Board and a replacement will be nominated in the next cycle. Following

advice from SEED, a representative from Learning and Teaching Scotland and business and industry have been added to the Board membership.

4.4 The Advisory Board meets twice a year – one meeting to agree the forward development plan and targets, the other to consider achievements against these targets. The development planning process is an inclusive one, as all members of staff are involved. In discussions with staff of SCILT the following process reflects current practice:

#### Planning Process

4.5 Professor Johnstone forms an initial assessment of needs through his various contacts in the field, using SEED policy documents and HMIE reports where appropriate and the outcomes of relevant research projects. These initial assessments are discussed with staff after which Joanna McPake, Depute Director, proposes models which reflect discussions and evidence. These are then formulated into one development plan which is discussed with SEED and then presented to the Advisory Board for discussion, advice and comment. The final development plan forms the work programme of SCILT. The current development plan covers a three year period and has required ongoing adjustment to reflect developments in foreign language policy. These adjustments were made with the full knowledge and support of the Advisory Board.

4.6 A meeting was held with the Chair of the Advisory Board to discuss his views on the effectiveness of the Advisory Board and his views on SCILT. Ian Lamont is headteacher of Alva Academy and has chaired the Board for 3 years. He also attends meetings of the CILT Board of Governors.

4.7 The role of the Advisory Board was seen as being to advise on the appropriateness of the development plan, using the experience and knowledge of the wide range of interests represented and to comment on achievement against those plans and on forward planning proposals. Mr Lamont is in frequent contact with SCILT and is kept up-to-date with issues.

4.8 The current Board are keen and willing and were expected to stay in place until the end of this current funding cycle. Mr Lamont strives to ensure that Board members feel able to participate in full and frank discussion of issues and take best advantage of the experience of members.

4.9 Mr Lamont was open to the possibility of cyclical membership, and the possibility of attracting members through advertisement. He was in agreement with the procedures set in place for accountability and consultation with the Board as he considered it vital that the Director of SCILT should take the lead in identifying tasks and objectives, while taking account of the views of the Board and the wider stakeholder constituency.

4.10 There seemed to be no clear system for inducting new members to the Advisory Board, although all were warmly welcomed by other more experienced members. The effectiveness of the Board would be improved if an information pack was prepared for new members which included background information on SCILT, development plans, relevant recent papers, board membership details and an outline of the role of advisory board members.



4.11 There should also be in place a formal system for attracting new members to the Advisory Board, bearing in mind the balance of representation required, and consideration given to timed membership, perhaps on a 3-year basis, although there could be options for extending membership. The membership, and balance of representation, should be widely publicised along with other SCILT materials. It may also be helpful if Advisory Board members were to operate an informal system of taking the views of sector colleagues on language issues and other issues related to SCILT. This may enhance the role of the Board as a conduit between SCILT and its stakeholders and provide a wider range of insights for the Advisory Board.

4.12 The role of the Advisory Board, as it operates at present, is an appropriate facility for overseeing the work of SCILT, given that Stirling University has overall responsibility for management and governance through the Dean of Faculty. Stirling University and SEED also liaise on issues of development planning, financial management, the composition of the Advisory Board and staffing issues, and discussed these issues at the beginning of the current 3-year cycle.

## **5. ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT**

5.1 SCILT operates within the Institute of Education within its cost centre. It adheres to the University financial management procedures. As indicated earlier in this report, SEED liaises with Stirling University on issues of financial management, staffing and the make-up of the Advisory Board.

5.2 SCILT has been successful in attracting income from other sources, the most significant being that from the SCOTLANG project. It has also successfully bid for work in other areas such as research into Gaelic-medium education and the Assessment of Achievement Programme for Modern Languages. However, SCILT should consider how it might attract more consistent funding streams. It may be possible to attract “corporate membership” from local authorities in respect of its support for schools. This would be in line with the new funding structure for language learning support which has led to SEED distributing funding to local authorities and devolving the decisions on spending within a framework linked to the recommendations made by the Action Group on Languages.

## **6. SERVICES PROVIDED**

### Resources centre

6.1 The resources centre offers materials such as cassettes, CD-ROMS and videos for learning and teaching of languages and it is mainly teachers and students who access these materials. SCILT records the use, time, profile and type of resources accessed throughout the year. There is an increased use of the centre during the summer, including those from other universities. The centre can facilitate organised visits for teachers, illustrated by the Goethe Institute residential course for primary teachers and SCILT intends to build on this. Teachers attending conference will also often visit the resource centre. The availability of twilight access has not been successful.

6.2 The previous reviewer suggested that SCILT might consider a travelling display of resources available and this suggestion is perhaps more relevant given the need for more outreach displayed in responses to the questionnaire. This might be extended to become a display of all services available through SCILT which could be used during in-service training days, local conferences and seminars and by Faculties of Education.

### Information services

6.3 **Newsletter:** This is issued to primary headteachers, principal teachers of modern languages in secondary schools, members of the SCILT FE network, HE modern languages departments and local authority advisers. Distributed two or three times a year, it contains information on conferences, research activities and contains features produced by other bodies such as the cultural organisations and SALT. The questionnaire responses feature this as the most common way in which teachers know about SCILT and it would therefore appear to be a successful awareness-raising vehicle.

6.4 **Website:** This provides up to date information on SCILT's activity and was newly designed in December 2000. It also contains the Scottish Languages Review and electronic journal containing contributions by practitioners and aims to support a virtual community of language professionals. An Information Sheet is also available which cover relevant topics, such as CPD and Entitlement and Compulsion.

6.5 **Inquiry Service:** A range of enquiries from teachers, students, parents, the media and the public are dealt with through the inquiry service, most through e-mail.

6.6 **Electronic Digest:** This is also available electronically, although on request to users of SCILT. It reports on a daily search of websites for information on language issues that has appeared that day.

6.7 The development of internet-related services can go some way to satisfying the need of those who find regular visits to SCILT difficult. These services are being developed in a forward-looking way, with hard copy versions being made available at conferences to raise awareness. The number of "hits" recorded is healthy and is increasing. This is a key area for future development and SCILT is taking an outward-looking focus on how it can improve by keeping up to date with ICT developments in website management.

### Conferences

6.8 Conferences cover three main themes: policy; practice; and promotion. Topics are often identified from post-conference evaluation sheets, analysis of which are posted on the website. In the period between August 1999 and March 2002, SCILT has organised 9 conferences with over 900 adults and 500 student participants. Topics of conferences were chosen to reflect key issues in language learning in Scotland and some highly respected speakers have taken part. Conferences for practitioners tend to be organised for a Saturday in order to avoid the need for supply cover.

6.9 This is perhaps the most valuable aspect of SCILT's work and one which is highly regarded. A significant number of responses to the questionnaire suggested a need for more outreach work, which might include conferences, perhaps during the working week. SCILT is aware of this need and is exploring how it might offer more outreach services within its

current staffing structure and is considering offering an advice service for local authorities who might wish to organise local conferences based on the template used for SCILT national conferences. SCILT undertook a survey of teacher opinion in 2001 to establish how many conferences it might put on, the topics of interest. Times of year, days of the week and locations formed part of that survey, the results of which are posted on the SCILT website. SCILT intends to carry out such a survey annually. SCILT should consider consulting the other Teacher Education Institutes to establish their views on topics for future conferences and take advantage of the opportunities they offer to hold conferences in other parts of the country.

## **RESEARCH**

6.10 SCILT has a well-known research capacity and has successfully bid for a number of contracts in the field of language learning and teaching. SCILT also disseminates research outcomes throughout the education community, adding a vital academic strand to the experience and knowledge of language teachers. There is no doubt in the mind of the University managers that this involvement in research is a valuable asset to SCILT, the education community and the University itself.

6.11 Given the increasing culture of evidence-based policy making at both a national and local level, the importance of being involved in and taking account of research outcomes in the work of SCILT is a vital service. There is no other agency which takes a central role in the assimilation, reporting and distribution of research into language learning and teaching. SCILT works well with other partner organisations, CILT, NICILT and CILT CYMRU to share information and research nationally. Professor Johnstone's work on the Cambridge University Press also brings an international dimension to the knowledge bank of SCILT.

6.12 This is an essential service and SCILT is ideally placed to provide it, taking account of its history of experience in research and that of Stirling University.

## **7. SPECIFIC TASKS**

7.1 As well as the provision of the above services, Scottish CILT has been involved in taking forward specific tasks. These tasks were undertaken either on behalf of SEED, as part of the core funded work of SCILT, or reflected SCILT's knowledge of language learning. An outline of each of these tasks is as follows:

### Action Group on Languages

7.2 A Ministerial Action Group on Languages was established in December 1999 to consider how to secure the place of language learning in the curriculum. The Group was broadly representative of a number of education and business interests and Professor Johnstone was a member of the Group. As part of his work on the Group, Professor Johnstone prepared the Rationale for language learning which underpins the report of the Action Group. He also supported the Chair, John Mulgrew, with the preparation of the text of the report, based on the discussions of the Group and approved by them. This was an onerous task which impacted on some of the tasks outlined in the SCILT development plan, some of which had to be rescheduled, with the full approval of the Advisory Board.

## Parents Survey

7.3 The Action Group on Languages considered that gathering the views and attitudes of parents to foreign language learning were an essential part of its deliberations. Scottish CILT was asked to compile a questionnaire and use it as a basis for a small consultation. This was part-funded by core funding with a small additional payment made. The task was reflected in the development plan and approved by the Advisory Board. Again, it had an impact on other tasks of lower priority and these were rescheduled.

## European Year of Languages

7.4 2001 was designated European Year of Languages and CILT was funded by DfES to take forward UK participation. CILT arranged a committee of representatives from across the UK, with SCILT as Scottish representatives. To better ensure that a wide range of Scottish views were fed into this UK committee, SCILT approached SEED with a proposal to set up a Scottish committee to facilitate the Year in Scotland. Additional funding of £5,000 was provided to SCILT to support a Scottish committee and encourage and register participation in Scotland. Again, this required a readjustment of the development plan after full discussion with the Advisory Board.

## Evaluation of projects

7.5 As part of its core funding, SEED asked SCILT to undertake the independent evaluation of two projects receiving support: a project in Clackmannanshire where secondary language teachers support primary teachers; and a partial immersion project in Aberdeen where pupils are taught part of the curriculum in French.

## SCOTLANG

7.6 SCILT successfully bid for a research project commissioned by SHEFC. The project aims to encourage research on the teaching, learning and use of modern languages. Among the activities funded through this SCOTLANG project are:

- Six small projects, four of which have been made available to HE institutions other than Stirling University, that will allow a national and international Scottish CILT network of collaborative research in this key area to be developed;
- A database of information on languages in Scotland that will be of use to decision-makers in education, the arts and business in deciding on language policies, needs and opportunities;
- Training for those who are interested in developing their research skills in the languages area.

7.7 Although the Advisory Board is kept up to date on progress on the SCOTLANG project, a separate board oversees the work and reports are made to SHEFC.

7.8 As part of the SCOTLANG project, SCILT played host to an international expert on languages policy. Professor Jo Lo Bianco was seconded to Stirling University for 7 months and worked closely with SCILT and its range of networks to produce a report on Scottish

language issues. While he was here, Professor Lo Bianco made several keynote speeches, at a SALT conference and several SCILT conferences. He also met with a range of representatives of various language interests, education, MSPs, the European Commission and Council of Europe as well as giving media interviews. Professor Lo Bianco's involvement with Scottish CILT undoubtedly had a major positive impact on SCILT, and the ensuing report has been well received. However, as it was funded as part of the SCOTLANG project, this aspect of SCILT's work was not assessed as part of this review.

7.9 Professor Lo Bianco made a submission to the review on his views on SCILT and his experience of working within the organisation. Professor Lo Bianco praised Scottish CILT for its research abilities, its leadership of others from a range of interests, and its capacity to support practitioners and policy makers.

## **8. ACCOMMODATION AND RESOURCES**

8.1 SCILT is currently accommodated within the Pathfoot Building, Stirling University. This accommodation was made available through refurbishment and extension of existing facilities, funded by SCOTLANG. There is sufficient space to display resources and publications, hold meetings and study. Small rooms with ICT facilities are also available for private study, or for use during meetings in the main room. While SCILT is currently located within the Institute of Education, there is some discussion on future location.

8.2 Should the University decide to relocate SCILT in accommodation elsewhere in the University following the possible mover of the Institute of Education from Pathfoot to the Cottrell Building, we would suggest that the minimum space requirement should reflect current arrangements.

## **9. PARTNERSHIPS**

9.1 This section will examine the relationships being developed between SCILT and other organisations, its attitude towards partnership working, and plans for making links with new organisations.

### Stirling University

9.2 The University and SCILT have a mutually supportive and beneficial relationship. The management are in no doubt of the value of the work carried out and consider it a key part of the Institute of Education. The siting of SCILT benefits the University by maintaining an interest in language learning and the importance of gathering and disseminating research evidence reflects the ethos of the University.

9.3 The Principal considers that SCILT is under-resourced through its core funding but accepts that its contribution in respect Professor Johnstone's time and the use of University services is balanced out by the benefits of having SCILT within the University. He also considers that SCILT is vital if SEED was serious about languages.

9.4 It is not clear whether separating SCILT from Stirling University would have an impact on the services provided and the perception of SCILT by practitioners. However,

such a separation would require substantial financial investment and reorganisation. The link between the two organisations seems beneficial to both SCILT and the University and the central location of benefit to stakeholders. SCILT should continue to be based in Stirling University.

## CILT

9.5 The partnership between CILT and Scottish CILT is friendly, co-operative and mutually beneficial. The director of CILT is closely connected with the work of SCILT and attends Advisory Board meetings where he provides an update on CILT activities. CILT also plays an active role in many conferences, adding a national dimension to discussions. The Chair of the Advisory Board, Professor Johnstone and an HMIE representative are invited to attend CILT Board of Governors meetings and there is a place for a Scottish practitioner on a committee concerned with teaching issues.

9.6 Since devolution, the financial relationship between CILT and SCILT has changed. Payments for SCILT were channelled through CILT whereas now payments are made separately to each organisation. Following this, a Letter of Agreement on the continuation and development of the partnership between SCILT, CILT and Stirling University was agreed, setting out each contribution to the partnership was agreed and signed by each partner. This has seemed to enhance the combination of the different aspects of SCILT and CILT and cemented an already positive relationship.

9.7 The Director of CILT submitted a statement of support to the review. It states that SCILT is making an impact on teachers in areas of its competence and responsibility. SCILT is also making a contribution to the wider community in Scotland, the UK and Europe through, for example: a major contribution to the CILT UK (and wider) research agenda in languages; core involvement in the European-wide discussions relating to language policy and the role of languages in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; support for languages in higher education; facilitation of the networking of key constituencies; participation with CILT in European initiatives, in particular European Year of Languages.

9.8 SEED will separately consider the role and impact of CILT in Scotland to inform future funding decisions.

## Local authorities

9.9 Generally, Scottish CILT has more contact with local authority advisers than with Directors of Education. However, there are a few authorities where dialogue and contact with local authority decision-makers is developing.

9.10 SCILT has facilitated a group of advisers and cultural organisations (COALA) which meets regularly to share information and discuss relevant issues. Similar networking arrangements have been set in place for a range of interests, either on a regular basis or on an individual one. SCILT is keen that its role is seen as facilitating networking opportunities with various groups and individuals rather than taking a leading role.

9.11 Advisers and teachers attend the conferences, and are often speakers or lead group sessions. Advisers are key to the promotion of SCILT and its services within an authority. They can encourage schools to use the resource and information services, as well as cover the

small cost of conference attendance. SCILT is encouraging schools to count the time spent at conferences as part of a teachers' continuing professional development.

9.12 The questionnaire responses from advisers in local authorities indicated that advisers valued greatly the support they received from SCILT and its facilitation of networks of contacts with others in the education and culture communities. Given the reorganisation of the advisory service since local government reorganisation, which led to a reduction in the number of subject specialist advisers, this could be a key support network for SCILT. Promoting this support service to Directors of Education might provide a vital profile raising among local authorities.

9.13 The membership of the Advisory Board includes two local authority advisers. They provide a valuable insight into the views of teachers and issues relating to current practice and school organisation. Including a representative of Directors of Education on the Advisory Board, perhaps in place of one of the advisers might help SCILT raise its profile within local authority policy makers.

### Schools

9.14 562 responses came from schools across Scotland, although not from all local authorities. Statistical data on these responses is attached, but some key comments arising from the responses are as follows:

9.15 Most teachers who are aware of SCILT, have become so through the distribution of SCILT newsletters/circulars to schools. This would suggest that this is a key avenue for contact with practitioners and one which should be strengthened, with perhaps some personal follow-up from SCILT staff, for example, as part of in-service days. There may be a little confusion about SCILT's role, with some comments suggesting that there is a perception that it is only for secondary schools, that it should provide exemplar materials and teaching resources (more a task for LTS) and that it should provide staff training. These misconceptions could be allayed by providing teachers with a clear outline of what they might expect from SCILT.

9.16 Of those who are aware of SCILT, but have not used the services, reasons include: lack of time to travel to SCILT; adequate support from local authority; languages not a priority;

9.17 Conclusion: SCILT should consider how to clarify its role in respect of teachers in schools and how it might overcome a perception that it is mainly interested in/aimed at secondary school provision. As many responses considered it should raise its profile, SCILT may wish to consider how it might organise a promotional initiative. The issue of outreach provision is already being considered and this might provide the means to promote SCILT, clarify its role and involve more teachers of both primary and secondary schools.

### LTS

9.18 Learning and Teaching Scotland is represented on the Advisory Board and links between the two organisations are fairly strong – LTS is invited to relevant meetings organised by SCILT and attends the conferences.

## SALT

9.19 Many members of The Scottish Association of Language Teachers are closely involved in the work of SCILT, through attendance at conferences and events and use of SCILT services. Many teachers reported that they were made aware of SCILT through SALT. SALT also runs conferences and both organisations are careful to avoid clashes of time and topics. SALT holds its annual conference in Stirling and this is facilitated by SCILT staff. When discussing alternative sources of income with SCILT it became clear that SCILT is keen to avoid any conflict with SALT in identifying alternative income sources – members of SALT pay a membership fee and SCILT would not like to either add an additional financial burden on teachers or be seen to be competing with SALT.

## SEED

9.20 A representative from SEED and HMIE attend the Advisory Board meetings and are involved in the development planning process of SCILT and in the monitoring of achievements against the development plan. SCILT provides a valuable link with practitioners and policy makers in local authorities and is a useful source of information and views on language learning and teaching issues. The insights provided are often used to inform policy development. SCILT does not consider itself a lobbying organisation, rather a source of balanced and evidenced information and support for language learning.

9.21 While SCILT accepts this relationship with SEED, it would prefer to have a more prominent and formal role in the provision of policy advice which would aid the development of SEED language education policy early in the process. This was explored during the meeting with Professor Johnstone. SCILT considers it would have many benefits for the future of language learning if a more formal role was defined.

9.22 On balance, the current relationship between SEED and SCILT remains appropriate. SCILT's independence is one of its strengths. While SEED and Scottish Ministers value the information and views provided by and through SCILT, it is one of a range of sources of such information which help Ministers make decisions. It would therefore be inappropriate to afford greater priority to any one source and unnecessary to formalise an existing, effective relationship.

## FURTHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION

9.23 SCILT has a wide range of contacts in Higher Education, and is extending its partnerships with further education. Both are represented on the Advisory Board and attend the COALA group meetings.

9.24 32 responses were received from Higher Education representatives which, while not universal, provided an overall picture of a healthy respect for the work of SCILT and appreciation of the support it provided. However, one response was highly critical of SCILT, its operations, management and the funding it receives from SEED. The response also raised concerns about whether SCILT was the best model to provide support for language education in Scotland, making suggestions for more diversified funding which should be available to a range of organisations. Doubts were also raised about the validity of the questionnaire. The issues raised in this response were not mirrored by others from the same institution but they



will be forwarded to SCILT and raised as a separate issue with the agreement of the respondent.

9.25 Further education interests submitted 17 responses to the consultation and again the overall view is a positive one. From discussions, it is clear that SCILT is trying to expand its network of contacts in further education and bring as many views from this area into discussions and network meetings.

## **10. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND INCOME GENERATION**

### Financial Management

10.1 Financial operations are run through the Finance department of Stirling University, under a separate account code. This was a recommendation of the previous review. SEED and the University have agreed the level and regularity of monitoring information in relation to the core funding. Where previously grant was paid in equal quarterly instalments, the University now prepares quarterly reports on actual expenditure and submits these to SEED. Payment of grant is then made on the basis of that spend.

10.2 Scottish CILT submitted details of its budgeting and monitoring systems which were analysed by the SEED finance department. The report on this analysis is as follows:

- The report suggests an ability to carry out detailed monthly checks on SCILT's finances, but these could be improved by setting more meaningful budgets within the overall funding.
- Documentation should outline how individual budgets are set and managed. Procedures should be set in place to provide for an element of flexibility in the budgets setting, and controls put in place to monitor variances to avoid the need to reorder budgets during the financial year.

10.3 This is an issue that should be taken forward with SCILT and the University Finance department and reports submitted to SEED on progress.

### Income Generation

10.4 Scottish CILT has been successful in attracting funding for various task-specific projects, such as the Assessment of Achievement Programme for Modern Languages and SCOTLANG. However, the issue of core funding is a source of concern to it. The core staffing has been increased mainly due to SCOTLANG funding, which is a three-year funding package. There are plans to diversify and expand the remit of SCILT, most significantly in building partnerships with heritage and community language interests and lifelong language learning. This would indicate that the increased core staffing complement currently in place would need to be retained to meet these expanded aims. SCILT intends to submit a proposal for additional funding to meet future plans, with the expectation that other Scottish Executive departments would have an interest in the planned future developments.

10.5 The previous review suggested that SCILT should explore other sources of income to avoid over-reliance on central funding. It is the view of this review that SCILT needs to

actively identify means of attracting funding for its core activities outwith the Scottish Executive.

## **11. FUTURE PLANS**

11.1 Scottish CILT has gone through a significant period of change in the past three years, through the provision of additional SEED funding and the attraction of SCOTLANG funding. There are plans to build on this development and SCILT will finalise plans during the coming months. Areas it will likely focus on include the enhancement of existing activities;, introducing some new activities; and extending its network of contacts and partners to include those involved in heritage and community languages. The aim will be to develop a long term plan for an expanded organisation which will work:

- To promote an enhanced capability for modern, heritage and community languages, including BSL, in Scotland;
- To encourage positive attitudes towards the language learning and use;
- To link language interests to other public policy areas such as culture, inclusion, etc.

11.2 This is a very challenging agenda and supports the progressive nature of the work and ethos of SCILT. A recent seminar was held in Stirling to which a range of interests were invited to discuss and advise on the future plans of SCILT. These views will be built in to the final proposals submitted to the Scottish Executive.

## **12. CONCLUSION**

12.1 Scottish CILT is providing a valuable service to language learning and teaching in Scotland. Although not reaching all parts of Scotland, it has impacted on a significant proportion. Those who are involved in contact with SCILT seem to value the support received and consider it to have a positive impact on teaching practice. SCILT is aware that some are finding the one location restrictive and is considering ways in which it can provide a more localised service. However, it remains a small organisation and an extension of services would have staff resource implications. One way of achieving this may be to work with other Universities to provide more localised conferences which may avoid putting additional strain on staff resources.

12.2 SCILT is operating efficiently and represents good value for money. It sets challenging objectives and operates an effective monitoring system which provides early warning of any rescheduling requirements. It has extended its focus out from the traditional modern European languages to heritage and community languages and is making more connections in these communities. The timetable of tasks has had some adjustment over the past 3 years but this reflects an ability to be flexible and adaptable rather than an inability to achieve.

12.3 Given the ever increasing need to take account of evidence in the development of policy or strategies, whether local or national, the research element of SCILT's work will

likely become increasingly important. It is essential that practitioners have access to research evidence to underpin their activities and strengthen their professional knowledge.

12.4 The loss would be keenly felt by a significant proportion of the education community.

12.5 The review has indicated areas where further development could improve services. These should be fully considered in developing proposals for the future of SCILT. Perhaps the key issue is how to reach a wider audience, meet the need for more localised contact and consolidate the achievements made over the last 3 years.

12.6 The review recommends that the current level of funding - £109,000 – continues in this year.

### **13. SUMMARY**

1. There is a strong case for a Scottish CILT based on geography and educational practice.

2. SCILT is effectively pursuing its aims of providing high quality information on the policy, principles and practice of foreign language teaching in the UK and beyond.

3. These aims were anchored in practice to the developments in language learning policy in light of the report of the Action Group on Languages, *Citizens of a Multilingual World*.

4. The main functions of SCILT are being carried out efficiently and effectively.

5. The services provided by SCILT were generally highly regarded by schools, colleges of education, local authorities and further education and higher education.

6. The relationship between SCILT and CILT is harmonious and effective as is the relationships with other UK CILT organisations in Northern Ireland and Wales. The services are complementary rather than competitive.

7. SCILT could not function at present without the funding provided by SEED. Income generation is as yet insufficient to support the centre.

### **14. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. SEED funding should be continued. The amount should remain at the current level for the financial year 2002-03.

2. SCILT should consider how it can improve its profile among teachers of both primary and secondary schools to reflect the perceptions reflected in the questionnaire responses. (Paragraph 1.5)

3. The role of Advisory Board members should be formally defined and new members properly briefed on the function of the Board. This information should be publicised, perhaps in SCILT newsletters. (paragraph 4.10)

4. The appointment of Advisory Board members should be formalised, perhaps by “corporate” identification of suitable members in line with the representative profile. Membership should be cyclical, with options for extensions. (Paragraph 4.11)
5. Scottish CILT should actively seek alternative/supplementary sources of core funding.(Paragraph 5.2)
6. Scottish CILT should consider how to involve other Teacher Education Institutes in conferences. (Paragraph 6.9)
7. Consideration should be given to attracting a Director of Education onto the Advisory Board. (Paragraph 9.13)
8. The services of the centre should be more positively publicised. A strategy for more localised contact should be developed, responding to requests for alternative conference venues and direct contact with schools. (Paragraph 9.17)
9. SCILT should set in place improved budgeting systems for expenditure. (Paragraph 10.2)

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

These provide information on the content of responses in percentages, with some of the most common comments annotated.

### REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)

#### TEACHERS: 562 RESPONSES

Name:

Institution:

Local Authority area/Independent

Primary	Secondary	PRIM &SEC/ SPEC	HE
81%	18%	1%	

#### 1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT

Very Well	Well	Quite Well	Unknown (if unknown, move to Qu15)
17%	13%	31%	38%

No Reply: 1%

#### 2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?

No Reply: 41%

Circulars/Newsletters  
Conferences  
SALT  
Advisers

3. Have you used its services	Yes	27%	Move to Q5
	No	33%	Move to Q4

No Reply: 40%

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 67%

Time/distance

Not enough knowledge of services

Not needed so far

Local authority provides adequately

More for secondary than primary?

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
No reply:70% Publications	8%	12%	8%	1% na/? 1% %
No reply: 79.5% Conferences	11%	7%	0.5%	1.4% na/?0.6%
No reply:90% Resource Centre	2%	4%	1%	1.5% na/? : 1.5%
No reply: 97% Other (specify:	1%	1%	0.2%	0.2% na/? : 0.6%

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	8%	Satisfied	26%	Not satisfied	4%
----------------	----	-----------	-----	---------------	----

No reply: 60%

Na/? : 2%

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify) 19%

No: 14%

No reply: 64%

Comments: More outreach; raise profile; more resources and exemplars; more direct contact with teachers; midweek conferences.

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Many ticked more than one box

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
<input type="text" value="47%"/>	<input type="text" value="7%"/>	<input type="text" value="10%"/>	<input type="text" value="17%"/>

No reply: 41%

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 66%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 58%

Na: 3.5%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 57%  
Na/? : 8%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important	Important	Not Important
<input type="text" value="12%"/>	<input type="text" value="34%"/>	<input type="text" value="4%"/>

No reply: 48%  
Na/? : 2%

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 59%  
Na/? : 5%

Main response: deals with Scottish issues.

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present	Yes, with some changes (specify)	No. (please explain)
<input type="text" value="29%"/>	<input type="text" value="10%"/>	<input type="text" value="2%"/>

No reply: 57%  
Na/? : 2%

Comments: similar to those at Q7.

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 85%

Positive comments such as “feather in Scotland’s cap”, “Staff very helpful” also explanations that contributor had insufficient knowledge to answer fully, or that local authority provides adequately for needs. Some requests for further information, which will be passed to SCILT.



**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**

**INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS: 26 RESPONSES**

**Name:**

**Institution:**

**Local Authority area/Independent**

**Primary**

**Secondary**

**FE**

**HE**





**1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT**

Very Well

Well

Quite Well

Unknown  
(if unknown,  
move to  
Qu15)





**2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?**

No reply: 12%

Circulars, conferences, SALT and colleagues

**3. Have you used its services**

62%

Move to Q5

19%

Move to Q4

No Reply: 19%

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 77%

No need so far.

Time/distance

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
No reply: 38% Publications	23%	27%	8%	0 na: 4%
No reply: 35% Conferences	42%	12%	8%	0 na: 3%
No reply: 54% Resource Centre	8%	30%	4%	4%
No reply: 84% Other (specify:	4%	4%	4%	4%

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	31%	Satisfied	42%	Not satisfied	0
----------------	-----	-----------	-----	---------------	---

No reply: 23%  
Na: 4%

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 42%  
Na/?: 8%

Comments include: more practical support; expand services; more contact with schools.

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
<input type="text" value="23%"/>	<input type="text" value="62%"/>	<input type="text" value="39%"/>	<input type="text"/>

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 15%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 23%

Na/? : 4%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 23%

Na/? : 8%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important

Important

Not Important

No reply: 15%

Na/? : 4%

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 19%

Deals with and understands Scottish issues.

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present

Yes, with some changes  
(specify)

No. (please explain)

61%

12%

4%

No reply: 23%

Comments similar to those at Q7.

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 69%

Supportive comments from others.

**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**

**ADVISERS: 27 RESPONSES**

**Name:**

**Institution:**

**Local Authority area/Independent**

**Primary**

**Secondary**

**FE**

**HE**





**1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT**

Very Well

Well

Quite Well

Unknown  
(if unknown,  
move to  
Qu15)

74%

19%

3.5%

3.5%

**2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?**

No reply: 11%

Circulars

Colleagues

Always known

Part of work

**3. Have you used its services**

85%

Move to Q5

11%

Move to Q4

No reply: 4%

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 89%

No language ability

No need

Not enough knowledge about services

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
No reply: 19% Publications	56%	22%	3%	0
No reply: 11% Conferences	70%	19%	0	0
No reply: 56% Resource Centre	22%	7%	15%	0
No reply: 70% Other (specify:	26%	4%	0	0

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	59%	Satisfied	30%	Not satisfied	0
----------------	-----	-----------	-----	---------------	---

No reply: 11%

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify) 41%

No: 22%

No reply: 37%

Comments include: more outreach including visits to schools and talks with parents; midweek conferences; residential meetings.

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
26%	45%	48%	26%

No reply: 15%

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 19%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 44%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 11%

Na/? : 7%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important

Important

Not Important

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 7%

?: 3.5%

Others: deals with and understands Scottish issues and is more accessible.

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present

Yes, with some changes  
(specify)

No. (please explain)

63%

30%

0

No reply: 7%

Comments similar to those at Q7.

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 78%

Positive statements apart from “can be costly for outlying districts” and “can seem cliquey, needs to overcome that perception.”

COALA meetings greatly valued.



**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**

**FURTHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: 17 RESPONSES**

**Name:**

**Institution:**

**Local Authority area/Independent**

Primary	Secondary	FE	HE
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

**1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT**

Very Well	Well	Quite Well	Unknown (if unknown, move to Qu15)
76%	12%	12%	0

**2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?**

No reply: 12%  
?: 12%

- Circulars
- Colleagues
- Conferences
- SALT
- Always known

<b>3. Have you used its services</b>	Yes	94%	Move to Q5
	No	6%	Move to Q4

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 88%

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
Publications	41%	35%	24%	0
Conferences	59%	29%	12%	0
No reply: 53% Resource Centre	12%	29%	6%	0
No reply: 82% Other (specify:	6%	12%	0	0

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	53%	Satisfied	47%	Not satisfied	0
----------------	-----	-----------	-----	---------------	---

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 29%

Comments include: more local work/outreach; summer events; midweek conferences; raise profile; do more for/with FE; link more with employers.

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
<input type="text" value="24%"/>	<input type="text" value="12%"/>	<input type="text" value="71%"/>	<input type="text" value="35%"/>

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 12%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 18%

Na/? : 12%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 23%

?: 6%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important

Important

Not Important

No reply: 6%

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 6%

Deals with and understands Scottish issues

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present

Yes, with some changes  
(specify)

No. (please explain)

Comments similar to Q7.

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 71%

Positive comments from others including: "very user-friendly", "good that SCILT exists".

**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**

**HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: 32 RESPONSES**

**Name:**

**Institution:**

**Local Authority area/Independent**

**Primary**

**Secondary**

**FE**

**HE**

**1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT**

Very Well

Well

Quite Well

Unknown  
(if unknown,  
move to  
Qu15)

74%

20%

3%

3%

**2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?**

No reply: 6%

CILT

Circulars

Conferences

Always known

**3. Have you used its services**

Yes 87%

Move to Q5

No 3%

Move to Q4

No reply: 10%

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 97%

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
No reply:6% Publications	65%	26%	3%	0
No reply:16% Conferences	58%	23%	3%	0
No reply: 39% Resource Centre	29%	16%	10%	6%
No reply: 58% Other (specify:	36%	6%	0	0

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	65%	Satisfied	23%	Not satisfied	6%
----------------	-----	-----------	-----	---------------	----

No reply: 6%

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify) 58%

No: 7%

No reply: 35%

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 20%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 16%

Na/?: 13%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 13%

Na/?: 3%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important

Important

Not Important

No reply: 6%

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 6%  
Scottish issues

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present

Yes, with some changes  
(specify)

No. (please explain)

61%

26%

6.5%

No reply: 6.5%

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 61%

Positive comments from others including: "excellent team" and "excellent organisation".



**REVIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CENTRE FOR INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH (SCILT)**

**MISCELLANEOUS: 31 RESPONSES**

**Name:**

**Institution:**

**Local Authority area/Independent**

**Primary**

**Secondary**

**FE**

**HE**





**1. Are you aware of Scottish CILT**

Very Well

Well

Quite Well

Unknown  
(if unknown,  
move to  
Qu15)





No reply: 6%

**2. If so, how did you come to hear of it?**

No reply: 3%

CILT

Circulars

Conferences

Always known

**3. Have you used its services**

Yes 84%

Move to Q5

No 10%

Move to Q4

No reply: 6%

**4. Why have you chosen not to use the services of SCILT?**

No reply: 87%

**5. Which services have you used, and how useful are they?**

	Very useful	Useful	Quite useful	Not Useful
No reply:29% Publications	61%	10%	0	0
No reply:29% Conferences	68%	3%	0	0
No reply: 45% Resource Centre	32%	20%	3%	0
No reply: 52% Other (specify:	45%	3%	0	0

**6. Are you satisfied with the support available from SCILT?**

Very satisfied	74%	Satisfied	7%	Not satisfied	3%
No reply:	13%				
Na:	3%				

**7. Do you think that Scottish CILT could do anything else?**

Yes: (specify)	35.5%
No:	20%
No reply:	35.5%
Na/?:	10

Comments include: more for Gaelic; provide more information and exchange ideas through the website; do more to foster collaborative networks.

**8. From where would you initially seek information on language teaching?**

Local authority/adviser	HMIE	SCILT	Other (specify)
29	26	68%	23%

No reply: 19%

**9. Do you use the services of any other relevant bodies?**

Yes: (specify)

No:

No reply: 19%

**10. Has your involvement with Scottish CILT led to you changing your classroom practice?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 19%

Na/?: 42%

**11. Do you think SCILT is helping to improve language teaching in Scotland?**

Yes: (specify)

No: please explain

No reply: 19%

Na/?: 3.5%

**12. Is it important to have SCILT?**

Very Important

Important

Not Important

No reply: 13%

Comments similar to those at Q7.

**13. What does a Scottish CILT do that a London CILT can't?**

No reply: 13%

Deals with and understand Scottish issues.

**14. Do you wish to see Scottish CILT continue in its present form?**

Yes, at present

Yes, with some changes  
(specify)

No. (please explain)

52%

26%

3%

No reply: 19%

**15. Please provide any additional information you consider relevant.**

No reply: 55%

Positive comments from others, including: "excellent staff", "highly effective organisation", "highly regarded".