

**PPD Barriers Project:  
PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION FOR BLACK AND  
MINORITY ETHNIC TEACHERS AND TEACHERS  
WITH DISABILITIES IN PPD PROGRAMMES**

**Final Report  
December 2006**



**Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education**  
*Harnessing Knowledge to Practice*

## Project Brief

CUREE was commissioned by TDA to undertake a short scoping study on patterns of participation of black and minority ethnic (BME) teachers and teachers with disabilities in Post-graduate Professional Development (PPD) programmes.

It was agreed that the scoping study would deliver four outcomes:

- A brief summary of the existing literature in the context of the relevant legislation as it relates to PPD.
- Information from the PPD provider consortia submissions relating to the barriers to participation
- Early discussions and relationship building with partners such as the NUT, in relation to its Equal Access to Promotion (EAP) programme; the GTC in relation to its support for disabled teachers and the work of the London Centre for Leadership and Learning (LCLL) for the London Challenge, particularly their research-based programme for aspiring BME leaders.
- Identify some 'sites of special interest'/areas for further exploration where promising practice in relation to disabled and ethnic minority teachers' participation exists for follow-up in 2007.

The report is organised in four sections with a supporting appendix, which outlines the evidence base, references and contact details for further research. Section 1 provides a brief summary of the legislative context of this study and the existing literature related to PPD. Section 2 presents the results of the interrogation of the provider submissions and Section 3 considers the views of PPD providers. Section 4 presents some of the steps being taken to overcome barriers to participation. Potential sites of further special interest and areas for further research arising from the evidence are indicated in italics and the contact details of key personnel are identified in the appendix.

Carrying out this scoping study has increased recognition of current gaps and interest in and a thirst for further research amongst a range of stakeholders and partners, particularly in relation to BME teachers. Contacts have been established with people who are interested in and starting to think about further research in the London Centre for Leadership and its partners in Harrow, Brent and Southwark; the London Leadership Strategy and its plans to extend successful London approaches to Birmingham LA; Middlesex University and Haringey, the London Challenge's Chartered London Teacher programme and the GTC Achieve and Connect networks.

Although there are significant gaps with regard to BME teachers the situation is worse with regard to teachers with disabilities. More systematic and sustained work needs to be done to identify the barriers facing such teachers and a number of starting points for this work have been identified. These include working with teachers with disabilities through the GTC and the ATL, developing links with Newham LA as a test site and similar possibilities through contacts in Bradford, Gloucester and Swindon.

### **Section 1: A brief summary of the existing literature in the context of the relevant legislation as it relates to PPD.**

#### **The legislative context for this study**

A brief review of the relevant legislation and its implications for the education sector was undertaken to provide a legislative context for this study.

Since 4 December, 2006, the **Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2005** will place a duty on all public sector authorities to promote disability equality. The **Disability Equality Duty (DED)** in England and Wales refers to 'disabled people' and in the context of education includes disabled children, young people and adults, as pupils, employees, governors, parents and carers and other members of the wider community that might use education provision. The guidance provided for schools defines disability as covering 'a broad spectrum of impairments including: cancer, diabetes, epilepsy, HIV, multiple sclerosis, hearing or sight impairments, mobility difficulties, people with mental health conditions or learning difficulties/disabilities. The Secretary of State for Education and Skills will have to publish a report every three years, giving an overview of the progress made by schools and other public bodies such as Ofsted and the TDA. The first of these reports is due in December 2008.

As the guidance states, a similar duty was introduced for race equality in 2002, namely the **Race Relations Amendment Act (RRAA)**, and a gender duty will be in force from April 2007. These are seen as 'positive duties' based on a social model of discrimination and its effects. All three duties share an approach which seeks to: promote equality of opportunity; eliminate unlawful discrimination; eliminate harassment; promote positive attitudes; encourage greater participation in public life and a more effective deployment of positive action strategies to redress under-representation.

Good practice in promoting equality of opportunity is underpinned by a commitment to audit existing practice for both positive and negative effects on the participation of BME teachers and teachers with disabilities; the designation of a 'champion' within the leadership of the organisation whose role is to ensure that 'equality-proofing' and 'impact assessments' lead to increased participation for all.

In assessing the impact of policies and practices in relation to BME teachers and those with disabilities, the legislation indicates that institutions will have to:

- ensure that recruitment and selection procedures collect information on gender, ethnicity and disability;
- use such data as a baseline for analysing the success of any schemes to ensure equality of opportunity; and
- analyse retention and completion rates.

**Key issues for consideration in relation to BME teachers and teachers with disabilities:**

*BME teachers*

It is evident from our experience of supporting the diversity strand of the NCSL's Succession Planning strategy<sup>1</sup> that, with the exception of the TDA, few education organisations are in a position to offer leadership on implementing the RRAA and the DED both in terms of their service delivery and as employers.

Under the current arrangements neither the Commission for Racial Equality and the DDA have the capacity to 'police' the RRAA and the DED respectively. There is a tendency to wait for a lead from the DfES, which tends to delegate the regulatory function to Ofsted.

The involvement of the DfES in the annual London mayoral conference on Education and the Black Child provides a platform for the Department to state its commitment to race equality. Each year in anticipation of the conference a series of reports are commissioned and subsequently reported. The GTC's Achieve Network for teachers in multi-ethnic settings was launched at the Conference two years ago. The link between the achievement of black and minority ethnic pupils and the importance of black and minority ethnic teachers as role models is well established as an important discourse. *We are not aware of a similar discussion or forum in relation to pupils and teachers with disabilities. This would require further research.*

*Teachers with disabilities*

In anticipation of the new legislation and duties, the Department asked the GTC (England) to convene the Disabled Teachers' Taskforce (DTT) in 2006. Nicholas Smith is the lead policy officer responsible for the DTT, which has met on two

---

<sup>1</sup> This involves Jan McKenley's participation as a consultant to the Diversity Panel, on which the following organisations are represented: TDA, GTC, SSAT, Teacher and Headteacher Associations, Church of England, Catholic Education Service, the London Centre for Leadership Learning, National Governors' Association and the NCSL.

occasions this year. It was set up in anticipation of the requirement from November 2007 that all public bodies will monitor and safeguard the interests of people with disabilities.

Accurate collection of data on disabilities is highly problematic. Although teachers are asked to identify any disabilities as part of the GTC registration process, the process does not work within a framework of a specification of the abilities of a teacher against which disabilities can easily be defined or recognised. Some 1200 teachers have declared their disability in registering with the GTC. DfES Circular 4/99 defines the criteria as someone who has the 'capacity and fitness to teach.' This definition is currently under review by the Disability Rights Commission to check whether this use of the term 'fitness' is discriminatory in practice and the outcome will guide the DDT's work on 'fitness to teach' standards. The DDT has no statutory powers over provision as such but includes HEI providers as members. *The work of the DDT is supported by a group of teachers who have disclosed their disability as part of their GTC registration process and are happy to act as 'expert' witnesses.*

Generally teachers with disabilities fall into three groups: the first group comprise those teachers who declare a disability on entry to the profession and who are sufficiently confident professionally and assertive about their rights to complete initial teacher-education. *A longitudinal study of a sample of newly qualified teachers with disabilities to explore opportunities and barriers to promotion might be worthy of consideration. Creating a reference group of teachers with a disability and/or to act as champions is recommended good practice in policy development in this field.*

The second group are those teachers who become disabled in service. There is a tendency in the profession to assume that a teacher who becomes disabled will want to leave the profession on medical grounds and efforts are largely directed to that goal. Rarely does the onus fall on the institution to accommodate the new needs of the teacher, and this has a direct impact on the third group – teachers who have a disability but do not disclose because they fear that such information will be used unlawfully to hasten their exit from the profession.

Enquiries about the diversity profile of their members were made to two of the main teacher associations. The NUT has an incomplete set of data on its members in terms of diversity although new members can volunteer data. There are no immediate plans to secure this data from the rest of the membership until the technology makes it easier for this to be completed online. *The ATL has a network of teachers with disabilities who are happy to be used as 'case studies' for further research, but no profile of its members.*

One of the clear priorities of the Taskforce is to create an effective climate for gaining information on teachers' disabilities and the issues involved in supporting them, rather than simply to expend energy on proving that there is indeed under-

representation of this group at all levels in the profession. The Disability Rights Commission states that it is likely that the numbers of people with a registered disability, taking account of the increasing incidence of disability as people get older, could be up to 20% of the population. There is a £60 million fund that employers, including schools and local authorities can use to make 'reasonable adjustments'. However, use of the fund, administered by the Department for Work and Pensions, is reportedly patchy. *It would be good to request information on how many schools, HEIs and education authorities have applied to this fund and to track some of the cases.*

Ofsted produce guidance for their staff with disabilities on 'Access to Work' which is a useful starting point for understanding the process a teacher with a disability might initiate. The onus is very much on the individual rather than the institution.

### **Brief summary of the research literature**

Each year the GTC commissions a survey of its registrants with an additional segment of minority ethnic teachers analysed by London Metropolitan University. DfES figures suggest that 9.4% of teachers in England are from a minority ethnic background – 4.7% of whom are from visible (non-white) groups. The most relevant finding from the survey for this study indicates that BME teachers are keen to further their careers but do find access to CPD problematic (Smart and Ross, 2006). No similar survey is conducted on teachers with disabilities. BME teachers reported that they wanted more access to career-enhancing CPD and identified racial prejudice as having an effect on their career development. The survey suggests that systems and processes in schools may not be enabling or encouraging these teachers to access the kind of organised, programmed CPD for which they have expressed a wish.

Smart and Ross found that a significantly lower proportion of teachers from visible minority ethnic groups in their first five years of teaching were in promoted posts as compared with white teachers. In contrast, a slightly higher proportion of BME teachers with less than five years experience are ambitious for their teaching career and aiming for headships. Also of relevance to this scoping study, they found that:

- Asian teachers were concentrated in the younger age groups (28% under 30) and Black teachers were concentrated in the 30-45 age groups;
- teachers from BME communities were less likely to stay in teaching than their white counterparts; and
- BME teachers were more likely to be on main scale grades rather than having positions of greater responsibility. 31.1% of white male teachers were found to be on the basic main grade as compared with 46.3% Asian male and 43.8% of black males.

An NUT survey of BME teachers in management roles in 2002 found that of 107 respondents (89%) would have liked more in-service training and only a third of

respondents had received any specific management development training. The majority of those who provided information about their career objectives indicated that they would like to move into middle/senior management or gain a post as a deputy head or head teacher. When asked “Do you consider BME school leaders face different challenges to their white peers?” the most common response was that BME teachers felt they constantly needed to prove themselves and work harder than their white counterparts. Lack of support from head teachers and others in senior management positions was seen to be a key factor in these negative experiences. By contrast, SMT support was a key factor in the positive experiences cited by BME teachers.

Soulsby and Swain (2003) used interviews and questionnaires to identify factors which inhibited or were likely to inhibit teachers from applying for award-bearing courses. The most commonly cited were workload, lack of funds, lack of time, lack of leadership support, the long term nature of the commitment and the lack of any clear financial or career incentive. Since the introduction of the new partnership arrangements for teachers’ PPD at masters’ level in 2005, these findings have been extended to the nature of the provision and its assessment processes. A small-scale research study by Arthur et al (2006) has been the first to raise a number of important issues arising from their experience of offering masters level PPD programmes at Oxford Brookes University, Bishop Grosseteste College, University of Gloucestershire and the University of Plymouth. Based on a sample of 46 students in three HEIs, the research sought to determine the age profile of teachers engaging in award-bearing courses, and the factors that supported and inhibited completion.

The research identified the following key issues which assist or constrain the participation of teachers:

- Clear assessment approaches either help or hinder completion of assessed tasks.
- Teachers’ workload and the absence of support from their school by way of reduced contact time for private study and paid cover for lessons to facilitate study time.
- Professional jealousies constrain the opportunities for participants to share the learning from their study more widely within departments and across the school.
- Confidence in, and relevance of, ‘academic’ writing requirements.

Of additional relevance to this study is *their analysis of the changing role of the CPD coordinator as a potential enabler or block on access to PPD*. This study also found evidence of the increasingly strategic nature of CPD as a key focus of school improvement and performance management. In many schools, CPD coordinators are important brokers or gatekeepers for a diverse workforce to access further professional training and development. *Northumberland Park*

*Community School, Haringey and George Green's School, Tower Hamlets would both be good exemplars of this new approach.*

Unfortunately for our purposes, the sample by Arthur et al (2006) was only analysed by age and gender; not ethnicity and disability. However it is clear from research interviews with providers and teachers from the target groups that the conclusions are of relevance to all groups.

The literature on disability in relation to PPD is sparse. As recently as 2006 Hoong Sin et al (2006) found no data in the literature on the number of disabled teachers so we do not know what proportion of the workforce they represent. Data collected on new entrants to ITE in 2003 showed that four percent of the cohort were disabled, but Hurstfield et al (2004) suggest that disabled people do not always declare their disability at the point of application. With no rigorous evidence base for the numbers of teachers with disabilities it is not possible, even with reliable data collection, to assess whether disabled teachers are participating equally with their non disabled colleagues in PPD programmes.

### **The voices of BME teachers and teachers with disabilities.**

#### *BME teachers*

A sample of 70 former participants on the EAP were contacted through the NUT as part of a consultation exercise on the design of a new leadership programme in development targeted at BME teachers in the profession for between 2-5 years. Participants were asked to identify when they took part in the EAP (2001-2006) and to evaluate its impact on their promotion prospects. Questions were also inserted at CUREE's request on participants' experience of PPD, other INSET and accredited courses taken since they participated on EAP. They were asked to identify any continuing barriers to leadership and to recommend gaps in the leadership development of emerging and aspiring BME teachers in the profession for less than 5 years. Fifteen scripts were forwarded by the NUT for consideration. All the participants had secured promotion since their involvement in EAP. Most of the participants had progressed to the LCLL's 'Investing in Diversity' programme – another non-accredited course; none of the 15 had pursued PPD or M-level programmes.

Further interviews were also held with individual BME teachers and advisers. No additional barriers were identified although an important point was made by one of the advisers who said that the personal as opposed to vocational motivation should not be overlooked as a factor for teachers considering M-level professional development.

Workload and burnout are very real issues affecting participation and completion rates on PPD programmes for BME teachers because research indicates that they are more likely to teach in challenging schools (Bush et al, 2006). Despite



this BME teachers do appear to be keen to participate in CPD as is evidenced by their participation in targeted programmes such as that offered by London Challenge. Smart and Ross (2006) also found evidence of active participation in CPD in the annual GTC survey sample of minority ethnic teachers. However it seems to be the case that these teachers are participating in the main in non-accredited, albeit high quality CPD. *TDA may wish to consider the most appropriate response to this situation. It may be that there is a need to encourage and support accreditation of programmes that are perceived by these teachers as meeting their needs or to encourage further adaptation of existing accredited CPD programmes or accreditation processes the better to meet such needs.* The responsibility seems to lie with the providers not the participants.

### *Teachers with disabilities*

Gaining direct access to teachers with disabilities has not been as straightforward as anticipated. A more formal approach needs to be made through channels such as the GTC and ATL who have teachers with disabilities who are prepared to act as 'expert witnesses'. We are grateful to Chris Foster, Policy Adviser, ATL in sharing her personal experience of becoming disabled in service and the barriers she encountered before leaving headship; her work with the GTC and her willingness to act as a 'champion' for any further work in this area. *Convening a small group of teachers with disabilities to further explore the opportunities and barriers to progression and promotion more generally, before a closer look at their experience of PPD should be considered.*

### **Summary**

In such a climate it is unsurprising that data on the barriers to teachers with disabilities taking up PPD opportunities is very difficult to obtain. Baseline data on the numbers of teachers with a declared disability is collected by local authority personnel/HR departments as requested by the DfES in its annual workforce survey. But, as is the case with teachers from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, there is no requirement to analyse or disaggregate this data by levels or grades and since no new policies have derived from this data, it is not collected systematically and is therefore unreliable.

Newham is a good case study to illustrate the point. The authority has had a political and educational commitment to inclusion since 1996. To date they have not made any connection between their inclusion strategy for pupils and an inclusion strategy for teachers. According to their records, some 72 teachers from a workforce of 3000 have declared a disability but the authority does not know if this is higher or lower than other authorities. The Learning and Schools department admits that they do not currently monitor the take-up of their CPD programmes by ethnicity or disability but they recognise that this state of affairs has to change and *Newham would be keen to take part as a site of special interest in overcoming the barriers for teachers with disabilities.*

## Section 2: Issues identified by PPD Consortia in their submissions to TDA

All 65 of the submission documents were subjected to a data extraction process through a framework of questions designed to elicit the consortias' identification of potential barriers to participation and their strategies for overcoming these. Only four referred to disability, of which two referred specifically to deafness and two more generally to special needs. One of the submissions identified ethnicity related barriers by noting the under representation of BME teachers, and one included representatives of minority ethnic groups amongst the list of stakeholders consulted about the nature of the provision.

When providers were consulted directly about their views on the participation in PPD of BME teachers or those with disabilities (see Section 3), the range of identified barriers were very similar although there did not appear to be the same confidence that most of these were being addressed. Full datasets are available for the submissions data, of which the main findings about perceived barriers to participation (all teachers) are highlighted below. Time, timing and funding were the principal barriers identified by the consortia, who also believed that teachers were often not fully aware of the flexibility of the provision on offer.

- **Time**  
65% of providers identified lack of time for teachers to study. 27% indicated that they were tackling this through flexible timing and modular progression for up to 6 years. 5 consortia indicated that teachers could progress part time through school-based learning.
- **Timing**  
57% (32) identified the timing of the course as a barrier. 52% of these proposed to tackle this by running twilight or weekend sessions and during holidays
- **Funding**  
58% of providers highlighted the costs of tuition or lack of funds as a barrier. Five consortia proposed to reduce fees for teachers from ITT partner schools; others variously mentioned LA support, TDA support, sponsored grants (e.g. through EiC). Others offered deferred fee options or hoped that running the course out of school hours would reduce the need for supply cover.
- **Nature of the provision**  
53% indicated that teachers perceived that credits gained elsewhere were not transferable. Most of these considered that such credits were likely to be able to be transferred.

90% of providers highlighted 'misunderstandings' about the nature and focus of accredited provision and the perceived inflexibility of programmes.

Most pointed out that they offered a wide range of start dates, courses, modules, delivery, assessment and content.

Nearly half the consortia highlighted 'misunderstandings' about the nature and focus of assessments and the perceived inflexibility of assessment methods. Most of these pointed to what they said were innovative and flexible assessment methods, including presentations, CD ROMs, email assignments, peer assessment and portfolios.

40% of providers said that teachers did not see any relevance, financial or career incentive, and value of further study in comparison (for example) to NPQH. Most of these providers said they had redefined or were redefining the purpose/locus of the courses into the community of schools with links to classroom practice and career stages. Thirteen consortia said that they offered customised courses.

- **Access and mode of delivery**

48% of consortia thought that lack of e-learning and distance learning were potential barriers. All of these said they offered a range of learning opportunities including web-based, e-learning, face-to-face tutorials and seminars. (Care needs to be given to interpreting these perceptions however. Systematic reviews of the impact of CPD and of networks suggest that it is only in extreme circumstances, where teachers are unable to meet at all, that teachers overcome the practical and psychological obstacles that distance and electronic support for CPD seem to present.)

30% of consortia highlighted insufficient tutorial support of whom 13% said that they were providing a better system of learning support – e.g. through work-based mentors and tutors and the use of professional learning contracts. The rest said that they allocated personal tutors to participants.

37% mentioned teachers' lack of learning resources. These included access to electronic library resources, student help desks etc. All of these consortia stated that they provided access to email, library schemes, VLE discussion rooms and other electronic resources to support learning.

- **Location**

32% of the submission documents mentioned teacher mobility and distance from provision as a potential barrier. 47% said that the majority of their provision was locally delivered – including schools, teacher centres and outreach centres. Three consortia said that they offered entirely school based options – for example through whole school accredited CPD projects by attaching field consultants to schools.

Eight consortia also mentioned the geographical isolation of participants in remote or deprived areas. They employed a variety of strategies to overcome this, from increased electronic communication to study groups, residential weekends and critical friendship arrangements.

- **Teachers' workload**  
42% of consortia highlighted this as a problem. Four said that they were flexible about completion dates and one said that they published assignment and submission dates in advance.
- **Lack of confidence and anxiety about returning to academic study**  
32% of consortia identified confidence as a potential barrier to participation. They offered a variety of strategies to address this, from writing support and study support to personal tutors.
- **Lack of school support**  
37% of submission documents targeted school support. Five said that they enlisted headteacher support through explaining the links to performance management and the long term benefits; three involved LA advisors and headteachers in the design and delivery of the programme. Others said that they identified school needs (1), developed school agreements (2) or required a letter of support from the headteacher (1).

### **Section 3: Discussions with key providers on the experience of BME teachers and teachers with disabilities.**

A sample of key providers (university and non-university providers, LA partners and Programme Directors) were asked for their views on the barriers to participation for BME and disabled teachers, partly to see if their views corroborated the Arthur et al research (2006) findings:

- a. One provider felt that the universities were the greatest barrier with their **out-dated notions of learning and their reliance on written assessment**, preferably conforming to narrow definitions of 'academic' standards. Promises of alternative forms of accreditation to take account of changing classroom pedagogy, the role of IT and new media in recording and demonstrating learning, have been slow to materialise. So much of what is required academically of working teachers is perceived to be removed from their daily tasks, and therefore additional and onerous.
- b. Another provider reflected on **the changing and increasing strategic role of CPD in schools and local authorities**. Supporting teachers pursuing M-level professional development requires a different set of skills and accommodation by schools and LA advisers.

- c. **Opportunities to tie-in ‘teacher-attractive’ initiatives such as the Chartered London Teacher** - hugely successful in engaging over 38,000 teachers - **appear to have been missed** by not scaffolding opportunities for progression to M-level at the outset.
- d. A similar point was made by the Programme Director of ‘Investing in Diversity’, a targeted leadership development programme also involving the London Centre for Leadership, the London Challenge and the Institute of Education. Over 400 BME middle and senior leaders have taken part in the programme, with over one-third securing promotion to senior leadership. The programme is trying to establish better progression and access for participants to NPQH and **this has raised issues about accreditation within the Institute and programmes offered by the NCSL**. *The Programme Director is involved in discussions about extending the ‘Investing in Diversity’ programme into Birmingham as part of the work arising from the NCSL’s Succession Planning Strategy. These discussions with Birmingham will take account of the issues of accreditation and other concerns raised in this report and might be considered as a potential site of special interest for overcoming the barriers to BME teachers.*
- e. **The separation between accredited professional development and non-accredited CPD and in-service training was seen as a significant and increasingly false barrier** and echoes the point made earlier in item c. ‘The impact on standards and pupil achievement is what should be the coherent purpose for teachers’ continuing professional development’ was the view of a county Head of School Improvement. She echoed the findings of Arthur et al (2006) that non-completion rates of M-level courses were high because of:
  - i. time constraints;
  - ii. relevance and the lack of tie-in to school-based tasks and challenges;
  - iii. lack of linkage with school improvement and as a consequence M-level study is under-valued in school culture. Assessments in her view should be re-framed as ‘impact reports’ of high leverage school-based tasks that deepen the intellectual capacity of the school.
  - iv. generally more consideration should also be given to the way schools support teachers on PPD. Practice varies in the way schools use study leave and non-contact/PPA time.

#### **Section 4: What steps are providers taking to overcome barriers outlined above, and what has been the impact?**

##### **(Potential sites of interest for further exploration)**

**A: Tackling the barriers of accreditation, assessment and relevance:** Case Study of the London Centre for Leadership Learning (LCLL) based at the Institute of Education.

A key task for Vivienne Porritt, recently appointed Head of CPD at the LCLL has been to bridge the divide between accredited and non-accredited PPD. She has designed the concept of 'Responsible Tutor' whose role is to ensure that CPD modules secure accredited status within the Institute of Education. Five Responsible Tutors (RT) were appointed in 2006, of whom, two are from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. The RTs are CPD professionals who have taught on NCSL programmes such as Leading from the Middle as well as programmes such as Investing in Diversity and SHINE – courses directed at BME participants which are successful in terms of levels of retention and completion. The remit of the team is to reflect the diversity of the teaching workforce in London and to ensure that programmes of study in the Institute take more accurate account of multi-dimensional classroom settings of London schools.

*The LCLL is working closely with Harrow, Brent, Southwark and Newham and would be keen to build on this scoping study with CUREE to explore issues of diversity and participation rates in advance of the changes to the PGCE in 2007. The Institute is proposing that PGCE graduates will exit with a certain level of M-credits which should provide the foundation for accredited CPD.*

**B: Developing a more strategic approach to CPD:** Haringey Leading Teachers' Programme (HTLP) developed with the Middlesex University.

The programme has been designed by the Haringey National Strategies team in partnership with Middlesex University and a number of Heads of CPD from borough schools. It was piloted in 2004/5 with 12 secondary school teachers; a further 29 completed the programme in 2005-6 and it has now been extended to involve primary schools. The outcome of the programme is the completion of a portfolio, which meets the standards for ASTs and post-graduate study at Middlesex University.

One school, Northumberland Park Community School (NPCS), Haringey has used the HTLP strategically to build capacity across its emergent and middle school leaders as part of a wider strategy to raise the achievement of the disadvantaged multi-ethnic community the school serves. Managed and supported by Linda Welds, Assistant Headteacher and CPD Coordinator at

NPCS, 12 teachers from the school have participated in the programme and the school's GCSE results have leapt significantly since teachers were involved in the HTLP. In addition to sending 12 teachers in the first cohort of the HLTP, the school runs its own MA programme with Middlesex University.

*The Strategy Manager would be happy to provide CUREE with details of the ethnicity of the sample, progression rates and an opportunity to track BME participants.*

**C: Wider strategic local authority perspectives on disability equality:**

Beyond Good Intentions: A resource for local authorities implementing the Disability Equality Duty.

Further possibilities for special sites include the list of 'Champion' authorities, which participated in producing a resource for local authorities implementing the Disability Equality Duty. These include Hackney, Bolton, Worcestershire and a small number of District Councils, identified by the Improvement and Development Agency to work with the Office of Public Management and the Disability Rights Commission.

**Miranda Bell  
Jan McKenley  
Holly Mitchell**

**CUREE  
December 2006**

## Appendix 1: Evidence base and contact details for further research:

### References:

1. Disability Rights Commission (2006) *Schools and the Disability Equality Duty in England and Wales: Guidance for Governors, Headteachers, teaching and support staff working in schools in England and Wales*. (2006) Part of the 'Raise Your EQ' series.
2. Smart, S & Ross, A. (2006) *Survey of teachers: Minority Ethnic Segmentation report*. Published by the GTC, England.
3. Arthur, L., Marland, H., Pill, A., & Rea, T. (2006) *Postgraduate Professional Development for teachers: motivational and inhibiting factors affecting the completion of awards*. Journal of In-service Education Vol. 32(2), pp.201-219.
4. 'The GTC, CPD and professional development issues for black and minority ethnic teachers' Presentation by Keith Hill, GTC Link Adviser to the SHINE Conference, 10 July 2003.
5. Bush, T, Glover, D, and Sood, K (2006) 'Black and minority ethnic leaders in England: a portrait'. *School Leadership and Management*, 26 (3), pp. 289-305.
6. 'Beyond Good Intentions: A resource for local authorities implementing the Disability Equality Duty' (2006) produced by the Office of Public Management and the Disability Rights Commission.
7. Hurstfield J, Aston J, Mitchell H and Ritchie H (2004) *Qualifications Bodies and the Disability Discrimination Act*, Institute for Employment Studies Report 417, Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies
8. *Pushed to Prove Themselves More*. NUT survey of BME teachers in senior management, 2002

### Interviews with:

- Nicholas Smith, Policy Officer, GTC (England) Disabled Teachers' Taskforce.
- Shiraz Chakera, Head of the GTC Professional Networks which include Achieve (teachers in multi-ethnic settings) and Connect (CPD Coordinators).
- Judy Douglas, Regional Adviser, Black Pupils' Achievement Programme, National Strategies.



- Richard Stainton, Head of CPD, NUT.
- Chris Foster, Policy Adviser, ATL ([cfoster@atl.org.uk](mailto:cfoster@atl.org.uk)).
- Sarah Read is the policy lead on diversity for the NCSL. Sarah is on secondment from the DfES ([sarah.read@ncsl.org.uk](mailto:sarah.read@ncsl.org.uk)).
- Vivienne Porritt, Head of CPD, London Centre for Leadership in Learning and CPD Consultant to the London Challenge ([v.porritt@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:v.porritt@ioe.ac.uk)).
- Rosemary Campbell-Stephens, Investing in Diversity – programme for aspiring BME middle and senior leaders funded by the London Challenge ([r.campbell@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:r.campbell@ioe.ac.uk)) . Working with Birmingham on developing a similar programme.
- Patricia Franey, Networked Learning Partnership – one of only 3 non-university providers of TDA PPD programmes/Interim Head of School Improvement, Gloucestershire ([trish@thenlp.org](mailto:trish@thenlp.org)).
- Judith Cameron, Head of Inclusion, Andi White, Head of CPD and Trevor Matthews, School Organisation (inc. personnel) Newham CYPS ([andi.white@newham.gov.uk](mailto:andi.white@newham.gov.uk))
- Ruth Proslmeyr, Secondary Strategy Manager, Haringey. ([ruth.proslmeyr@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:ruth.proslmeyr@haringey.gov.uk)) and lead designer of the Haringey Leading Teachers' Programme.
- Linda Welds, Assistant Headteacher/CPD Coordinator, Northumberland Park Community School. ([lwe@northumberlandpark.haringey.sch.uk](mailto:lwe@northumberlandpark.haringey.sch.uk)).

**Questionnaire responses:**

- EAP Re-United database held by the NUT.
- GTC Connect (Heads of CPD network)

**Briefings from attending:**

- NCSL Succession Planning Diversity Panel – involving GTC, TDA, DfES, Catholic Education Service, Church of England Education, NAHT, NUT, ATL and NGA.

**Additional website research:**

- Disability Rights Commission ([www.drc-gb.org](http://www.drc-gb.org)).
- Commission for Racial Equality ([www.cre.gov.uk](http://www.cre.gov.uk))
- [www.intute.ac.uk](http://www.intute.ac.uk)
- London Development Agency ([www.lda.gov.uk](http://www.lda.gov.uk))
- Ofsted ([www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk))