POSTGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PPD) PROGRAMME QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) STRAND

RESEARCH REPORT

4 Copthall House,
Station Square
Coventry CV1 2FL
+44 (024) 7652 4036
+44 (024) 7663 1646
info@curee.co.uk

CUREE would like to acknowledge and thank the following people for their contributions, guidance and support in the production of the Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand report:

- Professor Mark Hadfield (University of Wolverhampton)
- Michael Jopling (University of Wolverhampton)
- Dr Sue Ainslie (Edge Hill University)
- Dr Lorna Earl (University of Toronto)
- Liz James
- Christopher Noden

The CUREE staff involved in this first year of the evaluation include:

- Philippa Cordingley
- Julie Temperley
- Miranda Bell
- Holly Mitchell
- Lauren Goodchild
- Donald Evans
- Colin Isham
- Kate Holdich
- Clare Buntić
- Corinne Oldknow
- Paul Crisp

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) Quality Assurance Strand

Executive Summary

Background

1. The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) commissioned the Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) to conduct a three year evaluation of the Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) programme. The TDA PPD programme provides funding to support teachers' learning and development at postgraduate level.

2. The evaluation aimed to identify, highlight and communicate examples of good practice, areas where provision could be strengthened and inform the nature and direction of further research.

Methodology

3. CUREE researchers collected a mix of quantitative and qualitative data using an analytic framework based directly on TDA's evaluation objectives. CUREE also added a layer of predictive indicators to the analysis, based on best evidence from research on features of effective professional development. Data collection involved providers' documentary submissions and evaluations, student portfolios, student interviews and individual site visits to each of the 20 provider partnerships in the sample.

Findings

4. The evaluation found that effective partnership working adds value to the PPD provision, through:
    - sustainable recruitment from amongst partner organisations;
    - creating conditions to enhance the impact of Continuing Professional Development (CPD);
    - responsiveness to understanding learning needs and tailoring provision; and
    - using economies of scale.

5. The major barriers identified by the evaluation were time, funding, school support and addressing students' work life balance. The evaluation found that most providers are making thoughtful efforts to overcome these problems in a variety of ways.

6. While course preparations took account of the need to align provision with school and student priorities, there was little evidence that the design and preparations had taken into account the specific contributions of the course delivers – or specialists.

7. Providers were cautious about making links between PPD and pupil outcomes, yet most were able to report (or assume) improvements in pupil engagement and motivation, confidence, understanding and behaviour – and, in a few cases, achievement. There was evidence that students were using multiple evidence sources in their own action research projects and that they were reporting improvements in pupils' achievements and learning as well as a range of affective outcomes.

8. Planned teacher learning outcomes ranged from generic (e.g. leadership skills) to specific subject knowledge and skills (e.g. mathematics, ICT). More than three quarters of teachers interviewed said that PPD had made a difference to their professional practice.

9. Quality monitoring and evaluation were ongoing and integral to course validation procedures. All courses were subject to major review, ranging from an annual review to a five-yearly review.

10. Based on the analysis and synthesis of findings across the sample, the evaluation enabled the researchers to:
    - start painting a picture of the range and depth of teacher and school issues which the PPD providers are addressing directly;
    - develop an overview of the nature of the partnerships and to make recommendations about future progress in partnership working;
    - understand some of the issues around impact evaluation and to make recommendations which should help progress this in the future; and
    - identify gaps in the balance between content and design for learning and to make recommendations as to how these might be addressed.

Contents

Background to the TDA PPD Evaluation QA Strand Year 1

11. In 1998 the Teaching and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) led the Award-bearing In-Service Education and Training (INSET) scheme for the (then) Department for Education and Skills (DfES). A joint review by TDA and the DfES published in 2003 highlighted areas for development, including:
    - improving the responsiveness of courses to local needs;
    - increasing the accessibility and flexibility of courses; and
    - increasing participation amongst teachers and monitoring the impact of courses.

12. In response to these recommendations, and building on the strengths of the existing award-bearing INSET scheme, the TDA developed a new programme of award bearing postgraduate courses known as the Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) programme. The TDA PPD programme provides funding to support teachers' learning and development at postgraduate level (M level). Allocations of the first round of funding for PPD courses were made in February 2005, for the academic year 2005/06.

13. There are currently more than 60 providers of TDA funded PPD courses across England. The providers are partnerships or consortia usually made up of a combination of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), Local Authorities (LAs), schools, subject associations etc. The make-up and size of the partnerships varies considerably.

14. The Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) was commissioned by TDA in July 2006 to undertake a three-year evaluation of the PPD programme to monitor the quality and impact of the scheme. The evaluation was also intended to contribute to the evolution of the programmes, through working collaboratively with course providers to increase understanding of effective CPD and to use this to guide the development of the provision.

15. The key aims of the evaluation were to:
    - identify, highlight and communicate examples of good practice across the PPD provision;
    - identify areas in which TDA can strengthen PPD provision;
    - conduct research of a robust nature to inform advice to Government about the national availability and quality of PPD provision; and
    - inform the nature and direction of further research in this area.

    The specific objectives were to evaluate the:
    - effectiveness, quality and impact of course preparations;
    - effectiveness of activities designed to recruit and prepare participants for the course;
    - performance of providers;
    - impact on the performance development of teachers; and
    - robustness of providers' own quality assurance, evaluation and monitoring procedures.

16. The evaluation was designed to combine both qualitative and quantitative data sources and data analysis in order to create a robust data set. At all stages of the evaluation process the TDA team reviewed and agreed progress. A Project Advisory Group consisting of Dr Sue Ainslie, Edge Hill University; Professor Mark Hadfield, University of Wolverhampton; and Dr Lorna Earl, University of

Toronto was established to advise on the development of the evaluation methodology, to provide quality assurance of data collection and to review the data analysis and findings of year 1 of the evaluation.

PPD Barriers Scoping Study

17. During Autumn 2006 CUREE also undertook a separate, but related exploration of barriers to PPD participation specifically in relation to minority and disabled members of the profession. This review was conducted across the entire range of programmes and the findings are reported elsewhere as *'Patterns of Participation of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Teachers and Teachers with Disabilities in Postgraduate Professional Development Programmes'*. For the purposes of this evaluation, awareness of barriers to recruitment across the current sample of 20 providers relates to teachers as a whole group of potential participants and does not focus specifically on particular groups of teachers.

Methodology

Sample

18. A stratified sample of 20 course providers/partnerships was selected for detailed investigation in the first year of the evaluation. A stratified sample was chosen rather than a random sample because of the small sample size (20) and the need for a range of providers (ranging from large HEI led providers to small subject association providers) in order to be confident about the broad findings in this first year. In year 1 the following 20 partnerships were included in the sample:
    - Bury LA;
    - Canterbury Christchurch University College;
    - CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
    - CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
    - College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
    - DATA (Design and Technology Association);
    - Dyslexia Action;
    - East Midlands Partnership;
    - Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
    - Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
    - NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
    - North East Consortium - Durham LA;
    - Open University;
    - Oxford Brookes;
    - Sheffield Hallam University;
    - SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
    - University of Birmingham;
    - University of Cambridge;
    - University of Sussex; and
    - York St. John University.

19. During year 1 of the evaluation CUREE team members regularly attended TDA Partnership Managers Conferences (19th September 2006, 5th & 7th December 2006, 13th March 2007). These provided an opportunity for partnership managers to meet the CUREE research team to learn about the project and to ensure that it was appropriately connected to other related development work. CUREE Directors attended TDA Steering Group meetings (14th November 2006, 17th April 2007). These meetings served as a vehicle through which to report back to TDA on the progress of the evaluation and to enable the Steering Group to inform the strategic steer of the evaluation.

20. CUREE's approach was to unpack the specific evaluation objectives into a series of key questions, amenable to either quantitative or qualitative manipulation, or both. Where appropriate the questions were based around two sets of indicators, which probed 1). outcome indicators: what providers were doing in relation to the specific programme objectives, and 2). what providers were doing in relation to best evidence of successful impact on students and pupils, derived from research. The level two indicators were used as predictive indicators. We have listed the key questions below. The detailed questions used to unpack these and to populate the database are attached at Appendix 1, together with the detailed methodology. The analytic framework is attached as Appendix 3.

Key Questions

Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

21. Level 1
    Have providers:
    - undertaken a needs analysis: what are the issues for schools and teachers? What do schools and teachers want?;
    - consulted with local stakeholders (local authorities, schools, networks); and
    - subjected the courses to academic accreditation processes and peer review.
22. Level 2
    Have providers:
    - provided opportunities for teachers/other stakeholders to have an input in course design?;
    - attempted to align course provision with school goals and leadership?; and
    - created a balance between content (input) and design for professional learning? (What is learned and how it is learned?).

Effectiveness of Activities Designed to Recruit and Prepare Participants for the Course

23. Level 1
    Are providers:
    - aware of potential barriers to recruitment?;
    - marketing their provision and creating awareness of their provision?;
    - creating accessible information sources (e.g. online course information)?; and
    - access – on-line support, printed materials.

24. Level 2
    Have providers paid attention to potential barriers in terms of:
    - delivery – timing location (e.g. all provider based; all school based; mixture of the two)?;
    - finding out individual teacher's starting points; and
    - pre-course planning involvement and support of students.

Impact on Pupils and Teachers

25. Level 1
    Is there evidence of:
    - improvements in pupil learning (where appropriate depending on course content);
    - changes in teacher knowledge and understanding; and
    - application of new knowledge and understanding in professional contexts.

26. Level 2 Indicators
    Does the course include:
    - on-site training, modelling in the real-world environment of the classroom and addressing teachers' own concerns and issues;
    - demonstration, practice and feedback;
    - structured time for in-class modelling, preparation and teacher planning;
    - planned opportunities for peer support and classroom experimentation; and

- evidence of attention to adult learning and aligning professional learning with student learning.

Develop Teachers' Research and Problem-solving Skills through the Critical Evaluation of Evidence and Research from a Range of Sources, Including Academic Research and Other Data Available to Schools

27. Indicators:
    - participants' perceptions of research/problem solving skills using evidence from research and other data;
    - provider-led access to the public and local knowledge base and the extent to which providers tailor this to context and offer a menu from which teachers can choose; and
    - application of such skills in professional contexts, including skills in interpreting the implications of data for context.

28. In addition we looked for internal and external quality assurance procedures, such as procedures for course validation and monitoring external examining arrangement and inspection reports.

29. Providers were required to produce impact reports for TDA. These, together with the site visits, student interviews and portfolio reviews were used for this part of the evaluation together with a set of key questions:
    - Have providers established a baseline from which to assess participant impact?
    - Has participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, attitude (confidence, self efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact?
    - Have other indicators: satisfaction surveys, school feedback etc. been included in the evaluation of impact?
    - Have provider assessment outcomes been included in the evaluation of impact?
    - Have providers made efforts to establish tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research techniques?)

    For a detailed account of the evaluative methodology see Appendix 1.

Findings

30. Partnership is a key design feature of the PPD programme, introduced explicitly by TDA for the first triennial round of PPD awards to stimulate collaboration between HEIs, LAs, schools and other organisations in order to create the conditions in which teachers' and schools' learning needs might exert influence on PPD provision.

31. TDA has expressed a particular interest in learning about the effects of this decision early in the QA process. They asked us to look at how partnerships work, how they are led and funded and the different configurations of organisations within the programme. This cross cutting theme was additional to the core evaluation design and required us to expand the scope of our study to include additional contextual data specifically relating to partnership working arrangements. CUREE set out to explore partnership arrangements through 4 enquiry strands. First we profiled all the partnership arrangements within the PPD programme. The outcomes of that profiling are included as Appendix 4. Then we used the profile to bias the sample to include any partnerships that were not led by HEIs and any that were unusually large and diverse, i.e. any that involved more than 15 organisations and/or included schools, subject associations etc. Next we added some questions to the analytic framework so that any discussion of partnership that appeared in documentary evidence could be distilled. Finally we asked all Partnership Managers to arrange for researchers to meet representatives from partnership organisations other than the lead organisation during a specially extended 2-day site visit.

32. The following section reports on the findings of the specific partnership enquiries and several significant issues emerge from the data. As is often the case, the data also revealed a series of further, more detailed and as yet unanswerable questions. The limitations of the data are also therefore explored at the conclusions of the section.

Characteristics of PPD Provider Partnerships

33. Of the 20 provider partnerships in this year's sample, 12 were led by HEIs, 2 by LEAs and 6 by other organisations such as subject associations, development agencies and specialist organisations. Five of the partnerships involved 5 or fewer organisations, 9 involved between 5 and 15 organisations and 6 involved more than 15 organisations in their partnership.

34. Fifteen partnerships identified senior members of staff (e.g. Chief Executive, Pro Vice chancellor, Director) as their Partnership Manager. In 4 partnerships the Partnership Manager was Head of CPD or Head of Training and just 1 identified a discrete PPD co-ordinator post. Evidence about how PPD collaborative funding was used in relation to the Partnership Manager role was vague. Most posts are described as 'part-funded' by PPD.

Working and Learning Relationships Between Partner Organisations

35. Eleven of the 20 partnerships provided strong evidence of productive partnership and the mechanisms that have enabled them to work together. These included:
    - steering or consultative groups that involve a mixture of teachers (students), school leaders, local authority officers, course tutors and programme managers;

- conferences, workshops and publications where teachers share outcomes;
- access to a range of professional and research networks;
- off-site delivery i.e. in schools or LA accommodation; and
- LA officers or school based alumni acting as associate tutors.

36. Where the lead partner was not an HEI, and was therefore unable to accredit at M level, there was evidence of a significant degree of interdependence in the partnership. This is especially true for subject associations, which point to their partnerships with HEIs as helpful in publicising their often highly specialised programmes, and in particular, in enabling them to access PPD funding to support recruitment and delivery.

37. Effective partnerships in this sample seemed to extend beyond PPD funded provision, with providers offering consultancy support and other services to partner organisations and a range of collaborative development projects emerging from that relationship. Established partnerships that have been mobilised or reconfigured to deliver PPD were most likely to share these characteristics.

38. In 9 of the 20 partnerships there was evidence of specific challenges to effective partnership working. New partnerships were seen as not yet delivering to their full potential, and lead organisations were investing time and energy to 'get things off the ground'. Geographical distance has been a challenge for some, and infrequent meetings with irregular patterns of attendance have meant that provision in some partnerships continues to be very much 'institution-based'. Uneven participation, especially in larger partnerships was seen as an issue.

39. The absence of strong internal networking and professional learning communities *within* partner organisations was identified as a barrier to effective partnership *between* partner organisations.

40. The most intransigent challenges seem to have existed where providers' programmes and modes of delivery have continued more or less unchanged following the introduction of PPD and its partnership requirements. In these cases, (4, all HEI led) providers specifically identified problems with recruitment, which they attributed variously to high fees, to competition from lower charging institutions, to teachers' reluctance to travel to university and to teachers' lack of motivation to comply with traditional accreditation requirements.

The Relevance of Effective Partnerships for PPD

41. We found evidence that effective partnership working has added value to PPD provision in a number of key areas:

Creating Conditions Likely to Enhance the Impact of CPD

42. Working collaboratively with schools and local authorities has enabled HEIs to influence the context in which teachers participating in PPD work and learn. For instance, by working with whole schools and/or departments one provider has been able to model the institutional conditions for sustainable innovation and professional learning, making it more likely that participants and their pupils can benefit from their engagement. Elsewhere, working with a headteacher to develop a module for his middle leaders has created opportunities for in-school collaboration and co coaching.

Sustainable Recruitment from amongst Partner Organisations

43. Over time, sustainable recruitment and participation has strengthened the relationship between the partner organisations. Partnerships led by LAs and/or those in which LAs are especially active have been particularly successful in recruiting cohorts of teachers in ways that make sense within their overall approaches to school improvement, CPD, leadership development and succession planning. Subject leadership, teaching and learning development groups, mentor networks and middle leadership learning are all represented in PPD programmes. One provider is introducing the idea of advanced partnership where opportunities for school leaders to influence course design and to contribute to delivery are enhanced.

Responsiveness – Understanding Learning Need

44. Long established partnerships have enabled providers to demonstrate a deep engagement with and knowledge of local, and in some cases national, professional learning needs. The partnership context has also enabled providers to respond actively to even very specific learning needs. Examples of this include support for bereavement counselling skills for a cohort of teachers each year, Authority wide development work on transition in response to growing concerns about learning loss and collaboration with educational psychologists on behaviour management.

Responsiveness – Tailoring Provision

45. Having more partners might suggest an opportunity for diversification and personalisation. Multiple providers could, in theory, generate a broader offer and having more 'recipient' partners could, in theory, create a diverse and segmented market of learning needs. However, we found evidence to contradict this assumption; that the larger the size of partnership, the fewer the number of programmes offered are likely to be. One explanation for this could be the existence of 'shell' programmes; M level modules and programmes that are generic and/or skills focused. These have become an important tool for accrediting institutions that are serious about tailoring their provision to local learning needs within a timescale that is useful to teachers and schools. The single programme offer, therefore, is likely to signal a creative compromise that balances the need to satisfy the quality criteria of academic boards with the rapidly changing and diverse learning needs of practitioners.

Using Economies of Scale

46. Another explanation could be the use of a small and focused offer within the large constituency created by a broad partnership to generate economies of scale, which in turn enables providers to offer programmes for much reduced and in some cases no fees. By mobilising the partnership to recruit large cohorts, identify associate tutors and deliver in school or LA accommodation, partnerships are able to use TDA funding to significantly subsidise fees. With the addition of contributions from schools and LAs in the partnership, participation in M level programmes is, for many teachers, free at the point of delivery. This was mentioned frequently in student interviews in response to questions about motivation to participate in PPD. HEIs who lead smaller partnerships have not been able to benefit from economies of scale and have found that the funding makes little contribution to fees that remain very high. Recruitment in such circumstances has been a challenge for some.

The Limitations of the Data

47. These observations on partnerships should be regarded as provisional for the following reasons:

    - The decision to prioritise partnership arrangements that seemed more complex, meant that we were always likely to find a disproportionate number of sites who were wrestling with the more intransigent challenges of working with others.
    - It emerged during the documentary analysis and fieldwork phases that definitions of what 'partnership' might mean in the context of the PPD programme are loose and multiple. For some lead organisations in this year's sample, partners are mutually accountable and equal beneficiaries in a joint enterprise. For others they are customers, stakeholders or delegated providers.
    - The largest time slot available for fieldwork was an extended 2-day site visit. This proved to be inadequate to the task of really getting to grips with the perspectives of partner organisations. In particular, central Partnership Managers in large, complex partnerships simply could not have access to detailed information about provision and processes in numerous local delivery sites.
    - The partnership enquiry has necessarily operated along 'parallel lines' relative to the overall evaluation, and further work to explore, for example, possible connections between impact for teachers and pupils and partnership arrangements would be needed. In order to feel confident about the outcomes of such an analysis, greater consistency or, alternatively, more detailed differentiation between 'kinds of' partnerships would be required. As yet, we do not have sufficiently fine-grained evidence to enable us to make such a classification reliably. This might however, be an outcome of a more extensive study of a subset of partnerships in year 2, and might involve revisiting a subset of the year 1 sample, since this was deliberately tilted towards the largest and most complex partnerships.

Findings Relative to the Evaluation Objectives

Evaluation Objective 1: Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

Indicators

48. The first set of data for this part of the evaluation relates directly to established good practice in developing and validating new courses.
We looked for documentary and field data to ascertain whether providers had:
    - undertaken a needs analysis: what are the issues for schools and teachers? What do schools and teachers want?;
    - consulted with local stakeholders (local authorities, schools, networks); and
    - subjected the courses to academic accreditation processes and peer review.

Needs Analysis

49. All of the sample providers used a form of needs analysis to help shape both their course content and, in half of the partnerships, aspects of the programme delivery (e.g. timing and/or location). Overall, these ranged fairly extensively from the requirements of the national standards specified by eight providers to the professional associations who were involved in two cases. Not surprisingly, given the extensive networks afforded by partnership arrangements, over half of providers took school based priorities into account and half indicated that they included local priorities, included LAs' development plans. Teacher needs were either initially identified by heads (in seven cases) or by teachers (11) or both. Ofsted also played a role in a significant number of provider needs audits (7). Participant feedback played a part in five cases and special needs support and subject assessment needs were also taken into account by a minority of providers. (4)

50. Providers also consulted stakeholders such as special interest groups where appropriate (e.g. NAGTY) and at least seven also consulted national agencies such as the GTC or NCSL.

51. The range of issues which emerged covered a broad spectrum, with no particular front runners emerging. We have listed them here because they help to paint a picture of the current PPD spectrum to which we can add subsequent samples to gain an overall view of the needs and issues addressed by PPD over the full three year period. The range of issues included:
    - addressing identified weaknesses in teaching and learning;
    - assessment;
    - developing leadership capacity;
    - ICT;
    - improved school management systems;
    - inclusion;
    - learning disabilities;
    - performance management;
    - subject knowledge development;
    - supporting particular groups of pupils (e.g. struggling readers);
    - teaching methods/pedagogy;
    - recruitment and retention;
    - school improvement; and

- research skills.

52. It was clear from the 100 portfolios of student work we looked at that these priorities were reflected in the nature of the issues which the students were addressing. Leadership and management (13) was the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and Special Educational Needs (SEN) (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical/ sociology of education and ICT.

53. Overall, the attention to national standards, consultations with national agencies and consideration of local needs, together with the focus on school and individual priorities was reflected in the relatively high levels of satisfaction which emerged from our interviews with students.

Predictive Indicators

54. In collecting a 'second dataset' for this we were probing for elements of practice which were consistent with best research evidence of effective course preparation where participation in the courses was linked to positive outcomes for both teachers and pupils. We looked for documentary and field data to try and ascertain whether providers had:
    - provided opportunities for teachers/other stakeholders to have an input in course design?;
    - attempted to align course provision with school goals and leadership?; and
    - created a balance between content (input) and design for professional learning? (What is learned and how it is learned)?

Opportunities for Teachers/other Stakeholders to have an Input in Course Design?

Teachers

55. All of the providers involved teachers at some stage of the course development process. The range and depth of this involvement was extensive, with only one provider relying principally on participant feedback:
    - thirteen providers consulted both teachers and local authority stakeholders as an integral part of the course development process and six co-developed their courses with the teachers;
    - most providers also used participant feedback to inform course development;
    - eleven providers conducted teacher needs analyses and five included teacher self analysis at the outset of the course in order to align provision closely to teachers' self identified starting points;
    - three providers offered bespoke courses, negotiated between tutors and/or local authorities and school CPD co-ordinators; and
    - four providers included teacher representation on boards of studies or course committees.
56. Overall, providers showed a high level of awareness of the importance of teacher input and the consideration of teacher aspirations and learning needs.

57. *"Teachers engage in needs analyses and self audits at the outset of courses…Courses are planned and assessment activities negotiated to ensure an absolute fit with teachers' and schools' needs and priorities…Bespoke*

courses are developed through negotiation between school based CPD co-ordinators and course tutors."

58. *"Headteachers are asked to identify school priorities in written pre-course submissions, to identify the needs of specific teachers…Teachers are asked to identify their own professional and school priorities in written pre-course submission [and] set their own individual targets."*

59. *"We have had extensive discussion…this last year, focussing on the teaching of our two current modules…the problem of finding sufficient time to implement a collaborative model of CPD to enhance the teaching of the whole department. We have also had recent meetings with key staff in these schools and they have helped us in the planning and development of this…initiative."*

60. *"All participants negotiate individual study schedules with tutors which bring wider research findings and evidence to bear on their initial needs, and often as interest and awareness grows, to extended needs. Schools and teachers identify needs, select taught and/or independent study modules, commission new taught modules if required…negotiate time and place of input and select assignment themes and assignment modes…Teachers exercise a powerful development influence through the consultative committees and school agreement negotiations and evaluation."*

Other Stakeholders

61. LAs were active in nearly all the provider partnerships and co-deliverers of provision in a minority. Ten partnerships co-developed provision with stakeholder partners. Where programmes (3) were targeted at specialisms such as SEN or EAL, specialist services and interest groups were part of both the development and the ongoing review of programme delivery. Headteachers and/or CPD co-ordinators were identified as key stakeholders by eight providers. Other local stakeholders included employers, private providers, literacy advisors and learning support personnel.

Alignment of Course Provision with School Goals and Leadership

62. Providers used various means to align their provision with school priorities. Two providers said that they left this up to the students, but the majority (14) took an active role in establishing congruence with schools. Processes ranged from asking heads and CPD co-ordinators directly to identify school priorities (6) or school training needs (3) to ensuring that student research projects were aligned with the school development plan (3).

63. The overwhelming majority of the students interviewed across the provider partnerships made it clear that they enjoyed the support of their school. Overall, the attention to school priorities on the part of the majority of providers showed a clear recognition that teachers were more likely to embark on (and complete) a course if they were supported both in time release for provider input and for embedding professional practice in the school context. This accords also with the predictive indicators for successful adult learning.

64. *"The location of the learners' professional development in the context of school leadership requirements is a core feature of the PPD."*

65. *"Performance management outcomes are used to set individualised learning targets…headteachers and line managers are involved in the planning delivery,*

assessment and evaluation processes to ensure new practices become embedded in professional activity."

66. *"…headteacher indicates priorities for the school as a whole, based on school review documents."*

67. *"Schools and services are asked to complete an annual analysis of their SEN training needs…modules are provided as a direct response to this."*

68. *"…self-generated school improvement projects. For example a school…asked for a programme to provide assistance to a fairly new group of departmental heads in a school with a recent high staff turnover. A school…commissioned a programme to assist with achievement. Linking programmes to career stages, for example early professional development…middle management...coaching programmes for new and aspiring heads…aligning programmes to other activities and priorities for schools, such as NCSL, LftM…"*

69. *"Many schools have seen this programme not only as a way of supporting CPD and their staff but have integrated the PPD work with the school development plan and self evaluation processes…One school has developed a whole-school approach to CPD, organising teachers into pods of 9"*

Balance between Content (input) and Design for Professional Learning? (What is Learned and How it is Learned?)

70. Typically, HEI course/module approval requirements cover the knowledge base, learning outcomes, contact time, assessment strategies and resources. While there was evidence that many providers (see section 3) were using some delivery strategies for which there is strong evidence of success, it was not always clear whether this was purely for recruitment purposes (i.e. to overcome barriers to participation) or because the strategies were derived from best evidence about CPD processes for adult professional learning. Some providers did make it explicit that the course design paid attention to what's known about professional learning. One partnership used an explicit 'model' of collaborative delivery which was of equal importance to the programme as the course content. Collaboration is at the heart of this evidence-based programme and seen both by the provider and the students as core to its success. Another provider was working to build a structured model of CPD processes in one school with the intention that this could then be replicated and used in other schools.

71. Although only five providers made similar, explicit reference to research-based adult professional learning models, nearly all made explicit reference to collaborative work or peer-to-peer to learning as part of the programme, even when, in the case of one provider, this was via a virtual learning environment (VLE) and distance learning. The overall impression from the documentary evidence and site analysis was that many providers implicitly recognised the benefits of real-time collaboration in embedding learning but that this was not explicitly part of the validated structure or of delivery design. Nor was collaboration consistently encouraged guided and supported by specialist tutors. However when we used the systematic review evidence to probe aspects of course delivery (e.g. classroom based, focused on teachers' real concerns etc. – see below) it was clear that the majority of partnerships had moved towards a pattern of delivery which incorporated some (but not all) of the elements identified as important ingredients of professional learning models.

Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of Participant Recruitment and Preparation Activities

Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment

72. CUREE undertook a separate, but related exploration of barriers to PPD participation specifically in relation to minority and disabled members of the profession. This review was conducted across the entire range of programmes and the findings are reported elsewhere. For the purposes of this evaluation, awareness of barriers to recruitment across the current sample of 20 providers relates to teachers as a whole group of potential participants and does not focus specifically on particular groups of teachers. Nor did the data from the sample identify any specific group as being particularly at risk of exclusion.

73. The majority of providers in the sample had, from their experience of delivering professional development provision, identified time as a major disincentive and potential barrier to recruitment. This was consistent with the student interview findings. Fifty per cent of the 100 students interviewed had found time a major challenge, despite efforts on the part of providers to address this in the course design and delivery. Nearly half of providers also identified lack of support from students' schools and colleagues as a barrier to recruitment. Many made a point of consulting heads and/or school CPD co-ordinators as part of their course preparations and ensuring that teachers were able to choose modules which were aligned with school or classroom priorities.

74. Providers also anticipated that lack of funding for fees and supply cover would deter potential recruits. The majority had arrangements in place with partner organisations to mitigate this, including fully funding students from a combination of TDA and local authority resources. Two providers offered the option to spread fee payments over several months in a 'pay as you go' model and one waived programme fees altogether. Seven providers identified the location of the course delivery, with associated time and travel challenges, to be a potential barrier to access and twelve anticipated that their students would find challenges in balancing the competing demands of their work, family and domestic ties and their study.

75. Most providers are making thoughtful efforts to overcome these problems. PPD input sessions are generally run at times to suit participants and schools. Twilight sessions, weekend and summer courses, school visits, after school tutorial sessions, e-learning opportunities, sessions spread over the term in local venues, tutorial email and telephone support are variously cited by the majority of providers as part of their strategy to target potential access barriers.

76. Strategies to reduce the challenges of the work-life balance include the reduction of study leave periods, flexibility of provision, with stopping off and exit points for which transferable credit is given and distance learning capacity. Many providers have tailored assessment requirements as far as possible to link the programme with student practice and school development priorities. Providers have also tried to create 'accessible' forms of assessment such as portfolios, presentations, e-discussions and electronic journals. When we looked at 100 student portfolios we found them spread over reports of action research projects (36) to case studies (19), literature reviews (15), and evaluations (10). There were also 5 'portfolios of activity', 3 'reflective reviews' and a handful of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.' One

provider which is experiencing a drop in numbers believes the number and nature of completed assignments required for accreditation may be partly responsible for this.

77. Because the TDA programme is still in its early stages, it was not possible to use retention data to probe for links between accreditation requirements and non-completion rates. Anecdotally, we know of several partnerships where some students complete their courses with considerable engagement and enthusiasm but do not submit the written assignments required for assessment and accreditation. In the 2008 evaluation round it should be possible to collect a meaningful dataset in relation to retention and completion. What is certainly noticeable is the variation in the number and nature of assignments across the sample. Some of the ways in which providers were responding to the needs of students were:
    - integrating assessment tasks with regular course assignments to support participants' learning (3);
    - flexible completion dates for assignments (4);
    - use of flexible, innovative assessment models: presentations, CD Roms, email assignments, peer assessment, 'practice' assignments (7);
    - amending course assignment requirements in relation to student feedback or school priorities (4); and
    - providing formative tutorial and peer support for assignments (6).

78. Half of providers offered insights into how they took account of teachers' individual starting points in course preparations. These included:
    - an initial four day residential designed to help tutors understand their students' starting points;
    - an audit of student skills; and
    - the first assignment for each module is for teachers to assess their own practice/knowledge in the light of the evidence base they are introduced to.

79. In terms of their reach, providers employed a variety of marketing stratagems. The largest groups were events/conferences/exhibitions (7), through head teachers (7) via newsletters, leaflets and flyers (7) and websites (7.) Twelve providers made use of local authority and other networks. Only two providers used paid advertisements. This is consistent with the student feedback about the visibility of the PPD programmes. Half of the 100+ students interviewed had heard about the provision formally via their school or local authority, others via websites or informal contacts. Many felt that more direct contact with schools or local authorities would be productive and 20% thought more use could be made of the media.

80. There is a healthy congruence between good recruitment practice (i.e. anticipating and planning to overcome potential barriers to professional development) and the research evidence about models of CPD design and delivery which have been linked to effective outcomes in terms of student learning. The latter, while varied according to context and content, have several elements in common: in-school, real time embedding, collaboration and peer support and starting where the students are. It is clear that the majority of providers have addressed course preparations, access and delivery in their strategies to overcome barriers to participation. In so doing they are also taking account (although this is an explicit goal of course design in only five programmes) of some of the key findings about adult and professional learning,

although with some significant gaps relating to specified specialist input and learning support, involving real-time modelling and observing students' practice, as we shall see below.

Evaluation Objective 3: Improve Pupils' Performance through Embedded Improvement in Teachers' Knowledge, Understanding and Practice

Pupil Outcomes

81. Provider assessment of pupil learning outcomes fell largely into two categories; those who assumed a link between positive teacher impact and pupil learning/behaviour/motivation/confidence and those who reported some form of measurement based on collected data. The latter took various forms. They included:
    - assessment tasks;
    - external examiner reports;
    - formative feedback;
    - headteachers' feedback;
    - teacher reflection;
    - portfolios;
    - school/headteacher reports;
    - national test results; and
    - teacher perceptions/teacher journals.

82. Providers were open about the problems involved in assuming causal relationships between PPD and pupil outcomes, yet were able to report a number of linked improvements, spanning a range of outcomes, including attainment, improvements in pupil engagement and motivation, confidence, understanding and behaviour.

83. For example:
    "…the impact on pupil performance reported by partner schools in terms of improved test results at different key stages has been unexpected in terms of its magnitude. Additionally, improvement in pupils' behaviour, engagement, motivation and participation in lessons was reported more extensively than expected."

84. *"Recent assignments report…increased number of level 5s in speaking MFL enhanced performance in KS3 SATs scores for a target group of borderline level 4 pupils in English; improved spelling scores in a year 2 class using VAK approaches to teaching and spelling."*

85. *"Over a six week study small increases could be seen in some pupils' test results. More importantly their interest level in the subject itself seemed to increase..."*

86. *"A peer and self-assessment project in a Cornish school suggests an average net improvement of one GCSE grade after the first year of the course. 91% A*-C as opposed to minimum target grades of 77%A*-C."*

87. *"While it is generally agreed that it is often difficult to isolate all the contributory factors which affect pupil performance, the perception of these professionals is that the improvements are a direct result of active involvement in the PPD programme."*

88. When we looked at the portfolio evidence we found that the majority of projects in the reports (79 out of a hundred) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools students used for making judgements about impact included:
    - observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
    - interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
    - survey questionnaires (21); and
    - pre and post test results (9).

89. Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

90. Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning, 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. Thirteen identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

91. In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

92. Overall, while acknowledging the provider reservations about cause and effect in a professional development context, the portfolios revealed a level of critical engagement by the students with evidence which lends support to the schools' and partnerships' reports of improvements in pupil outcomes as a result of many of the programmes. (See section 3.7 for findings about provider approaches to impact evaluation).

Teacher Outcomes

93. The provider sample spanned a broad spectrum of provision, from leadership to mathematics teaching and dyslexia. Planned teacher learning outcomes ranged from the generic (e.g. leadership skills) to specific subject knowledge and skills (e.g. mathematics, ICT). Development of teacher knowledge and understanding specifically identified from submissions and evaluations included:

- collaboration skills (2)[1];
- action research skills (2);
- use of Information Communication Technology (ICT) (1);
- understanding and skills relating to inclusion (2);
- links to work related learning (1);
- management and organisation skills (3);
- monitoring and assessment skills (2);
- pedagogical knowledge and practice (3);
- critical review and use of evidence skills (2);
- knowledge, understanding and skills relating to understanding pupil needs (7); and
- development of knowledge and skills for school improvement (1).

94. Actual outcomes as reflected in provider evaluation reports and interviews with students added to the mix above as follows:
    - teachers' specific subject knowledge (8);
    - presentation skills (1);
    - use of coaching/mentoring (1);
    - teachers questioning skills (2);
    - teachers' confidence and self belief (2);
    - enthusiasm and commitment (2); and
    - assessment (1).

95. Examples of what this might mean in practice included:
    "...the highest occurring comments on the impact of the programme as reported by teachers and CPD co-ordinators in reports, surveys and interviews are: improved subject/process knowledge base, greater confidence and enhanced belief in teachers' own power to affect pupils' learning, greater reflection on practice, greater understanding of and enthusiasm for collaborative working, greater commitment to changing and improving practice, improved motivation, engagement and achievement of pupils."

96. *"…teachers becoming familiar for the first time with school based assessment data…[and] the existence of national strategy materials…middle managers considering the notion of leadership for the first time…using coaching for the first time…"*

97. *"…improved knowledge of relevant teaching methods, differentiation and personalisation, resources, strategies…using research to support ideas…improved confidence and self esteem, especially in managing colleagues…"*

98. *"All the teachers stressed the increase in knowledge, professional awareness and confidence they had experienced. Some were now leading learning in their own schools and feel ready to bring their experience to other schools."*

99. *"Course participants…were unanimous…about increased confidence in their role, development of their subject knowledge, management of change and increased achievement."*

100. Our review of 100 student portfolios helped to focus more deeply on the teacher learning outcomes. In terms of focus, leadership and management (13) was the

[1] None of these categories are mutually exclusive.

largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

101. The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:
    - improved professional learning skills (26);
    - improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
    - improved leadership skills (4).

102. Finally, 85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study, e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. Twenty five percent said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

103. Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD. (See section 3.7 for findings about provider approaches to teacher impact).

Predictive Indicators of Impact

104. Because of some of the caveats and doubts surrounding the providers' perspectives on establishing causal links between PPD interventions and pupil learning, we again used a series of predictive indicators taken from best research evidence about the nature of CPD which made a difference to teacher change and to pupil learning. These all related to elements in the programme design which were a consistent feature of effective CPD in the research. They were:
    - in class modeling;
    - addressing teachers' own concerns and issues;
    - demonstration, practice and feedback from observations;
    - time for preparation and teacher planning;
    - planned opportunities for peer support;
    - using feedback about pupil learning to inform students' own professional learning; and
    - planned opportunities for classroom experimentation.

105. This was one of the most difficult areas of the programme to evaluate. The purpose of using predictive indicators of CPD design was to add another lens to the evaluation by examining questions of impact through the research evidence lens of what CPD elements have been linked to effective student and pupil outcomes. However trawling the documents and asking questions during site visits elicited information about addressing teacher concerns, planning opportunities for peer support and planned opportunities for students to

experiment in their classrooms or schools where appropriate. What happens during specialist input sessions by the providers (i.e. our questions relating to in-class modeling, demonstration, practice and feedback, using feedback about pupil learning etc.) was more difficult to ascertain. Clearly much of this was up to individual tutors. There was little evidence that specific features of input and specialist support were specified from an evidence-based approach to adult professional learning as part of the overall course design. Researchers were all briefed to probe these elements during site visits as we had noticed the silence about the nature of specialist contributions to adult professional learning (as distinct from course content) in some of the documentation but we did not succeed in getting much further.

106. However there was plenty of practice which featured some of the key elements which are linked by research evidence to effective teacher and pupil outcomes. All of the providers made sure that their programmes addressed teachers' related concerns in a variety of ways, some of which we described in relation to evaluation objective 1 as regards provider course preparations. Specific strategies for addressing teacher concerns varied across the programmes, but was evident as much in programmes with a leadership or organisational focus as in those with a subject or pedagogical focus.

107. " The assessment framework will enable participants to draw on and build up work linked to identified priorities…for example a post-inspection action plan or to a primary leadership programme priority."

108. "Since participants themselves decide on the focus for their dissertation work, they are able to use the processes…to meet personal objectives. Current favoured themes from across the framework are creativity, emotional literacy, transition, pupil voice, inclusion and subject related foci. Many of these have very specific learning objectives and success criteria developed by participants themselves in consultation with headteachers and colleagues."

109. The comment from one provider (below) reflects the ongoing learning about effective PPD which the data seems to indicate is taking place across the sample as a whole:
"The comments…about the most 'popular' courses being those that are flexible enough to respond directly to the schools' priorities is indicative of a changing emphasis in PPD. The need to create provision arrangements that don't pre-determine content but respond flexibly to the schools' needs is more important than we envisaged. In many courses the audit of the teacher's workplace identifies areas for the focus of the investigation and the assignments take the form of school-based studies which seek to impact on student learning experiences. Many worthwhile and successful projects have been developed, particularly in the area of behaviour management. All assignments are chosen by the teachers themselves and are anchored in their own professional concerns."

110. Clearly TDA's requirement for an action research component in PPD programmes has encouraged the development of (supported) experimental approaches to new knowledge and skills. It was difficult to gauge the extent to which experimentation was a feature of the PPD work from the documentary evidence, so researchers probed this specifically during the site visits. Nearly all the providers adopted an action research model with an experimental approach: i.e. where students were not collecting data about existing approaches or

issues, but where they were evaluating new approaches, use of new resources etc.

111. Provider comments were largely consistent on this:
"The model of practitioner research adopted…is based on one that integrates inquiry, collaboration and experiment."

112. " Assignment briefs include: 'Experimenting with your teaching approach and use of resources/Develop a (new) sequence of lessons to teach a particular subject'."

113. "The assignments require evidence of using new knowledge to improve an aspect of practice. Teachers write journals about work with individual pupils and share samples of lesson plans with study groups."

114. "The modules encourage participants to think creatively and logically in finding solutions to key issues and in evaluating them."

115. This is consistent with the pattern of work emerging from the student portfolio analyses where the majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of (new and experimental) activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils.

116. Most programmes were also designed with built in opportunities for peer support. In three instances this took the form of collaborative working between schools and more than half made use of within-school collaborative opportunities – largely through action research. Six providers used seminars, tutorials and workshops for peer support activities. One provider put collaboration and peer support at the heart of its PPD model, based explicitly on research evidence drawn from a variety of well respected sources. The same provider made it clear that the model of PPD it was using was shared and understood by everyone involved in the delivery and all of the module inputs were evidence based. Thus, for example, the students were required to take a module in 'Collaborative Practice' where they were supported in peer learning strategies, as well as their subject based learning module. In this way they were consistently supported in learning *how to learn* at the same time as the course tutors provided inputs of new knowledge and skills – *what they learned*.

117. "The model of shared planning, implementation, observation, review and discussion on a regular basis which underpins all modules, will become established practice in the mathematics department and from our initial experience is likely to be taken up by other departments. It is based on the work of Joyce and Showers…adapted to…schools in the UK."

118. Another provider also actively stresses the importance of peer support. Students are supported by tutors, mentors and guided peer observation as an integral part of the course delivery.

119. Other providers also made reference to good practice research evidence. Soulsby and Swain, and Day and Harris were cited by at least two providers in the context of embedded student learning and the use of techniques to support structured reflection. Another provider was working to achieve a replicable model of CPD processes in one school, for subsequent use with other partner schools. Part of the process involves the use of school 'champions', CPD co-

ordinators or in-school CPD consultants to support students through the course activities and maintain pace and focus. Vygotsky's theories of learning, contextualized by EPPI Review and Ofsted evidence were applied by another provider, whose approach to CPD is *"founded on the principle that participants will develop most effectively through self reflection on personal practice, particularly where that is supported by a critical friend."*

120. Two providers focused directly on peer support for capacity building across the wider department or school/s. *"Programmes are designed to help build capacity at school, local and regional levels by 1). encouraging collaborative PPD including peer coaching and inter-school visitation; 2). encouraging collaborative teaching, planning and assessment; 3). encouraging participants to share their learning with colleagues in their own establishments and across the region; 4). creating a community of learners."*

121. Overall, we found that many providers were making effective use of collaborative strategies and peer support in their delivery strategies. They were also, for the most part, taking care to address teachers' own concerns and issues. However we found very little evidence (only explicitly referred to by one provider) about the structure or consistency of the specialist or expert contributions. For example, when we probed for evidence of modeling, demonstration, practice and feedback from observations, learning from observing others or building in time for collaborative preparation and teacher planning as learning opportunities, we did not find it.

Evaluation Objective 3.3: Develop Teachers' Research and Problem-solving Skills through the Critical Evaluation of Evidence and Research from a Range of Sources, Including Academic Research and Other Data Available to Schools

122. There is no one best way to introduce teachers to the skills and interests involved in doing and using research. They include experimentation and refining practice and the confident use of data in order to identify trends and issues and to gauge the effectiveness of the activities/strategies they are implementing. Consequently we approached the development of indicators for this objective holistically, starting with the students' own perceptions, their introduction and access to the public and local knowledge base and the extent to which this is used for the application of skills in professional contexts, including skills in interpreting the implications of data for context.

123. Overall, many students were generally tentative at first, in relation to research. Nearly all providers offered support for the development of research skills, often initially through attempting to 'demystify' the processes involved. We were not able to ascertain the perceptions of enough students during site visits to make a meaningful perception-based dataset, so we have used the providers' approaches to supporting students' involvement in/engagement with research, coupled with the analysis of 100 student portfolios to generate an overview of the ways in which providers approached the development of students' research and problem-solving skills and use of evidence.

124. Most providers were quite specific about their approaches to student involvement in research. Given our view that there is no one 'perfect' approach, these create a richly detailed picture of the types of strategies employed in introducing evidence-based problem solving techniques to teachers:

"Course participants will be expected to…focus on an individual child's or group of children's progress in an action research project…use frameworks and procedures for collecting and analysing classroom and school data, making comparisons with baseline data and national findings. Research and problem solving skills are developed by…an introduction to action research methodology, including development of key research questions, use of observation frameworks, methods of data collection and analysis…"

125. *"Use of case studies and plan-do review sessions…how to apply practical skills and research findings to specific challenges such as emotional literacy. The skills of data analysis, critical use of sources and development of evidence…are all incorporated."*

126. *"…provision is based upon a model of teacher research and problem solving. The model includes identifying individual and school development needs from an analysis of data, including school performance data. Planning a programme of learning, enquiry and research, developing practical strategies in schools and classrooms and collecting evidence of improvements. Participants are supported by materials, discussions and advice to cover research and problem-solving skills such as...collecting evidence of learning,…observation skills, conducting a literature and research review on best practice."*

127. *"Encourage students to engage critically with research evidence and other data (e.g. national test scores, Ofsted reports school and pupil data) – and to relate it to their current practice."*

128. The evidence with which students were required to engage was concentrated in research journals: possibly reflecting the knowledge base or comfort zones of the course deliverers. Only four providers said that they supported students in engaging with school-based data. Six used national data and three regional data. Access to data was via provider libraries or online sources, although several (8) provided students directly with core reading material and 'book boxes'. Twelve providers also used tutorials, taught modules and presentations by 'experts' to introduce students to the critical evaluation of evidence from research. Students used these skills to take their practice forward through their action research projects, collecting evidence and analysing data.

129. A random selection of examples from the portfolio reviews helps illustrate the diverse range and depth of student engagement with research and evidence:

- The creation and leadership of an effective model of professional learning is crucial if pedagogy is to change to meet the challenges of the 21st century school. A systematic enquiry into an aspect of leadership of learning and inclusion.
- Does the use of single sex reading groups during guided reading time affect boys' behaviour and enjoyment as readers?
- What are the critical features of good practice in teaching writing and becoming a writer?
- Examination of the process of change and how it is managed in school.
- Investigation of effective learning methodologies and processes to create a contextualised model for professional learning in school.
- We write becose to lorne and to spele good: Developing an enquiry-led approach to learning in reception class.
- Evaluation of textiles CPD in Warwickshire LA.

- Improving maths skills through the use of D&T.
- What do pupils think about self-assessment as an aid to learning in the primary classroom?
- Evaluating Wave 3 provision in a Lincolnshire Secondary School.
- Examining self-assessment and pupil voice in a mixed Year 3/4 class.
- Better knowledge and understanding of ADHD; how to develop positive relationships with children with ADHD.
- Increased knowledge and understanding of issues around dyslexia and relation of this to school improvement.
- Understanding, assessing and teaching pupils with specific learning difficulties.
- Examine the effectiveness of a series of lessons focused on academic language and learning.
- Investigating how to develop language skills of two KS2 bilingual learners through art lessons.
- Does cross-age peer tutoring in 'Pause, Prompt, Praise' strategies improve attitudes to reading in both tutors and tutees?
- How can we improve the quality of IEPs by increasing staff contribution to the development of IEPs to enhance teaching and learning experience of pupils?
- Is there a link between poor behaviour of some SEN pupils in the school and teachers' organisation and practice?
- Analysis of behavioural records to identify pupils with difficulties.
- Examination of potential for tutoring to create a positive school atmosphere and increase self-esteem.
- Examining strength of link between teaching and learning organisation and behaviour.
- Improve skills in using IWB and creating resources; new teaching strategies.
- What factors influence motivation levels when teaching pupils with literacy difficulties?
- This study aims to investigate how the TLA has had an impact on staff development and school improvement…
- Consideration of strengths and weaknesses of the department and how to develop it.
- Consideration of main criteria for a teacher to be a successful mentor.
- Impact of participation in TLA on staff and pupils' attainment.
- The impact of group work on learning in design technology: a case study.
- Recognising the opportunities for creativity, innovation and thinking skills in design and technology.
- Teaching of forms and motion in Physics - identifying and targeting misconceptions.
- Examining concerns about assessment practice in music especially around the role played by teacher input.
- Establishing most effective approaches to assessment.
- Examination of issues central to inclusion and of parents' and pupils' views on inclusion.
- Greater understanding of inclusion and integration and how school can put new strategies into place to improve inclusion.
- Evaluating effectiveness of use of student voice to support reflective teaching.

- Assessing the outreach teacher's impact on changing attitudes and practices, when transferring pupils from special schools to mainstream schools.
- 'You can see what the particles are doing.' An investigation into the impact of computer modelling on children's learning in Year nine Chemistry.
- Evaluate use of word prediction software and barriers to its use.
- Review of teaching based on whole-class interactive teaching.
- Developing whole-class interactive teaching.

130. Providers selected the sample portfolios we reviewed so we are aware of potential bias in the sample. However, if the 100 portfolio sample we reviewed is typical of the kinds of work in which teachers across the provider sample are engaged we believe that it reflects the evidence about the learning potential of collaboratively adapting provision to teachers' own concerns or of enabling students themselves collaboratively to interpret or adapt the learning processes for their own contexts. It also reflects the potential of action research for bringing about real changes in teaching and learning.

Evaluation Objective 3.6: Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures

131. We found that quality monitoring and evaluation are usually integral to course monitoring and validation procedures in the accrediting bodies for the partnerships. All courses were subject to some form of major review, ranging from an annual review to a five-yearly review with the majority somewhere in between. In between these reviews is normally an ongoing monitoring process, often involving school and LA input. Universities are also subject to QAA reviews, adding an external layer of accountability to internal quality assurance procedures. All but two of the partnerships documented a multi-layered approach to quality assurance of which evaluation was a key component. Typically, core quality assurance processes include evaluation by course tutors and mentors, participant surveys and external examiner audits, overseen by a board of studies or equivalent scrutinising body. We found evidence that completion rates fed into the QA process for only one provider but that may have been due to the flexible nature of many of the programmes, where students were able to set their own pace of study.

132. Overall the array of quality assurance procedures in place appeared to be both thorough and rigorous and to involve stakeholder and participant perspectives and outcomes as well as internal review and validation procedures.

133. The purposes of quality assurance monitoring across the sample are fairly consistent in that the processes in place are designed to ensure that the specified outcomes of the programmes are being met. In addition to the core processes outlined above, providers used an array of supplementary information, including:
    - Ofsted reports;
    - school visits;
    - headteacher surveys;
    - analysis of assignments;
    - career paths;
    - pupils' work;
    - reports from school senior management teams;
    - quantitative data relating to enrolment, retention data etc.;

- LA reports;
- independent assessors;
- consultative committee meetings with stakeholders;
- monitoring of the external environment to maintain currency; and
- test data.

Evaluation Objective 3.7: Provide Specified Management Information and Include an Evaluation of the Programme's Impact on Practice in Schools

134. TDA's specification of impact evaluation has meant that providers are required to produce evidence that their programmes are effective in bringing about changes in teacher knowledge and skills for which in turn there is evidence of positive impact on outcomes for pupils. In section 3.3 we discussed the nature of the impact on teachers and pupils of the PPD programmes. In this section we examine the ways in which providers have responded to the requirement for an impact evaluation.

135. Overall, we found that most providers have tended to respond to this requirement by adding impact on pupils as an additional layer of analysis from the data which they already collect for quality assurances purposes, detailed above. QA procedures already require monitoring of progress towards learning outcomes, so evidence of teacher impact, particularly where the PPD was classroom based, is collected via teacher perception data, assignment analysis, school/headteacher feedback, LA reports, Ofsted etc. Only two providers conducted a pre and post student skills audit. One provider uses a 'Discourse of Impact' pack to gather perspectives on impact from participants, stakeholders, tutors and local authorities. In relation to pupil impact, only one provider had established a programme-wide practice of baseline tests for pupils against which to assess impact. The focus of the programme was specifically to improve teaching and learning in a particular subject area, using a uniform model of content and delivery, thus making a programme-wide approach to evaluating impact more achievable. Most providers were reluctant to claim direct causality between PPD interventions and pupil outcomes both because of the time factor and because of the multiple intervening variables.

136. Participant perceptions, supplemented in seven cases by school/headteacher reports were the principal means by which impact on both teachers and pupils was assessed. Three providers used student learning journals as a means of perception gathering. Fourteen providers made use of student written evaluations or questionnaires and a handful (3) used discussion groups or meetings to gather their students' perceptions of impact. Only half of providers reported that they used the students' own research in relation to impact on pupils as part of their impact evaluations. This is surprising as we found that many students – at least in the sample portfolio we reviewed – were making good use of multiple evidence sources to evaluate their own practice in relation to its impact on their pupils. In theory, given the strong emphasis TDA puts on PPD as action research, it should be relatively straightforward for providers to aggregate the teachers' own evidence for the programme as a whole to lend weight to reports of pupil impact.

Key Findings and Recommendations

Partnerships

137. It was clear to us that where partnerships were well established, non hierarchical and involved LA and school-based partners in both the preparation and delivery of the programmes, they had the potential to add considerable value in the following ways:
    - linking locally based needs analyses to national or regional priorities;
    - creating consultative networks to ensure that provision is tailored to meet school and teacher priorities;
    - using monitoring to shape and develop provision according to participant and partner feedback; and
    - sharing outcomes and learning through events, seminars, presentations, conferences and workshops.

138. The use of partnership networks for recruitment also seems to have considerable potential. LA partners are well placed to recruit at school level, for example, something which many student interviewees would have welcomed. School contacts could be used both for initial recruitment purposes and also to establish school priorities and teacher needs, thereby accomplishing two core activities without duplicating effort.

139. We recommend that TDA continues to promote active partnership arrangements as a basic criterion for PPD funding. Where this does not already happen, HEI led partnerships should be encouraged to involve LA and school partners, together with other stakeholders (e.g. subject associations) in recruitment, needs analysis, school consultations, course development, course delivery, monitoring and feedback in order to increase the alignment between provision and day to day development work thus creating a whole bigger than the sum of the parts.

140. In our view it would be worthwhile building fine-grained portraits of effective partnership structures and activities, with a portfolio of strategies for making partnerships work to enable partnerships that are working at an earlier stage of development to identify a selection of strategies appropriate to their needs.

Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

141. All of the sample providers used a form of needs analysis to help shape both their course content and, in half of the partnerships, aspects of the programme delivery (e.g. timing and/or location). Providers were able to provide information about the range of issues uncovered by the needs analysis and we have used them to start painting a picture of the current PPD spectrum to which we can add subsequent samples to gain an overall view of the needs and issues addressed by PPD over the full three year period. Overall, we found that the attention to national standards, consultations with national agencies and consideration of local needs, together with the focus on school and individual priorities was reflected in the relatively high levels of satisfaction which emerged from our interviews with students.

142. We recommend that TDA make use of examples of effective provider networks to help providers to develop their partnership networks to ensure that strategies for conducting needs analyses are designed to ensure consistency across individual, school, local and national priorities.

143. What the predictive indicators revealed was rather more patchy. All of the providers involved teachers at some stage of the course development process. Providers generally showed a high level of awareness of the importance of teacher input and the consideration of teacher aspirations and learning needs. The majority of providers also took an active role in establishing congruence with school priorities, which was reflected by the student interviewees, most of whom made it clear that they enjoyed the support of their school. Overall, the attention to school priorities on the part of the majority of providers showed a clear recognition that teachers were more likely to embark on (and complete) a course if they were supported both in time release for provider input and for embedding professional practice in the school context.

144. We also found the course preparations strong on content and on certain aspects of delivery such as timing, collaboration and peer support. However they generally lacked attention to the nature of the specialist or expert contributions. We found little evidence that tutors modelled practice, observed students experimenting with new practice or trained them in the most effective forms of peer support. Nor did we find evidence that course approvals and quality monitoring procedures attempt to specify such contributions to teacher professional learning.

145. We recommend that TDA makes use of the existing and forthcoming EPPI CPD Review reports to encourage providers to take account of the evidence about specialist contributions to teacher professional development which is linked to positive changes for teachers and for pupils. TDA could usefully prompt and stimulate debate about the instructional skill sets necessary to facilitate professional learning.

Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment

146. Lack of time for study was rightly considered by most providers to be a major disincentive and potential barrier to recruitment. This was consistent with the student interview findings. Providers also identified:
    - lack of support from students' schools and colleagues[2];
    - lack of funding for fees and supply cover; and
    - onerous assessment requirements.

147. Most providers are making thoughtful efforts to overcome these problems in terms of running sessions at times to suit participants, helping students with funding, flexible provision and accessible forms of assessment. However there was some evidence that out of context assessment requirements may be preventing students from completing the requisite assignments for accreditation.

148. Only half of the sample indicated how they took account of individual teachers' starting points at the outset of each course and it was not possible to determine, given the early stages of the TDA programme, whether there was any connection between provider efforts to start where their students were and retention/drop out rates.

149. We recommend that TDA:
    - *encourage providers to review their assessment and accreditation requirements to bring them closer into line with teachers' own priorities*

[2] The corollary of this is shown in student interviews where successful students identify school support as an important advantage (see paragraph 143).

and professional concerns. There are many examples among the partnerships which could be used to illustrate how this could be done. The learning benefits of writing assignments need to be made clear and rigour needs to be balanced with flexibility;

- *encourage providers to put processes in place by means of which they are able to explicitly align and adapt activities and programmes so that they build on what individual students know and can do already; and*
- *encourage providers to explore how far tasks that teacher/students have to do anyway, such as lesson and course planning, can be used as vehicles for collaborative professional learning by adding specific learning goals and debriefing activities to them, to make double use of the learning time available to them.*

Improve Pupils' Performance through Embedded Improvement in Teachers' Knowledge, Understanding and Practice

Pupil Outcomes

150. Provider assessment of pupil learning outcomes fell largely into two categories: those who assumed a link between positive teacher impact and pupil learning/behaviour/motivation/confidence, and those who reported some form of measurement based on collected data.

151. Providers were open about the problems involved in assuming causal relationships between PPD and pupil outcomes, yet were able to report a number of linked improvements, spanning a range of outcomes, including attainment, improvements in pupil engagement and motivation, confidence, understanding and behaviour. Examples of student work showed a relatively high level of engagement with evidence about impact on pupils. The tools students used for making judgements about impact included:
    - observation;
    - interviews;
    - survey questionnaires; and
    - pre and post test results.

152. Areas of impact included pupil learning in specific subject areas, improved knowledge, skills and understanding and improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence.

153. Overall we found that the student portfolios revealed a level of critical engagement by the students with evidence which lends support to the schools' and partnerships' reports of improvements in pupil outcomes as a result of many of the programmes. We believe that providers could make more effective use of student evaluations in their impact assessments.

Teacher Outcomes

154. The provider sample spanned a broad spectrum of provision, from leadership to mathematics teaching and dyslexia. Planned teacher learning outcomes ranged from the generic (e.g. leadership skills) to specific subject knowledge and skills (e.g. mathematics, ICT). Development of teacher knowledge and understanding spanned a wide range which included collaboration skills, subject knowledge and management skills.

Predictive Indicators of Impact

155. Overall, we found that many providers were making effective use of collaborative strategies and peer support in their delivery strategies. They were also, for the most part, taking care to address teachers' own concerns and issues. However we found very little evidence (only explicitly referred to by one provider) that the nature of the specialist or expert input was highly specified in the course design. For example, when we probed for evidence of in class modeling, demonstration, practice and feedback from observations, or building in time for preparation and teacher planning, we did not find it.

156. This is consistent with the findings reported above in relation to course design and preparation, and supports our recommendation that providers take account of the skills and processes necessary for instructional facilitation of professional learning.

Develop Teachers' Research and Problem-solving Skills through the Critical Evaluation of Evidence and Research from a Range of Sources, Including Academic Research and Other Data Available to Schools

157. We found an impressive array of approaches to introducing evidence-based problem solving techniques to teachers, although few providers attempted to support students in engaging with school data and there appeared to be a heavy reliance on research journals as evidence sources. Student portfolios exhibited a diverse range and depth of engagement with research and evidence, clearly tailored for the most part to concerns directly related to students' professional practice. If the 100 portfolio sample we reviewed is typical of the kinds of work in which teachers across the provider sample are engaged we believe that it reflects the learning power of adapting provision to teachers' own concerns or of enabling students themselves to interpret or adapt the learning processes for their own contexts. It also reflects the strong potential of action research for bringing about real changes in teaching and learning.

158. We recommend that all providers should be encouraged to build on this promising start and extend and develop the support and training they offer students in the use of research and evidence to gauge the effectiveness of their work.

Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures

159. Overall the array of quality assurance procedures in place appeared to be both thorough and rigorous and to involve stakeholder and participant perspectives and outcomes as well as internal review and validation procedures.

160. Given the ambiguities we encountered around retention data, we recommend that providers should be encouraged to use such data systematically in course monitoring and validation processes if they do not do so already.

Provide Specified Management Information and Include an Evaluation of the Programme's Impact on Practice in Schools

161. Overall, we found that most providers have tended to respond to this requirement by adding impact on pupils as an additional layer of analysis from the data which they already collect for quality assurances purposes, detailed above.

162. We recommend that TDA should offer support to providers in establishing criteria for weighing and aggregating the evidence of pupil impact reported by students. This will help providers to meet the TDA criterion for impact evaluation and also help focus participant enquiry more directly on specified learning outcomes for particular groups of students.

Appendix 1. Methodology

Sample

163. A stratified sample of 20 course providers/partnerships was selected for detailed investigation in the first year of the evaluation. A stratified sample was chosen rather than a random sample because of the small sample size (20) and the need for a range of providers (ranging from large HEI led providers to small subject association providers) in order to be confident about the broad findings in this first year. In year 1 the following 20 partnerships were included in the sample:
    - Bury LA;
    - Canterbury Christchurch University College;
    - CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
    - CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
    - College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
    - DATA (Design and Technology Association);
    - Dyslexia Action;
    - East Midlands Partnership;
    - Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
    - Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
    - NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
    - North East Consortium - Durham LA;
    - Open University;
    - Oxford Brookes;
    - Sheffield Hallam University;
    - SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
    - University of Birmingham;
    - University of Cambridge;
    - University of Sussex; and
    - York St. John University.

164. During year 1 of the evaluation CUREE team members regularly attended TDA Partnership Managers Conferences (19th September 2006, 5th & 7th December 2006, 13th March 2007). These provided an opportunity for partnership managers to meet the CUREE research team to learn about the project and to ensure that it was appropriately connected to other related development work. CUREE Directors attended TDA Steering Group meetings (14th November 2006, 17th April 2007). These meetings served as a vehicle through which to report back to TDA on the progress of the evaluation and to enable the Steering Group to inform the strategic steer of the evaluation.

165. CUREE's approach was to unpack the specific evaluation objectives into a series of key questions, amenable to either quantitative or qualitative manipulation, or both. Where appropriate the questions were based around two sets of indicators which probed 1) outcome indicators: what providers were doing in relation to the specific programme objectives and 2) what providers were doing in relation to best evidence of successful impact on students and pupils, derived from research. The level two indicators were used as predictive indicators. We have listed the key questions below. The detailed questions used to unpack these and to populate the database are attached at Appendix 1, together with the detailed methodology.

Document Analysis

166. During Autumn 2006 a team of seven CUREE researchers was involved in the first desk research phase of the evaluation which involved both qualitative and quantitative analysis of documentation submitted to TDA by the partnerships.

167. CUREE developed an analytic framework, in association with the Project Advisory Board and in consultation with TDA, based on an adapted version of the EPPI systematic review data extraction tool to analyse documentation. The analytic framework is based on 3 key evaluation objectives which are sub-divided into level 1 and level 2 indicators. It was designed to be capable of storing and analysing multi-method data types (submissions documents, impact Evaluations and data returns, site visits data including interview data, additional documentation and observation data, student portfolio data and student telephone interview data).

168. Indicators used in the PPD evaluation were developed from cumulative knowledge and expertise in the field of effective professional development. Key CPD literature from which predictive indicators were drawn included Guskey, T. et al (1995) 'Guidelines for Success'; Robinson, C. et al (2005) 'A Review of Research and Evaluation to Inform the Development of the New Postgraduate Professional Development Programme'; Soulsby, D. et al (2003) 'A Report on the Award-Bearing Inset Scheme'; and Ofsted (2000, 2004) 'Making a Difference: The impact of award-bearing in-service training on school improvement', 'Inservice Postgraduate Training Courses for Teachers: An overview of inspections of courses funded by the Teacher Training Agency'. Findings from four systematic reviews into effective CPD underpinned the development of the predictive indicators.

169. Indicators derived from evidence about, inter alia, the need to build from teachers' starting points, and the knowledge that professional development programmes require 'specialist' support to develop new knowledge and skills.

170. The Analytic Framework was based around three key Evaluation Objectives:

Evaluation Objective 1: Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

171. Existing literature in this area shows that professional learning is most effective when it is relevant to everyday teaching concerns (Cordingley, P. et al, 2004-06) (Guskey, T. et al 1995). The involvement of the learner in planning and needs analysis, and taking account of teacher, school and local priorities also influence the effectiveness and impact of professional development (Robinson, C. & Sebba, J. 2005; Cordingley, P. et al. 2004-6).

172. The Level 1 indicators for this evaluation objective are concerned with the rigour and quality of the course development procedures and standards applied in developing and accrediting the provision.

173. The Level 1 and Level 2 indicators investigate whether providers have:
Level 1
    - undertaken a needs analysis: what are the issues for schools and teachers? What do schools and teachers want?;
    - consulted with local stakeholders (local authorities, schools, networks); and

- subjected the courses to academic accreditation processes and peer review.

Level 2

- provided opportunities for teachers/other stakeholders to have an input in course design;
- attempted to align course provision with school goals and leadership; and
- created a balance between content (input) and design for professional learning (what is learned and how it is learned?).

Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of Participant Recruitment and Preparation Activities

174. Current literature exploring the factors that inhibit the take up of M level study suggest that the relevance of the provision, time, workload, funding, school support, long-term commitment, travel and awareness of the provision combine to challenge postgraduate study (Soulsby, D. & Swain, D. 2003; Ofsted 2000, 2004).

175. The Level 1 and Level 2 indicators interrogate whether providers were:

Level 1

- aware of potential barriers to recruitment;
- marketing their provision and creating awareness of their provision; and
- creating accessible information sources (e.g. online course information)

Level 2

Have providers paid attention to potential barriers in terms of:

- delivery – timing, location (e.g. all provider based; all school based; mixture of the two);
- finding out individual teacher's starting points; and
- pre-course planning involvement and support.

Evaluation Objective 3: Provider Performance Funding Criteria and Quality Threshold

176. Previous research has found that providers of CPD are often poor at evaluating impact, especially on multi-module M level programmes (Robinson, C. & Sebba, J. 2005). This evaluation objective focuses on analysing the TDA PPD funding criteria, considering whether the criteria were being met in practice and evaluating impact.

177. The following areas were addressed under Evaluation Objective 3:

- improvements in pupils' performance through the embedded improvement of teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice;
- recognised qualifications at M level or above;
- develop teachers' research and problem-solving skills through the critical evaluation of evidence and research from a range of sources, including academic research and other data available to schools;
- directly involve teachers, schools and other local and regional stakeholder in planning, reviewing and developing provisions to meet the identified needs of schools and teachers in the region(s) where it will be offered;
- reduce identified barriers to teachers' participation in postgraduate professional development;
- be subject to internal and external quality assurance procedures; and
- provide specified management information and include an evaluation of the programme's impact on practice in schools.

178. The Level 1 and Level 2 indicators interrogate whether providers have:

Level 1

- made improvements in pupil learning (where appropriate depending on course content);
- evidence of changes in teacher knowledge and understanding; and
- evidence of their application of new knowledge and understanding in professional contexts.

Level 2

Does the course include:

- on-site training, modelling in the real-world environment of the classroom and addressing teachers' own concerns and issues;
- demonstration, practice and feedback;
- structured time for in- class modelling, preparation and teacher planning;
- planned opportunities for peer support and classroom experimentation; and
- evidence of attention to adult learning and aligning professional learning with student learning.

Database

179. In order to record and interpret the data CUREE designed and built an Access database. The database held all information collected by the researchers over the course of the first year and is intended to be refined and used in the remaining two years of the evaluation.

180. In the 'desk research' phase researchers analysed the Submissions Documents, Impact Evaluations and Data Returns, submitted by the providers to TDA, against the three Evaluation Objectives. From this the researchers were able to gain an idea of the individual partnerships' intended and existing postgraduate provision. It also informed the fieldwork and guided the approach to interviews during site visits, for example in identifying the areas in which further information was required in order to create as full a picture as possible of the partnerships and providers.

Site Visits

181. In early 2007 five CUREE researchers were allocated partnerships for the field work phase of the evaluation. Researchers made contact with their allocated sites in January with the intention of establishing a relationship prior to the site visit. Arrangements were made and dates were finalised for all 20 of the partnerships to be visited between February and March 2007.

182. The site visits were used by the researchers to collect further data on the sites, to clarify any ambiguities from the 'desk research' and to gain an experience of the partnership 'on the ground'.

183. Site visits for the larger more complex partnerships (15+ partners) were conducted over two days and the smaller partnerships were one day visits. Due to the distinct nature of each partnership the visits were tailored to the individual site requirements, the data that needed to be collected and the staff and students available for interview. The researchers met with and interviewed the Partnership Manager during each of the 20 site visits and then interviewed a selection of other key staff from the different partners involved in the provision. These included course tutors, administrative staff, business managers, LA staff, CPD co-ordinators and current students. In some cases the researchers were able to observe course teaching and tutorials with students. In order to quality

assure the site visits phase each of the researchers was accompanied on two of their site visits by a senior member of CUREE staff in order to ensure consistency in the fieldwork.

184. The sample providers were requested to provide 5 portfolios of student work for review and 10 student volunteers to take part in a telephone interview. In total 100 pieces of student work were analysed against 10 criteria developed from the Analytic Framework. The researchers found the telephone interviews with students one of the most difficult aspects of data collection. Initially CUREE had intended to conduct 200 telephone interviews, however the researchers found that due to a combination of factors, including incorrect contact details, students being unavailable, difficulties with organising times to conduct interviews, only half the intended interviews were conducted. Telephone interviews lasted between 20 and 30 minutes and focused on students' experiences of studying at M level. The interviews addressed students' motivation, barriers to study, marketing and information available about courses, and impacts of their study programmes.

185. Following the site visits the researchers analysed the data collected on site, together with the data from the documentary analysis, student portfolio data and telephone interview data. From this the researchers wrote 20 individual Site Reports presenting both an outline of the findings across the sample as a whole and the more detailed findings for each site. The Site Reports were sent to Partnership Managers at end of June to give them an opportunity to correct any factual inaccuracies and misinterpretations, and also to play back to them the findings from the evaluation and our understanding of their partnership.

Report Writing

186. During June and July 2007 the CUREE team collated all the data collected from the different phases of the year 1 evaluation and synthesised across the findings to produce this report.

187. The synthesis phase of the year 1 evaluation distils the main findings, illustrating these with examples from the partnerships. The PPD Access database was used to run comparative queries from the content for indicators (Level 1) and predictive indicators (Level 2). The data sources were recorded in the database in order to allow a read across the range of evidence. The database automatically calculated quantitative data such as numerical values and data selected from drop-down categories. Qualitative data input into text fields was categorised and collated by the researchers. The data analysis and synthesis allowed the researchers to identify corroboratory evidence from across the data types and identify any gaps in the data.

188. The site reports are included as Appendix 2. The analytic framework used to populate the database in attached as Appendix 3.

Appendix 2. Individual Site Reports

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Bury LA and Manchester Metropolitan University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: Wendy Jackson, the PPD Partnership Manager, Paul Baker, the HEI partner from Manchester Metropolitan University and headteachers and teachers from the Bury area. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The partnership consists of Bury LA and Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU). The two partners have worked together since 1991, through a franchise agreement, to provide a Management Development Programme (MDP) for teachers in Bury LA and neighbouring areas of the northwest. The programme has been supported by TDA funding for Award Bearing INSET programmes since 1998. The programme was established through consultation to reflect management development policy in Bury LA and has evolved over time to keep up to date with educational thinking and the current and future needs of teachers as leaders. The LA wishes to continue to support and develop future leaders not just for retention in Bury, but as part of their support for individual PPD. The programme was revised and renamed as the Leadership Development Programme (LDP) in September 2005 in line with PPD funding application.

The two-year programme leads to a PG-Cert in Education Leadership and Management at M level (the programme equates to a third of a Masters degree). The course is modular and the content has been developed to conform to the MMU assessment framework that is a requirement for accreditation. The assessment criteria are those used for any M Level course at MMU. A classroom-based research project is part of the assessment framework – this enables participants to lead on a 'real' issue that will have a measurable impact on pupil performance, such as leading and improving learning, engaging parents and workforce remodelling.

The assessment framework requires students to demonstrate proficiency in knowledge and understanding as well as other areas, including:

- thinking skills (e.g. ‘evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them’); and

- practical skills (e.g. ‘apply knowledge to the solution of problems; use research techniques to answer questions and solve complex practical problems’, ‘demonstrate the implications for improving professional practice’).

The programme includes a balance between theory and practice and between participants’ personal and professional learning and organisational need. Reflection (including self-reflection) is a core element of the programme. Students are encouraged to draw on and build up work linked to identified priorities e.g. the classroom-based research project may link to a post-inspection action plan or to a Primary Leadership Programme priority. The programme focuses both on the functions of leadership and leadership of learning. Leadership aspects covered by the course include motivating others, recruiting and selecting staff and managing resources. In relation to leadership of learning some of the areas the students explore are learning styles/strategies, transition and transfer and personalising learning.

There is negotiation between senior staff in the school, via the mentor, and the student about potential areas of school interest the student could explore.

The programme coordinator is an employee of Bury LA, but the partnership funds part of her work as the Partnership Manager. She sees her role in terms of:

- course design with input from local heads/senior leaders, tutors, MMU;
- organisation of programme including assessment & marking;
- delivery of key elements of the course;
- quality assurance;
- brokering industrial placements/school visits;
- recruitment; and
- marketing.

The role of MMU staff is to:

- register students;
- provide accreditation;
- provide a taught input in each of the three modules;
- observe and give feedback to the group tutor annually;
- give guidance on progression pathways for students on completion of the PG-Cert;
- support staff involved in marking assessments, attend a sample of participant presentations and moderate assessments; and
- conduct QA.

MMU staff and LA staff (LDP programme coordinator and tutors) plan the details of the provision together.

The Primary and Secondary National Strategies identified leadership capacity and dissemination of good practice as key drivers for school improvement. In this respect, Bury has a history of growing its own future leaders – a number of current headteachers and one LA adviser are past graduates from the MDP.

Future provision is shaped by feedback from:

- participants;
- MMU;

- Bury LA's Schools Group;
- in-school mentors and school leaders; and
- course tutors.

Feedback is collected in oral and written form, including questionnaires and interviews. When asked, “How well do you rate the balance of inputs and activities?” in a questionnaire, 85% of the respondents (from 62% of participants) rated the PPD programme as good or very good. Similarly, 85% of those responding rated the programme as meeting their expectations well.

Some feedback comments from the year earlier were used to inform future planning:

“More ‘group tasks’ early in course would have helped us to get to know one another”

“Email addresses for whole group would be useful so we could contact each other for more information etc.”

Bury LA is represented at the Centre for Educational Leadership’s local network (formerly NCSL's North West Affiliated Centre meetings) which provides them with a national perspective on school leadership.

There is an initial opportunity for participants to say 'What I want from the Programme' and this is taken into account in relation to the working methods of the cohort and the make up of the study support groups.

Recruitment and participation

On average, there are around twenty participants in a cohort (twenty-two teachers enrolled on the programme in 2005, twenty-three for 2006) who are assigned a group tutor. Recruitment is mainly through headteachers identifying candidates for the PPD course. These are usually:

- people who want to become more qualified with a view to leadership; and/or
- people the school leader would like to develop in relation to building capacity for leadership in the school.

Most marketing is by word of mouth which leads to enquiries from interested parties whose names go on a waiting list for the next year’s course. There is also a training guide that goes into all schools and a briefing meeting is held in the summer term which is advertised via headteachers and CPD coordinators. Whist the provision is designed primarily for 'aspiring' and 'early emergent' leaders, participants are welcomed from all levels and at all stages of their career.

Teachers’ main concerns about embarking on M level work relate to:

- not being used to academic study, and being frightened of essay writing;
- conflict with school responsibilities;
- ‘travel to learn’; and
- costs.

The provider has a number of measures designed to overcome these barriers, including:

- the majority of provision is held locally at Bury LA's 'Development and Training Centre' from 4.30 - 6.30pm;

- the Assessment Framework is flexible and includes a classroom-based research project;
- there is a full day's input for each module to minimise disruption to schools; and
- the programme is funded except for supply costs.

Engagement in CPD processes

The programme is designed around developing participants' knowledge, understanding and skills in the four key areas of subject leadership (TDA National Standards) including key area B 'Teaching and learning'. Participants are expected to evidence their work against the standards as part of a Professional Development Portfolio. The provider has also been guided by the GTC's Teachers' Professional Learning Framework (March 2003) which states:

> *"Teachers are supported in making judgements and leading change in their practice by … designing and conducting classroom-based research activities, including: collecting, analysing and interpreting both qualitative and quantitative data, keeping and analysing a log of their own or learner activity."*

The course design has a number of features as follows:

Enquiry

This is built into the course structure through a classroom-based research project that links to an identified priority within the student's school. The participant is required to action plan and review the outcomes, including the impact on pupil performance within the classroom (the evidence may be quantitative data or 'softer' perception evidence).

Formal sessions

There is input from:

- tutors from LA children's services;
- personnel (recruitment and selection);
- Education Business Partnership (day placements in other commercial or industrial settings);
- finance;
- governors;
- headteachers (headteachers who have been through the course also act as markers); and
- an international consultant.

Group-work is a key part of the formal sessions and includes role-play in relation to interviewing and recruiting, for example, and shared thinking and reflection.

Placement

An interesting element of the course is the opportunity for students to undertake a placement in a different sort of workplace to see what leadership is like in other contexts.

Writing

In order to receive credit at M level, students are assessed in the three modules:

- Human Resource Management;
- Strategic Resource Management; and

- Leading Learning Organisations.

Students must complete a 3500 word assignment for at least one of the first two modules (they can substitute three shorter assignments for one of the longer ones), and the third module is assessed through a classroom-based research project which requires candidates to demonstrate leadership and impact on pupil performance. By completing these assignments students receive 60 credits at M level.

Student support

Professional mentors in the school setting offer support and guidance to students, including observation and feedback. The Partnership Manager/Group Tutor also provides one-to-one tutorial support at arranged times.

Learning outcomes and impact

The provider monitors impact in a number of ways, including:

- students' enquiry reports and action research;
- students' learning logs;
- mentors' comments; and
- programme manager observations.

Teachers return to their school ready to mentor other teachers in relation to Leading from the Middle, for example, or those keen to take on curriculum leadership. A major benefit for headteachers is the element of capacity building. Teachers gain skills and knowledge that are not necessarily used as soon as they complete the course. But there is capacity for use when, for example, a headteacher wants to expand the number of teachers in the performance management team.

One headteacher commented:

> *"They develop a willingness to lead, instead of expecting the head teacher to lead. For example, one teacher came back from a tutorial on financial management and wanted to develop this further in school."*

Responses to "How your attendance has impacted on pupils" in the participant questionnaire have included:

> *"Developing more individual learning strategies within the classroom"*
> *"I have thought much more about my teaching and my role within school as a senior manager"*
>
> *"Made me more aware of different styles in which 'they' learn"*
>
> *"Following the 'Managing Stress' session I planned a lesson on Yoga…. The children really enjoyed the different exercises…. We have since used Yoga as a means of brain gym to re-focus the children…"*

The provider has built in a number of approaches to QA, including:

- annual evaluation against Bury LA's Children's Plan/ Service Plan;
- annual evaluation of each cohort in terms of attendance, retention, completion and promotion rates;
- the programme manager/group tutor monitoring the quality of 'guest' speakers, visits to schools etc;

- MMU staff attending a sample of training sessions;
- MMU staff involvement in support for markers, moderation of samples and the provision of further moderation if there is cause for concern;
- the normal evaluation and review procedures of the University, covering a) standards, b) accessibility c) all the knowledge and skills areas;
- participant feedback via questionnaires about impact on their own professional development and their pupils' achievement; and
- mentor feedback about evidence of participant leadership development through an evaluation questionnaire.

External QA is provided by headteachers through an Annual School Survey that includes 'How good is the LA's support for Leadership and Management?' This Audit Commission-led survey is external and allows Bury to compare its performance with that of other LAs. It is also planned to include headteachers, mentors and pupils in evaluating the impact of the classroom-based research project with their evidence forming part of the assessment process.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to the TDA

Bury has a good track record in identifying and overcoming barriers to participation, not least the acquisition of TDA funding for the Management Development Programme, reducing the financial burden on schools/ individuals within a low funded LA. They would like to continue to receive TDA funding to enable them to continue and expand their work including developing stronger links with MMU, such as exploring more flexible assessment routes and involving MMU staff more in tutoring.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team-building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These

ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars, to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007, CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;

- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for Bury LA to illustrate the extent to which responses from Bury students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 6 Bury LA students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

Bury responses
The majority of participants interviewed from Bury told us that their motivation to study at M level was career development in order to develop leadership skills. Of the participants interviewed 2 were in the process, and 2 had recently moved into a middle management/senior leadership role. They considered the PPD course as beneficial to these career changes.

All Bury LA students were fully funded by the Local Authority, except supply costs.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

Bury responses
The main barriers identified by participants interviewed were time (3) and child care (2). Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses to participants included running twilight sessions at a later time (3), introducing a short residential aspect to the course to allow participants to block-book time out of school (1) and more on-line support for the course (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA.15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for

half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

Bury responses
The majority of participants (3) interviewed said that they had found out about the Bury courses via information available in their schools; 2 others had found out about it through word-of-mouth. Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses included through school publications (2) and LA publications (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

Bury responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included improved management skills (3), increased confidence (1) and improved teaching (2). Participants also reported impact on their pupils (1) and one student has been disseminating findings to colleagues (1). One participant said that they had not experienced any impact yet.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with any supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, the Head of PPD, the Head of Academic Regional Development and two senior lecturers. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Department of Professional Development at CCCU offers a wide range of Masters programmes within a common framework. Programmes are taught in three self-contained and certificated annual stages:

- Stage 1 (Postgraduate Certificate);
- Stage 2 (Postgraduate Diploma); and
- Stage 3 (Masters).

Nevertheless, the M level programme allows a great deal of flexibility. Timings are not constrained to the academic year and teachers can spread their studies over more than a year. Previous work completed at M level either at Canterbury or elsewhere is fully accredited (up to half the programme, 90 out of the 180 credits required). Accreditation of prior learning of professional programmes such as 'NPQH' and 'Leading from the Middle' is also possible. The current PPD provision has evolved over the past decade and is part of a long tradition at CCCU of providing high quality school-based research for teachers in the region. CCCU has built up a good reputation for this type of work and has established many contacts through networking. For example, CCCU works with the Faculty of Education at Cambridge University to produce 'Teacher Leadership' – a journal of teacher-led development work.

The university has created various forms of partnership: strategic (marketing and recruiting), operational (delivery by local authority (LA) personnel) and advanced (school based groups taught by university tutors and school staff who have already attained MAs). The advanced partnership is a new pilot initiative and is part of a university-wide initiative to extend participation by including local people. Canterbury's partners include LAs (Kent, Buckinghamshire, Medway and Newham) as well as national organisations, such as the National College of School Leadership and the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth, and smaller institutions, such as schools. Normally, 15 participants are needed to secure a viable group. The Canterbury Action Research Network (CANTERNET) brings participants of local

groups together at conferences and workshops where they can also network with well-known speakers and researchers. CANTERNET also publicises teachers' accounts of their M level enquiry and development work through 'The Enquirer' journal.

The PPD programme is primarily locally based, with seminars and tutorials held in schools and professional development centres etc. Typically, two-hour twilight tutorial sessions take place on week days, several times a term. But whilst CCCU tutors view it as important to reach out to teachers by running courses at their schools, they also actively encourage teachers to feel a part of the university, by encouraging them to make use of the library and through inviting them to conferences, study days and seminars held on Saturdays at the various university campuses (Canterbury, Chatham, Broadstairs, Hastings and Tunbridge Wells). Online facilities are another important component of the programme. All courses and assessment activities are carefully planned and negotiated to ensure they fit with teachers' and schools' needs and priorities. Current favoured themes (from across the programme) are: creativity, emotional literacy, transition, pupil voice, inclusion, and subject-related foci.

Having a range of partners working in collaboration with CCCU enables the conjoining of groups to share academic and professional interests. For example, one programme director attended a LA conference on transition and was invited to talk about the MA opportunities to further develop this work. A number of teachers expressed an interest and began to develop their expertise in transition on the MA programme. The following year they were invited to present their research and enhanced practice which evolved as a result of the MA to another local authority conference, which resulted in them forming a local authority group of experts on transition. This has enhanced their expertise, and standing in the local authority, whilst their schools benefited from their development and the university and local authority engaged in collaborative work. This model is being currently developed with a group of teachers who support children who have suffered bereavement. The university is working collaboratively with the local authority and the charity 'Slide Away' to enhance the work undertaken by these teachers.

Recruitment and participation

Provision is developed and marketed through LA clusters. All programme marketing literature highlights the value of PPD in terms of both pupil impact and benefits for staff and schools. The recruitment process also involves targeting initiatives within geographical areas as well as targeting individual teachers and schools. Sometimes, programme directors have to be creative about the way they recruit participants. For example, one school had 11 teachers wanting to take part – four short of the minimum number required. Canvassing the feeder primary schools added another six and made the group viable.

The university finds that many former PGCE students return to study at M level and those with leadership responsibilities often co-develop courses with CCCU tutors. Ex-students frequently recruit colleagues, so word-of-mouth is viewed as a powerful recruitment tool. Staff at the university aim to build strong, sustained relationships with students, believing *"We don't sell a product, we sell a relationship"*.

Currently, around 475 teachers are enrolled on the PPD programme. There are a number of strategies in place designed to make courses accessible to more teachers:

- most of the courses and programmes are run at school-based venues and at times to suit teachers – courses are run during school time, after school (twilight and evening), weekends, half-terms and during the Easter and summer school holidays;
- weekend conferences and Easter and summer schools take place at CCCU sites throughout the region (Thanet, Canterbury, Tunbridge Wells, Medway and South East London);
- virtual learning environments, with live links to internet sites, academic papers, session notes and a discussion board have been developed. These enable teachers to engage with course content and processes any time and anywhere;
- school venues are provided with book boxes for easy access to core materials;
- hand-in times and deadlines are negotiated within the validation frameworks;
- participants are given access to library learning resources at other higher education institutions, whilst inter-library loans systems enable participants to order books from the CCCU library at a distance including through local libraries; and
- CCCU computer services enable on-line reserving and renewal of books.

Engagement in CPD processes

The aim of the programme is to equip participants with the knowledge, skills and understanding they will need to initiate and develop research projects in their own school contexts. The programme makes substantial reference to issues in research and its relationship to professional practice. At every stage of the programme, participants are encouraged to draw on research and policy development material that relates to their particular professional contexts and interests. Use of computer technology, in the form of a virtual learning environment is an essential element of each course. Participants often work collaboratively on projects in school-based groups. They are also required to network, share and disseminate ideas and good practice.

Learning outcomes and impact

The PPD programme has improvements to teaching and learning clearly at its core and impact is embedded right from the start. A highlight of the programme is the 'Towards a Discourse of Impact' pack designed by the MA Framework team which enables them to gather perspectives on impact from participants, tutors and LAs. The impact pack contains questionnaires that request information about:

- dissemination of expertise (presenting at conferences, publication of practice and findings);
- cluster and consortium initiatives that have arisen as a result of the programme;
- the development and evaluation of new practices;
- collaborative working;
- enhanced teachers' and pupils' motivation, knowledge and skills;

- effects on the school as an organisation (structures for communication, shared leadership, evidence to underpin practice);
- coherence of values; and
- effects beyond the school.

Participants are required to evaluate provision and outcomes in terms of how they feel their own practice has been affected. Their own progress is related to initial self-audits against National Standards. When evaluating their projects, they are required to draw on evidence of pupil progress and attainment. Assessment tasks, particularly portfolios, contain personal reflections and evidence of impact on teaching and more importantly learning. Presentations made by course participants at CCCU and other conferences require an emphasis on impact. These frequently reveal evidence of greater confidence, self-esteem and emotional understanding on the part of both the pupils and the teachers. CCCU report how teachers are often surprised at the impact they can make on the whole school and at the influence they can have in working collaboratively with colleagues or in sharing good practice at conferences and seminars. Participants from across the programme have commented, for example:

> *"I have found observing children for the assignment very valuable – I know how to assess their literacy competency and can build upon it".*
>
> *"The children are really keen on literacy now – I involve them more and make the experience a more creative and demanding one".*
>
> *"There has been a huge impact. It has really switched both the children and myself onto different ways to improve learning".*
>
> *"The emphasis on understanding how children learn to read and develop writing has made a profound impact on my practice and their standards".*
>
> *"The research I've undertaken and the course as a whole has revolutionised my practice in the classroom; now my children are motivated and engaged learners".*
>
> *"My skills have improved which has changed the way I look at what I do in the classroom and why I do it".*
>
> *"Far more aware of learning and do find myself analysing things and others more".*
>
> *"The course allowed me to focus on the issues and actions that I need to plan to improve performance and move the team forward".*
>
> *"It has given me the confidence to plan for the future as a subject leader".*
>
> *"I am much more reflective about everything I do from meetings to teaching".*
>
> *"It has helped me improve my time management".*
>
> *"The MA has given me the confidence to completely restructure my Department".*

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- Keep up the funding.
- Recruitment figures are measured in relation to the academic year, but recruitment rolls on throughout the year – there is no typical academic year pattern.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team-building, self-assessment,

pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars, to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the

intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 artnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for Canterbury Christchurch University to illustrate the extent to which responses from CCCU students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 2 Canterbury Christchurch University students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

CCCU responses

The motivation of participants interviewed from Canterbury Christchurch to take part in M level study varied from dissatisfaction with their current situation to wanting more specific SENCO training.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of

funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

CCCU responses
Interviewees identified funding, time and competing demands from home as the main barriers they faced.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes
Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

CCCU responses
Only one participant interviewed could tell us about how they found out about their course and that was from a flyer in school.

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study, e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

CCCU responses
Only one participant reported that as a result of taking part in PPD they have reorganised SEN provision in school, introducing a 'provision map' for each class.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Centre for Innovation in Maths Teaching (CIMT)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site including video clips of student classroom practice and school/departmental impact reports. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with the Pogramme Manager and Course Tutor. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The partnership consists of CIMT, University of Plymouth, and University Practice Departments (UPDs) – primary schools and secondary school maths departments which act as hubs for networks of schools, and in which CIMT delivers programmes. In 2005-6 the number of schools in the network was 26, and coverage was national. Since beginning PPD provision, CIMT has ceased its association with Exeter University, and is now affiliated to the education department of the University of Plymouth. Programme leaders have developed a system of M level accreditation which is more easily accommodated within the flexible approach of Plymouth's Integrated Master's Programme, and completed the move in the summer of 2006. With LAs playing a smaller role in professional development for teachers, CIMT has found schools welcome the in-house model of CPD it provides, and forms partnerships directly with them.

CIMT is a relatively small operation - one Centre manager, two tutors, and one administration assistant. The Centre manager and tutors often work in schools and can therefore use this first hand experience and the outcomes of meetings with key staff to shape programme design. This has led, for example, to a mode of delivery based on whole-school/department collaboration, which the partnership has found to be the most effective way of sustaining innovation in practice and professional learning. That is to say PPD from this partnership is only accessible to practitioners whose whole department/school participates in the programme.

The establishment of UPDs has created a national network of centres in which the programme can be delivered, increasing reach and accessibility. Often schools work in collaboration with UPDs to form local networks. This has fostered inter-school support and observation of lessons.

CIMT reviews programme design and delivery based on:

- meetings with UPDs;
- its network of contacts with academic specialists both in the UK and internationally;
- discussions with specialist organisations, such as SSAT; and

- experience in other mathematics projects they are involved in, in particular the Mathematics Enhancement Programme, which itself grew out of an international analysis of maths teaching.

CIMT's international projects provide opportunities for teachers on the PPD programme to experience effective practice from other countries. The programme promotes, in particular, the interactive techniques used in Eastern Europe, but also encourages students to broaden their horizons when exploring new practice. One primary mathematics coordinator, for example, visited schools in Japan to observe their Lesson Study model of CPD in action.

The partnership programme consists of three modules:

- collaborative practice for enhancing mathematics teaching;
- effective mathematics teaching; and
- teaching mathematical foundations, applications and enrichment.

Each module normally consists of three two-hour input sessions held over a term, but tutors can be flexible on timings. At the end of the first two sessions students are given assignments which require them to implement new practice and involve observation, reading, writing critiques, and impact reports.

The modules carry 30 credit points at Masters level each, and students have the opportunity to use credits gained towards completion of a full Masters degree at the University of Plymouth, which can be achieved on successful completion of four modules and a dissertation. A maximum of two modules can be completed in one year.

TDA PPD funding means that the modules can be delivered free of charge. CIMT regards itself primarily as a research and development centre, and finds PPD funding a particularly advantageous arrangement, as it enables CIMT to put research into practice and build the PPD programme on research evidence.

Recruitment and participation

CIMT has used its existing schools networks to promote the PPD programme. Marketing also takes place via the University of Plymouth and on its own website. The partnership recruited 163 students in 2005-6 – more than double the anticipated number.

The salient feature of the CIMT PPD programme is its uncompromising approach to collaboration as the most effective way to ensure *"buy in"* from all participants and school leaders. Programme leaders believe this has been achieved by only offering the modules to whole schools (primary), or whole departments (secondary). This approach achieves a level of commitment which means the CPD becomes a part of school improvement plans, and adequate time is allocated for it to be carried out. In addition, the whole-school/department approach ensures teachers, who may in other circumstances drop out of the course, are *"locked in"* to the process, and receive high levels of support from their colleagues and school leaders to continue.

Once a school has made a request to participate in the programme, CIMT staff assess the school's maths provision through a data analysis procedure developed by CIMT – Mathematics Performance and Progress Analysis. This ensures discussions with school leaders are based on an understanding of the school's starting point, and

what needs the programme should address. CIMT staff make a visit in person to the school, during which they assess a school's readiness to undertake the course. If for any reason they do not feel the school is ready to get started, (for example, because of a lack of consensus among staff to take part) the school is advised to link with another school/department to prepare for entry later.

The modules are flexible enough for schools to decide on a focus appropriate for their starting point. One school, for example, focussed on developing general teaching strategies (use of TA support, questioning, strategies for pupil engagement etc) within the maths classroom.

Programme leaders are aware that the collaborative approach to CPD has the potential to expose 'weaker' teachers, and strategies and support mechanisms for dealing with this are discussed in the early stages with school leaders. As teachers implement new practice they can draw down lesson plans from the CIMT website for additional scaffolding.

Engagement in CPD processes

The modules are designed around three, typically two-hour, 'input' sessions. The first phase of each module introduces students to the established research findings, and students are encouraged to reflect on their own practice in the light of their exploration of the evidence base. Students are also encouraged to search for additional relevant material in libraries and on the web. The CIMT website itself has a comprehensive weblinks page. The modules are designed to ensure students:

- are able to identify and evaluate educational concepts and issues;
- engage in critical debate, drawing on theory, research and practice;
- identify and justify solutions to educational problems;
- contribute to policy, practice and professional and curriculum development in the workplace;
- critically evaluate the relevance of theory to practice;
- synthesise relevant literature; and
- use research data.

Students are encouraged to reflect critically on their own teaching and that of others, as well as to share ideas and thinking on strategies to overcome problems. With help from CIMT staff, departments make arrangements for taking collaborative CPD forward. This typically involves establishing smaller groups of 3-4 teachers who take it in turns to observe each other during the course of the programme. Introduction to and implementation of new practice typically follows a cycle of:

- presentation, reading and video demonstrations;
- joint planning;
- classroom practice;
- review; and
- assignment and feedback to whole group.

Tutors encourage reflection on practice by, for example, arranging for students to video their lessons and then critically evaluate them as a group. As this can be quite an exposing experience, CIMT provides initial guidance on how to go about this by presenting and having students discuss a DVD example of a review session.

CIMT also introduces participants to data analysis procedures, developing their understanding of how to use data-based evidence to support evaluation of small-scale initiatives in the classroom.

Learning outcomes and impact

Students complete module evaluation forms in which they are asked to comment on how the modules have supported them to translate their learning into practice, and how that has had an impact on pupils' performance. In addition, school leaders (headteacher, head of department etc) complete an impact report on the PPD programme. Those interviewed for this report highlight the support they have received from CIMT in establishing collaborative CPD as being more effective and sustainable than traditional INSET. One head of department noted, *"Although each member of the department went on an external INSET course last year, they didn't really help as they weren't applicable at this college and more time was spent travelling than training ... Both individually and as a department, the collaborative practice method for CPD has transformed the way we think about our teaching and the planning of our lessons."*

At the end of the programme, schools repeat the Mathematics Performance and Progress Analysis, carried out at the time the schools applies to participate in the programme, to assess distance travelled as a result of participating in CPD. CIMT reports that all participating schools over the period 2005-6 showed improvements in national test scores. Although programme leaders note that it is difficult to ascertain to what extent improved pupil performance is a result of the PPD programme, this evidence together with participant and school impact reports indicate overall benefits.

CIMT staff seek to assure quality through:

- the establishment of UPDs on the basis of the quality of the teaching within the school;
- visits to schools applying to participate in the PPD programme to ensure they are in a position to benefit from the programme. CIMT staff advise schools on what steps they need to take in order to prepare for participation;
- meetings directly with UPDs, and an annual national meeting open to all participants in the programme;
- examination of school reviews and OFSTED reports for reference to CPD impact;
- baseline and end-of-programme data analysis, including pupil performance; and
- the senior management team at each participating school is invited to provide evidence of impact and effectiveness of provision.

In addition, the programme is subject to evaluation of quality by the appointed external examiner, subject to the QA procedures of the University of Plymouth.

Summary of messages to the TDA

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team-building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);

- improved knowledge of school processes (6) and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term "self reflection" or "reflection" as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for CIMT to illustrate the extent to which responses

from CIMT students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 3 CIMT students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

CIMT responses
All participants interviewed from CIMT explained that their primary motivation for taking part in the M level study was their genuine interest and passion for maths and that from doing the course they hoped to improve the quality of their teaching.

Participants have received funding from their school and supply cover to release them from teaching in order to study.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and

distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

CIMT responses
The participants interviewed were generally very positive about the course and CIMT, stating that the only minor barrier that they have faced has been the reorganisation of time and staff timetables. One suggestion for increasing the accessibility of the course was the provision of funding for resources and activities to take place in school.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

CIMT responses
The participants interviewed from CIMT explained that they had found out about the courses through existing links (2) and from the website (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses include tutors making presentations in school (1), sending information to headteachers (1) and advertising through subject associations (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

CIMT responses

Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice (2), reflective practice (1) and pupils being more enthusiastic and motivated (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Centre for Literacy in Primary Education (CLPE)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with any supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with the Partnership Manager and course tutors. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The partnership consists of the Centre for Literacy in Primary Education (CLPE, a registered charity and the lead partner organisation), two higher education institutions (HEIs): Christchurch Canterbury and the University of East London, and a number of London local authorities (LAs) including Southwark, Lambeth, Redbridge, Newham, and Lewisham. The partnership holds joint planning and review meetings through the Training and Course Development Group, which is made up of stakeholders representing LAs, schools, and the HEIs. CLPE believes it benefits from working with two HEIs, which offer different literacy specialisms and thereby enable the provision of a wide range of courses. In addition to the formal partnership arrangements, the HEIs provide support and advice on a day-to-day basis. The HEIs also offer a progression route for students who wish to go on to achieve the Postgraduate Diploma or Masters degree.

The nature of the relationship between CLPE and local authorities is changing, as responsibilities for CPD shift from local authority to school level. Until now local authorities have identified practitioners who would benefit from attending the programme, and consultations between CLPE and LA inspectors and advisers had a more direct influence on this process. Under the new framework, there is a greater emphasis on schools identifying their own development needs. Nevertheless, programme leaders feel that partnership organisation, such as that which exists in Lewisham, has the potential to accommodate individual school needs while maintaining authority-level coherence and support. Here the LA encourages and facilitates schools to work collaboratively in order to identify priorities across schools. The LA in turn offers funds to help schools achieve common goals.

CLPE itself has accumulated knowledge and understanding of issues in raising school achievement, grounded in extensive experience of leading school improvement projects, for example as part of Education Action Zone (EAZ) programmes, conducting classroom research and publishing the outcomes.

CLPE has developed a series of Post Graduate Certificate in Literacy and Learning programmes, each consisting of two modules. These include Effective Teaching in the Early Years (ETEY), Raising Literacy Standards, ICT Literacy and Learning, and the Role of the English Coordinator (REC). Each course carries 60 credits at M level,

and leads to a Postgraduate Certificate on successful completion of a portfolio consisting of:

- a school and classroom-based reflective review of practice (1000 words);
- a critical review of identified areas within language and literacy (2000 words);
- school-based assignments (2000 words);
- a self-evaluation of own development and practice (1000 words);
- a final presentation (1000 words); and
- a final essay (5000 words).

Each programme consists of 10 whole-day sessions which are delivered over three terms, and take place every 2-3 weeks.

Students completing CLPE modules can continue working towards a Masters qualification by enrolling on courses at the partner universities.

TDA funding enables the partnership to subsidise course fees, which are currently £525 per Postgraduate Certificate programme.

Recruitment and participation

The PPD programme offers accreditation which supports teachers to progress in their career, in particular in relation to the Role of the English Coordinator module. Often teachers register having made an individual decision, but also headteachers may recommend that a teacher attends, for example, if they need help in fulfilling a new role. In addition to standard marketing, including website and leafleting, CLPE also uses dissemination events, where students present their work to fellow practitioners, school leaders and LA personnel, to raise the profile of the programme.

CLPE is taking a range of measures to help overcome these barriers, by, for example:

- offering different modes of study including school visits, after-school tutorial sessions, and e-mail tutorial support;
- integration of assessment tasks with regular course assignments to ease the route to accreditation;
- involving headteachers in the pre-course planning, and post-course evaluation processes, to ensure the outcomes of the programme are aligned to their whole-school needs; and
- delaying the beginning of the course beyond September in an effort to maximise recruitment and allow time for liaison with schools.

In recent years, CLPE has experienced a considerable drop in recruitment: only two programmes ran in 2006/7, and 28 part-time students were recruited against anticipated provision for 90. Programme leaders believe the reasons for this to be:

- increased LA and government funded training for literacy teaching which is less demanding in terms of time and therefore more attractive to busy teachers and heads who do not feel they can afford to release experienced staff;
- the demands to the individual of completing the large number of assignments required at M Level; and
- reluctance among some school leaders to release teachers, who in many cases are key personnel.

CLPE notes an additional problem of a reluctance among organisations to fund expensive professional development, when there is a risk that staff might move on as a result of becoming qualified. They cite Westminster LA as an example, who used to promote participation in the Effective Teaching in the Early Years course, but ceased doing so as so many practitioners left the borough after qualifying. Now the local authority prefers to invest in Specialist Teaching Assistants, as these tend to remain in the same location.

Engagement in CPD processes

Students meet with tutors for 10 whole-day sessions during the course of the one-year programme. Activities at these sessions include:

- analysis of video examples of good practice;
- preparation for, analysis of, and dissemination of classroom-based research; and
- analysis of policy documents containing literacy and performance data.

Course tutors encourage collaborative practice among students. In seminars students are assigned to groups of interest, of about 3-4 per group, and take turns in preparing seminar content and presenting to the other course members. Programme leaders understand the importance of within-school collaborative support, and encourage heads to send pairs of teachers onto the programme, rather than single individuals. However, for reasons mentioned earlier, this is not always practicable.

Assignments which students complete between input sessions are designed so that students critically evaluate their own practice, experiment with new practice through action research, and review academic research, inspection and policy sources. In addition, students are required to keep a journal in which to log and reflect on their own professional learning. Students have direct access to resources through CLPE's own library of 25,000 items of texts and resources, and are also provided with an Athens password as part of the partnership arrangements with the HEIs.

In order to encourage professional learning across sites, the programme coordinators arrange observation visits for students to schools where good practice is taking place. Increasingly schools are charging for this service (for example, one school charges £50 per student), which has a knock-on effect for course costs.

Learning outcomes and impact

CLPE collects data on students' starting points, as well as impact data on the completion of modules. Headteachers whose staff participate on the programme are asked to identify school priorities in a pre-course questionnaire, and then invited to feed back on the impact of the programme from the school's perspective once staff have completed the programme. Equally, individual teachers themselves identify their own professional and school priorities before starting the course, and set their own targets for the course. Students track their progress by completing a questionnaire at the beginning and end of the programme, indicating where they assess they rank on indicators covering 'confidence', 'experience', 'use of strategies', 'knowledge and understanding', and 'reflectiveness'. Students are required to demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of:

- their subject area;
- government curriculum requirements;

- children's learning and pedagogy; and
- how to share experience and successful practice.

Students also complete a self-evaluation form in which they describe what they have gained from the course and areas for development. Completed evaluation forms indicate students gain most from increased confidence and knowledge of strategies:

> "*it has provided me with lots of practical ideas for reception teaching, and more confidence to eloquently verbalise my feelings about Early Years practice*."

Students are introduced to methods of collecting and interpreting school and pupil data as a way of assessing the impact of their changing practice against their individual targets. To help them collect and analyse data, students are provided with a variety of assessment and observational frameworks, which they are encouraged to use to collect baseline and end data. The action research element of the programme entails a case study of an individual child's, or group of children's, progress.

Internal QA procedures include:

- reference to national guidance on CPD and external programme evaluations;
- a CLPE quality assurance manager who attends sample course sessions to evaluate delivery against the agreed framework;
- review meetings of the Training and Course Development Group (described above);
- survey and evaluation evidence to shape the planning of provision and pattern of programmes;
- attendance by HEI representatives at course sessions;
- sessional written evaluations by students and tutors, and full mid-course and end-of-course written evaluations by students and headteachers; and
- internal marking and double-marking of submitted coursework within agreed criteria, sample moderation and, in some cases, second marking by HEI.

External QA procedures consist of:

- HEI external examiner moderation of candidates' course submissions; and
- HEI external examiner attendance at end-of-course presentations.

Summary of messages to the TDA

CLPE welcomes the opportunity to feed back to TDA on the value the PPD programme adds to existing CPD provision, and hopes that the evaluation exercise will result in TDA being in a position to offer guidance to partnerships on how to configure and provide courses appropriate for current conditions in early years and primary education. In particular, CLPE would ask TDA to consider:

- ways of countering the backwash effect of competition, especially where this leads to heads focusing primarily on their school's position in league tables. Often this means heads are less willing to release good staff for development programmes which entail any length of absence from the school; and
- the necessity for courses to always be linked to accreditation. There is a tension between what schools are asking for – whole-school development – and the need to accredit individuals through the programme.

With regard to the latter issue, CLPE points to the 'Power of Reading as the kind of development project which TDA could usefully support, which addresses both whole-

school (even authority wide) and individual development needs. Programme leaders are also concerned that they are overly conscientious with regard to ensuring that all programme participants complete all aspects of the course work. They hope that the outcomes of the TDA PPD evaluation will give them a feel for how other partnerships are faring in terms of pass rates, and if there is scope for teachers to attend the course without fulfilling all the elements necessary to obtain accreditation.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites

teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and

- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for CLPE to illustrate the extent to which responses from CLPE students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 7 CLPE students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

CLPE responses
A key motivating factor for participants on the CLPE courses has been encouragement by colleagues and senior staff to take part in the M level courses, with 5 of participants interviewed giving this as a factor influencing their participation.

6 participants had received funding from either their school or LA to support their study.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of

meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

CLPE responses
The main barriers identified by the interviews with participants were time (5), juggling the competing demands of work with study (2), studying at M level (3) and access to libraries and books (2). The majority of participants interviewed considered that the courses provided by CLPE were accessible with relevant support from tutors.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

CLPE responses
The majority (4), of participants interviewed from CLPE had found out about the course from their headteacher. Others had found out through colleagues (2), website (1) and existing links (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses include via websites (3), through the LA (2), TES and other publications (1), mailing to schools (1) and directly to teachers (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their

practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

CLPE responses

Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (7), reflective practice (1), increased confidence (1) and increased theory and knowledge (1). One participant has been disseminating findings to colleagues.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

College of St. Mark and St. John (South West Initiative for Training (SWIfT))

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: programme managers, programme tutors, and students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The South West Initiative for Training (SWIfT) is a partnership of two higher education institutions (HEIs) College of St. Mark and St. John (Marjon), and the University of Plymouth which lead the partnership, and nine local authorities (LAs) (Bournemouth, Cornwall and Isles of Scilly, Devon, Dorset, Plymouth, Poole, Torbay, Somerset, and North Somerset). Formal arrangements for communicating development needs and consulting on programme design take place through the SWIfT Management Group, consisting of three representatives from each of the HEIs, and one representative from each of the nine LAs. This group meets four times a year, reviewing the programme and making suggestions for change. In addition, partnership leaders feel that they benefit from the long-term working relationships that have developed among educationists over years of work in the Southwest.

The partnership benefits from the wide range of provision the two HEIs are able to offer. The modules provided by Marjon are designed to accommodate the areas of interest and developmental needs of the individual student while providing guided learning on themes including learning and development, e-learning and leadership. The University of Plymouth offers over 50 ‘taught’ modules covering SEN, Early Years, music, outdoor education, post-compulsory and adult education, and professional development. Plymouth takes advantage of the range of venues the partnership provides by delivering the same modules at locations as far apart as Truro, Street, and Bournemouth, thus providing access to a larger number of teachers.

The modules differ in the number of credits they carry: the Plymouth modules are validated at 30 credit M Level, but are offered as a double registration to meet the 60 credit provision. Marjon modules carry 60 credits. Credits are transferable within the partnership, and may be ‘cashed in’ for an award related to value of credits obtained (Certificate, or Diploma). Having achieved 180 credits and on completion of a dissertation, students can graduate with a Master of Arts (Education) at Plymouth, or a Master of Education (University of Exeter EXON) at Marjon. The partnership uses PPD funding to subsidise modules for serving teachers, so that in most cases there are no fees to pay.

In addition to their main post-graduate programmes, both HEIs provide bespoke modules and accreditation at M Level for schools seeking to gain recognition for staff involved in enquiry-based development. Often these are based on school and/or local priorities. The bases for these arrangements are the 'school agreements' which set out the content and intended outcomes of the module. Through this approach the partnership aims to create learning communities which draw on the partnership for specialist input and accreditation. Increasingly schools are developing the infrastructure for PPD to take place by, for example, developing learning forums which encourage teacher research. There is also a movement towards school partnerships, such as the Plymouth NLC which fosters collaboration among primary schools. However, this is not happening consistently across all schools, and depends on how well senior leaders promote it.

The pool of over 150 university approved tutors (UATs) means that the partnership can be very flexible in the type of support, specialist knowledge, time and place of delivery it can offer. The UATs are often serving, or recently-serving, practitioners, or education professionals working with the local authorities, and bring with them an understanding of local needs. In addition to advising on the designing of modules, local authorities are also active in brokering courses with schools.

TDA PPD funding enables SWIfT to offer many of its courses free of charge to participants with QTS.

Recruitment and participation

The involvement of local authorities in the partnership, along with course delivery in schools, advertisement of the programme on the University of Plymouth and Marjon websites, and frequent distribution of publicity materials mean that practitioners are made aware of the programme through several channels. The partnership recruited 1305 students in 2005-6. Programme managers do not feel there are any particular difficulties recruiting students and indeed believe it could reach more if more resources were available.

SWIfT regards dissemination of CPD outcomes an essential element of the programme. Tutors actively encourage students to share their work in staff meetings, professional associations, and regional and national conferences. Local authority personnel also encourage dissemination at events and, in Cornwall, through the 'Inform' journal, which showcases professional development projects.

partnership leaders are confident the programme is meeting its objectives in terms of increasing teachers' knowledge base, and supporting their development as reflective practitioners. There is an emphasis on aligning the course with the priorities of the student and/or school. The 'school agreements' negotiated between the partnership and individual schools ensure the programme:

- is meeting the improvement needs of the school;
- has the support of senior staff;
- helps participants to address real issues; and
- is delivered at times and in ways that fit in with the working patterns of the school staff.

In most cases university approved tutors (UATs) deliver the modules on schools' premises, and become very familiar with the day-to-day circumstances and concerns of those students who work in the school. However, it appears that this 'problem-

solving' feature of the programme is the main motivation to participate for many, as tutors have often noticed a reluctance among some students to progress from initial research and action to formal accreditation.

In order to encourage students to obtain full accreditation, programme leaders have taken steps to facilitate this process. They are particularly sensitive to the starting points of teachers who are embarking on courses at M Level, and have designed the modules to offer diversity of access and style of engagement. Participants are supported by a blend of teaching and distance learning to meet individual need. The course handbooks give a thorough introduction to carrying out research. The handbook provided by Marjon, in particular, is very user-friendly in its design and language, offering headline advice on such things as deciding on a focus, selecting research methods and completing assignments.

Engagement in CPD processes

The courses are designed to provide a firm grounding in research and classroom enquiry techniques, while at the same time maintaining a focus on classroom practice. There is an emphasis on developing evaluation, critical thinking, and research skills among students to help them meet the rigorous demands at M-level, and provide them with the grounding they need to obtain a full Masters degree. To assist students in this, the University of Plymouth has developed the Research in Education (RESINED) online resources available to all participants; it provides advice and information on all areas of research theory and practice. In addition, students receive dedicated tutorial support on designing and writing up the research elements of the programme.

Modes of programme delivery vary, depending on, for example, time restraints on students. Modules delivered on school sites take place at times negotiated in the school agreements, and may involve a combination of school visits by the UAT and e-tutorials. In addition, the University of Plymouth offers a range of modules as part of its Integrated Masters Programme, which take place on and off campus at pre-specified times. Typically these are a series of twilight sessions over one semester, but times are flexible to encourage participation. The Outdoor Learning module, for example, takes place on two Saturdays, and includes online directed tasks and e-mail support between sessions.

During input sessions students engage in collaborative group activities, role play, and simulations. They are encouraged to observe each other in the classroom, and collaboration is encouraged by tutors and schools. One school, for example, has established professional enquiry 'pods' (consisting of 3 groups of 3 teachers), which investigate a particular area on the school agenda. In another case, a primary languages teacher on the programme developed a MFL learning community and received financial support from Devon LA to carry out dissemination and coaching activities.

Module assignments are designed to provide a supporting structure to help students link theory with practice. The University of Plymouth enables participants to consider different approaches to completing assignments, such as presenting a modified reflective journal or portfolio. In all cases students are required to demonstrate 'critical exploration, engagement, and reflection on data.' The Marjon programme requires students to compile a professional development portfolio, in which they critically reflect on their current practice and role, and plan for future CPD. It also

includes a coaching and mentoring module to help students develop their skills in disseminating practice and supporting colleagues.

Learning outcomes and impact

The partnership monitors impact using a variety of sources, including:

- student assignments;
- school evaluations; and
- LA reports.

The partnership's analysis of course evaluations identifies 'raised awareness' of their practice and an ability to 'critically evaluate' their teaching as the most common benefits cited by students. Other benefits cited by students include increased knowledge of child development, their subject area and related pedagogy.

Students are also required to identify the impact of their participation in the programme on pupil performance. This is based on their observations of levels of interest and motivation, pupil classroom behaviour, and/or comparison of baseline and end-of-programme performance data. In some schools headteachers have made links between participation in the programme and improved pupil performance. This satisfaction at senior management level is reflected by the extension of school agreements (some now in their fourth year).

Programme leaders, however, are wary of making simplistic connections between CPD activity and test results, and have commissioned independent research into how to evaluate the impact of CPD, based on their own programme. It is intended the outcome of this research will provide students with an even finer understanding of and tools for carrying out impact analysis.

SWIfT's quality assurance processes include:

- school agreements between the partnership and participating schools;
- programme evaluations from students, tutors and programme directors;
- assignment double marking, moderation and tutors' QA team meetings;
- local authority liaison meetings on programme effectiveness;
- initial training, induction, and 'buddying' with experienced tutors for new UATs;
- annual 4.5 days development for all UATs; and annual partnership conferences; and
- peer observation among tutors.

SWIfT also refers to external reports, such as OFSTED reports and TDA surveys as part of its assessment of the programme.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- The SWIfT partnership recognises the fact that teaching is now an all graduate profession, therefore of necessity, real professional development should be postgraduate. Current funding and entitlement is inadequate to secure this for all.
- There are conflicts of purpose and lack of clarity between the GTC TLA provision and PPD. Either TLA should be abolished or there needs to be clearer alignments.

- M level has a national currency through QAA. This is not the case for other awards that teachers might seek. The PPD programme has a coherence which needs wider acknowledgement from Ministers and Government departments related to teaching and schools.
- The TDA need to be mindful of the emerging 14-19 provision and QTLS status. Shouldn't the latter be entitled now to PPD?
- The impact evidence demonstrated by PPD needs louder expression and dissemination.
- How should/does PPD relate to Childrens' Workforce Development, the entitlement of other professionals and the Integrated Qualifications Framework?

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and

- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for SWIfT/Marjon to illustrate the extent to which responses from SWIfT/Marjon students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 10 SWIfT/Marjon Students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/ leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

SWIfT/Marjon responses

A range of motivating factors for involvement in M level study was gained from interviews with participants on the College of St. Mark and St. John courses. 4 participants were involved in a school project or school improvement project of which M level study was a key element, another 3 participants were doing the course as part of their career development.

7 participants interviewed received funding from either their school or the College of St. Mark and St. John; the remaining 3 were self-funding their study.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

SWIfT/Marjon responses

The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers that they had experienced including time (7), balancing the competing demands of study with family (4), competing demands of work (3), writing at M level (2), accessing the library (1) and maintaining motivation (1). Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course included sabbatical time from school (3), providing funding for resources and work in school (2), support from school (1). 3 participants were keen that the on-line resources could be improved, while 1 participant was recommending less emphasis on on-line resources for those less technologically savvy participants.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

SWIfT/Marjon responses

The participants interviewed from the College of St. Mark and St. John explained that they had found out about the course through two key routes; existing links with the college (3) and through the tutors on the courses (4). Others had found out about the courses via websites (2), LA (2) and colleague (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course include mailing direct to schools (1), meeting with tutors directly (2), advertising in the TES and similar publications (1) and regional meetings (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

SWIfT/Marjon responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included impact on teaching practice (4), role in school (1), helped putting learning into practice (1), findings of research has been adopted by school or incorporated into the whole-school improvement strategy (2), made a film shown on Teachers TV (1) and delivering training and INSET (2).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Design and Technology Association (DATA)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Assistant Chief Executive and Partnership Coordinator, from the Design and Technology (D & T) Association, and the Course Leader at the University of Central England. The researcher also attended one day of a ten-day primary course run by Staffordshire local authority (LA). Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

Provision is offered by the Design and Technology Association in partnership with the University of Central England (primary) and Sheffield Hallam University (secondary). The association considers them to be the main players in primary and secondary D & T provision in the country. Courses are located throughout the country, generally in association with local authorities, using a group of national experts as regional tutors. For example, primary provision is taking place in partnership with 10 different local authorities in 2006-07, from Sunderland and Lancashire to Hertfordshire and Cornwall.

Courses are offered at Postgraduate Certificate (aimed at becoming subject leaders), Postgraduate Diploma and MA levels. The MA has recently been revised to increase its flexibility and offer a wider range of modules, as well as allowing more flexibility in assignments and assessment.

The partnership came into being because the partners, all of which had experience of PPD in the area, saw the mutual benefits of collaboration. It is overseen and administered by the D & T Association, which is the only Teaching Association involved in funded PPD provision. In terms of formal structures, it has a Partnership Coordinator who is responsible for the administration, and financing of the provision, as well as the assessment of its impact. The D & T Association's Assistant Chief Executive, Andy Mitchell, is also closely involved in overseeing provision, having formerly been involved in the delivery of programmes at Sheffield Hallam. The delivery of provision is the universities' responsibility. The partnership also extends informally to the local authorities with whom the partnership works and the group of regional tutors who deliver courses locally. The partnership's submission document emphasises that LA staff, who primarily deliver the course, ensure that a comprehensive audit is undertaken at the start of each course to ensure that participants' needs are met. It was also felt that LA involvement adds value to the programme.

Provision is scrutinised by the D & T Association's Council of Management, which has around 18 members, and its four advisory groups. Since 1999 when the provision was established, it has been inspected twice by OFSTED, rated as *"outstanding"* both times, and selected to be a good practice case study. The partnership feels that the partnership approach adds value through combining the D & T Association's reputation as a subject expert with the universities' academic experience, expertise and rigour in running and accrediting postgraduate study and research.

Recruitment and participation

Students are offered a range of resources once they have signed up for provision, including materials; a large subject leader's file; reduced price membership of the Association and access to online, email and phone support from tutors. Both the Association and the universities have considerable experience of provision in this area.

The partnership uses a range of methods to recruit students, including newsletters, email and its publications 'D & T News' and 'D & T Practice'. It also uses the D & T Association and university websites. It is sometimes approached directly by local authorities – Leicestershire is an example of this in 2006-07 – and has several local authorities with which it has worked over several years, especially since numbers of D & T advisers employed by authorities have declined recently. Numbers are relatively high in 2006-07 with around 150 students on the 10 primary courses currently underway and 20-40 students on the secondary courses in a typical year. In primary provision, it was considered that around 10% of students progress to the full MA and about 30% to the Postgraduate Diploma. The reasons given for this were that the partnership does not attempt to 'hard-sell' the M level provision and that many students are primarily motivated by the desire to get the Postgraduate Certificate to give them accredited Subject Leader status. As well as students' needs, barriers to progression to M level have been found to be lack of time to study, the academic demands of M level study, the conflicting desires to achieve leadership qualifications to progress in their career, and finance. The cost of supply cover was cited in the D&T Association's submission document and by several of the students interviewed on this subject. In some cases, local authorities have been able to offer bursaries or funding from other initiatives to remove some of the costs associated with undertaking the course. In recent years, the partnership has attempted to make provision more flexible, for example by increasing the proportion of assessment devoted to presentation of work and reducing the requirements for written assignments. This reflects the impression that D & T teachers tend to prefer practical work to writing about projects. Students are also able to transfer credits to local university providers or incorporate separate modules, for example in management, into their portfolio.

Engagement in CPD processes

The partnership has recently adopted a new delivery model for secondary teachers based on 6 taught days a year (2 per term), some of which will take place on Fridays and Saturdays. Extensive support and additional materials are available online, on CD and by phone and email. However, where it is requested, other modes of delivery are used, for example in Staffordshire local authority where provision takes the form of two intensive 5 day blocks. This was the seventh year in succession that Staffordshire had offered the course in this way. Areas covered in the five day

programme for the Postgraduate Certificate in Professional Studies: Education - Primary Design and Technology taught in February 2007 included the following:

- tool skills and techniques;
- the role of the coordinator;
- drawing skills and communicating ideas;
- modelling through kits;
- ICT in the D&T workshop;
- textiles workshop; and
- mechanical toys workshop.

A second five-day programme followed in June, looking at areas such as electrical control and food, before focusing on more generic areas such as curriculum planning and assessment. The course director also spends part of a day with students working on planning for the module assignment. In each case, the morning was devoted to tutor demonstration, with students able to practice new techniques and skills in the afternoon. The partnership's impact report stated that a key aim of the course is the development of teachers' knowledge and understanding of technology skills and knowledge, coupled with the development of practical skills through engaging teachers with 'hands on' making activities.

In general, the partnership feels that primary practitioners are keen to experience a hands-on course and often reluctant to fulfil the academic requirements of a course beyond certificate level. It speaks of updating practitioners' skills and increasing their 'conscious competence'. Provision mixes action research, methodology and analysis, with students being given some input and then encouraged to try out new methods and 'make things' themselves. The level of funding does not allow for in-school training, which means that progress and impact are tracked through assignments and student feedback. Students are encouraged to give presentations about their work, however, and each year three or four students present at the CRIPT International D&T primary conference and two or three secondary students at the Design and Technology Association International Research and Education conference.

Learning outcomes and impact

The D & T Association monitors formal learning outcomes. Impact data largely come from the three substantial assignments which each student completes, as well as from external examiners' reports. Smaller scale evidence is also provided by the process diaries and evaluation sheets kept by students during courses. Letters are sent to headteachers after students have completed the course with a pro forma about impact but response rates have tended to be low.

This makes it difficult to track pupil learning outcomes but indirect impact is implied by the changes to teachers' knowledge and understanding. External examiners have reported increases in experimentation and risk-taking which have had a knock-on effect on pupil learning. Students have access to new tools, strategies and ideas which broaden their pupils' experience of D & T, especially in primary schools where D&T subject leaders are not necessarily subject specialists. Student feedback on courses included comments such as *"My subject knowledge has now been heightened"* and *"Increased subject knowledge throughout all key stages"*. There is also some evidence of students moving to more responsible positions after completing the course, including Local Authority Adviser and Deputy Headteacher.

It was felt that students are generally apprehensive about research and research methods before undertaking the course. However, the emphasis on practical approaches to teaching creativity and problem-solving is intended to mitigate this. Impacts on students include increased self-esteem, confidence and enthusiasm and the pass rate for the certificate is very high. Students are encouraged to value research and are given a range of opportunities to publish and share their research, through D & T journals and publications, events and conferences.

The partnership also place emphasis on encouraging students to be advocates for their subject. For example, the secondary course has three main components designed to develop students in this way:

- managing D & T in school, focusing on the curriculum;
- key issues in D & T, including health and safety and staff management; and
- design for manufacturing, ensuring skills are updated and relevant to the needs of stakeholders.

Quality assurance is the responsibility of both the D & T Association and the universities, ensuring that assessment standards are maintained. The assessment of impact was one of the outstanding features of the OFSTED report on provision.

Summary of messages to the TDA

As both Subject Association and PPD provider, the D & T Association is already well-placed as an adviser to the TDA to relay messages specific to its subject.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In

addition as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);

- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association) ;
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for DATA to illustrate the extent to which responses from DATA students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 7 DATA students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional

association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

DATA responses
A variety of motivating factors were gained from participants interviewed on the DATA M level courses, including: interest in the subject area (1), career development (3) and recommended by headteacher (1). 2 Participants explained that it was the reputation of Sheffield Hallam Design Technology department that had motivated them to take part in the course.

The majority of participants interviewed had either been fully funded on the course, with 1 receiving part funding.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

DATA responses
The participants interviewed said that time (4) was the major barrier they faced when participating in the PPD courses run by DATA. Travel (2) was also a barrier, along with negotiating release from school (1) and balancing work and study (1). Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course include a change of venue (1), and a reduction in the workload (1), improving the on-line elements of the course (1), improving communication and feedback from tutors (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help.

20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

DATA responses
The participants interviewed from DATA explained that they had found out about the courses in a variety of ways including through their headteacher (2), email (2), website (2), word-of-mouth (1) and through an existing course (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses included websites (1), DATA magazine (1), case studies from former students (1) and broadening the target audience beyond subject leaders (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

DATA responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (4), reflective practice (1), disseminating findings with colleagues (4), running INSET (1) and greater respect from colleagues (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Dyslexia Action (Formerly the Dyslexia Institute)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Programme Manager, course tutors and former students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

Dyslexia Action works in partnership with the University of York to validate its PPD provision at M Level, and also to provide latest research evidence and expertise in the area of dyslexia. The partnership is managed from Dyslexia Action by the Head of Training and from the University of York through the Department of Psychology, subject contact, Senior Academic Registrar, and designated member of the University Teaching Committee. There is overall oversight through the University Teaching Committee. To date the partnership has utilised a network of five Dyslexia Action training centres to deliver its courses. These are based in London, Tonbridge, Bristol, Leicester and York. In addition, Dyslexia Action has provided distance learning courses, providing access to a broader client group nationally and internationally. For reasons described below the entire PPD programme will be delivered as a blended learning course from September 2007.

The programme is informed by input from several sources, including:

- feedback from current students;
- questionnaires completed by former students to gain a longer-term perspective on impact;
- feedback from school leaders whose teachers have participated on the programme to gain an understanding of impact at school level;
- market research;
- British Dyslexia Association Accreditation Board; and
- OFSTED inspection and follow-up visit.

Dyslexia Action has a network of 23 sites which mainly provide teaching and assessments for pupils and learners of all ages from schools, colleges, universities and workplace settings and in addition run projects and a small amount of non-accredited training for teachers, parents and other interested parties on dyslexia issues (five of these sites have been used to deliver PPD modules). In addition to the above Dyslexia Action forges links and activities with a wide range of other agencies, including parliamentary groups, DFES projects, specialist research, through its fundraising, lobbying and PR charitable activities. All of these activities serve towards keeping Dyslexia Action informed of current in-school issues in this way. Formal review of the TDA-funded PPD programme is carried out by the Board of Studies, on

which students and the University of York are represented. Dyslexia Action has an Education Forum which internally reviews the activities listed above and a management group which meets 6 times annually and receives reports on relevant PPD and course issues, which in turn are relayed to the Dyslexia Action governing Board.

The Post-Graduate Diploma programme consists of 12 modules, covering the areas of:

- structure of spoken and written language;
- specialist literacy teaching;
- advanced specialist teaching;
- education methods;
- psychology and assessment; and
- professional issues and related topics.

The modules are designed to ensure that, on completing the Diploma, the student has learned to deal with a wide range of severity, a wide age range, including adults. Students will also have considered other specific learning difficulties in addition to dyslexia.

Each module carries 10 credits and all are compulsory and sequential. In order to introduce an element of flexibility into the new online structure, a student may move from one cohort of the course to another in certain circumstances (illness etc). New cohorts begin (Spring and Autumn) twice a year. This means that any student needing to take leave of absence during the course, can leave, for example, after module 5, and then pick up with the next cohort when he/she is ready to begin module 6.

The online course begins with a 5-day residential, at which students are able to get to know each other and their tutors face-to-face. Following this, students have weekly one-to-one online contact with their tutor and receive individual feedback on their teaching. The programme is accredited by the British Dyslexia Association, which has stringent requirements on what students who complete modules should be able to do in terms of practical teaching and assessment. Course leaders estimate that students need to spend a minimum of 15 hours per week on the course, (this does include the time spent teaching or assessing a dyslexic learner as well as academic study) and conversations with students bear out the high workload required to complete the modules. The total length of the course Postgraduate Diploma is six academic terms. The Postgraduate Certificate, (interim award will be offered from October 2007) can be gained in 3 terms. A break between Certificate and Diploma level is possible as long as the entire programme is completed within 4 years.

More assessment training has been included on the course so that all students completing the full PG Diploma in future are eligible for the DSA assessments Practising Certificate, required by DfES for specialist teacher assessments for post 16 learners from July 2008.

Because of the resource-intense nature of the programme (tutor-student ratio is 1:6) costs are relatively high, even when subsidised through TDA PPD funding. The course fee for home students was £3250 for the full 2 year Diploma in 2006-7.

Recruitment and participation

In addition to being attracted to the professional qualification which the course leads to, students also enrol on the course as a way of getting back into teaching, either after a career break or more senior teachers who may otherwise retire from administrative / managerial positions in schools or elsewhere. The latter students may need special permission to study through the University if they do not also have Qualified Teacher Status and teaching experience as these are admission criteria.

Dyslexia Action has taken a series of measures to understand and reach its target audience, including:

- building a database to log all enquiries;
- purchasing a database of SENCOs;
- developing the Dyslexia Action website and including 'taster' courses;
- targeting flyers at individuals on existing Dyslexia Action databases and at key conferences and exhibitions;
- sending articles for web based E-zines in education, and key publications;
- placing advertisements in the TES; and
- marketing in collaboration with other organisations such as the National Strategies and TDA.

Analysis of the database of enquiries in 2006 showed that one of the main barriers to joining the programme was getting employers to agree to release participants for the one day per week over 2 years demanded by the attendance version of the course. For this reason, over 75% of participants were taking the distance learning option. Analysis also showed that enquirers from FE were finding it easier to find support in terms of time and funding, and that the majority of students:

- worked part-time or not at all; and
- paid the course fee from their personal savings.

The partnership has a high retention rate. Only four students out of the 2005-6 intake of 104 left the course early. Of the remaining one hundred students, 46 successfully completed the first year of the two year programme and will continue to the second year, and 44 completed the second year of the programme so were awarded the full Postgraduate Diploma.

The partnership has taken steps to improve take-up of the course by offering a Post-Graduate Certificate option after completion of 6 modules. In addition, by concentrating its resources on a single, blended-learning mode, Dyslexia Action aims to increase the appeal and benefits of the mode of delivery favoured by the majority of its applicants to date. The blended learning approach also means that Dyslexia Action can increase its international reach, and establish collaborative relationships between teachers in the UK and abroad.

Engagement in CPD processes

All the courses which will be delivered on the PPD programme will be in blended learning mode from October 2007 onwards. Before starting the course, students complete an assignment on the origins of language, which provides a starting point for the four-day residential at the beginning of the course. The residential gives students and tutors the opportunity to get to know each other as a basis for online collaboration which is a feature of the blended learning approach. It also gives a concentrated opportunity to 'kick-start' and teach the specialist practical teaching and assessment skills student will be required to develop during the course.

As students work through the module, they put their new learning into practice in a weekly lesson conducted with a dyslexic pupil/learner. For each lesson students must produce a lesson plan, select, adapt or create resources, and evaluate the lesson. All of these aspects are monitored by the tutor, who provides feedback. In addition, students are required to video-record three lessons at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the teaching practice and assessment elements. These are sent to the tutor, who provides feedback on performance, and is able to evaluate the student on the basis of the final recorded lesson. These video observations are required for BDA accreditation for AMBDA and eligibility of the students at the end of the course for a Practising Certificate.

By completing the Professional Experience Report and an Intervention Study, students are encouraged to ground their developing knowledge and practice in the local evidence base. The Report is an opportunity for students to evaluate critically data from test and examination results, SEN statistics, inspection evidence and other sources.

The Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), which hosts the resources and discussion forums for the online course, is arranged in modules, which are released as students move through the programme. Each module provides access to lectures, teaching and learning resources, guidance on teaching practice, PowerPoint presentations, pro-formas, links to key websites etc. They also provide students with a reflective journal, which they are required to keep updated as they implement new practice. Asynchronous and synchronous group and one-on-one tutorial sessions, tutor and administrative support are provided via the VLE. Books and other paper-based resources are available for loan at Dyslexia Action centres. Students can also access books from the Dyslexia Action headquarters in Surrey, using the postal loan service.

Collaboration is an important element in the blended learning approach. The VLE is set up to facilitate the sharing of resources students have developed themselves. The VLE also has discussion areas for tutors and students, as well as a student-only area to which tutors do not have access. Discussion is central to the process of critical self-evaluation which students are required to demonstrate in their reflective journals and assignments. Students reported the benefits of team teaching and observation which had been a feature of the ‘face-to-face’ mode of delivery. Programme leaders and tutors will monitor the progress students make on the blended-learning approach to ensure these benefits are maintained. They are, for example, looking into the possibility of colleagues observing practice at regional centres.

In addition to their supervising tutor, students have access to other teaching and support staff via the VLE, including a psychologist, the Head of Training, and the e-Learning Administrator.

Learning outcomes and impact

Impact on teacher practice and pupil learning is monitored on a weekly basis through evaluations which students forward to their tutors. In addition, students keep a reflective journal, and are required to contribute to group seminar discussions and complete on-course questionnaires via the VLE.

Dyslexia Action received grade 1 from OFSTED in 1999 for impact of provision and was selected for a follow-up visit by HMI in 2002, as an example of good practice. Individually, teachers report on the impact of the programme on their pupils’ progress

– for example, the positive outcomes achieved through understanding and implementation of structured multi-sensory teaching. It was also clear from teacher reports that the programme was very thorough in introducing students to specialised areas of linguistics and pedagogy, and that the close links made between theory and practice through weekly practical sessions and evaluation left them feeling more confident about their practice. Students also find the course professionally rewarding: "*teachers who have attended the course become the specialist who is in demand.*"

Internal quality assurance mechanisms include:

- Dyslexia Action annual staff appraisal;
- Dyslexia Action Training Service annual peer appraisal; training and mentoring of new trainers;
- all Training Service staff report to a line manager, and through him/her to the Head of Training;
- reports to the Board of Studies from the staff/student committees;
- a complaints procedure which enables students to complain to someone outside the Dyslexia Action Training Service, and ultimately the University of York; and
- the Training Service is subject to Dyslexia Action's Senior Management Committee, and the Council (trustees).

External quality assurance mechanisms include:

- British Dyslexia Association, which scrutinises the programmes every four years, or whenever there is a substantial change;
- the External Examiner, appointed by the University of York, moderates a proportion of all examined work, approves essay titles, and submits a termly report to the Board of Studies and the University;
- Annual Report to, and feedback from the University of York Teaching Committee; and
- triennial University of York validation review visits.

Summary of messages to the TDA

Dyslexia Action as a national programme which also covers a number of specialist groups has wider needs for support than programmes targetting narrower curriculum or local groups. The messages for the TDA relate to this situation:

- funding is available only to students who live in England and this means Dyslexia Action is not able to provide support for students coming from elsewhere in the UK and would like the funding to be available to all UK students;
- the specialist course attracts students from wide but highly relevant professional backgrounds and includes psychologists, speech therapists, specialist learning assistants, social workers, probation officers, doctors, nurses, education managers and other professionals seeking a career change to this valuable area of work. Dyslexia Action feels this enriches the course and the specialist teachers it is able to train. Dyslexia Action believes they should be equally eligible for TDA funding, given that they are eligible to study on the Course (approved admissions policy – York University);
- many students are seeking a career change; typically they may be young professionals taking a career break for children. Many are able to study on the course but are not currently also working more than 50% in a maintained school. It would be impossible for them to manage both in the context of the family responsibilities. Dsylexia Action would like the TDA to consider funding people training as specialist teachers in this situation; and

- a parallel situation exists with older teachers who otherwise would retire or leave the profession. Many are keen to train as a specialist teacher in specific learning difficulties (SpLD) and willing to give many years service, often in a part time capacity, following training.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;

- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for Dyslexia Action to illustrate the extent to which responses from Dyslexia Action students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 6 Dyslexia Action students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

Dyslexia Action responses
The majority of participants (4) interviewed from Dyslexia Action cited career development as the main reason for doing the M level course, while 2 gave personal reasons for taking part.

The majority of participants were fully funded for their studies, while 2 were self-funded.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of

funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

Dyslexia Action responses
The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers that they faced in order to take part in the courses, these included engaging in study at M level (2), time (1), changes to the content and structure of the course (1), dealing with the workload (1), family commitments (1) and the financial burden for which one participant has taken out a loan. Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course include providing provision locally (2) and making the courses modular (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

Dyslexia Action responses
The participants interviewed from Dyslexia Action said that they found out about the course from a number of sources including their school (1), an advert in the TES (1), website (1) and existing links (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing include sending flyers to schools (1), via websites (1) and through LAs (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

Dyslexia Action responses

Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (6), dissemination of findings to colleagues and pupils (3), new knowledge (1) and structure and organisation (2).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

East Midlands Partnership

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager and a local authority (LA) partner. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

This East Midlands Partnership is unusual in that the lead partner is not a provider. The School Development Support Agency (SDSA) was previously, and is still currently, involved with local authority (LA) partners to convene a CPD partnership. The collaboration with the higher education institutions (HEIs) came as a development of this partnership and 'competitors' came together, warily at first, but then more positively as they realised the potential of a regional approach.

The East Midlands CPD partnership brings together:

- the nine East Midlands local authorities (Derby City, Derbyshire, Leicester City, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire and Rutland);
- seven universities and higher education colleges in the region (Bishop Grosseteste College University College Lincoln, University of Derby, University of Leicester, University of Lincoln, Nottingham Trent University, and University of Northampton); and
- a number of specialist agencies in leadership and management (the schools development support agency, the East Midlands Regional Partnership and the East Midlands Leadership Centre).

Whilst the stakeholders have an equal role in the partnership, the individual universities retain some autonomy regarding, for example, fees and QA.

All the universities within this partnership offer flexible courses that are tailored so that they focus on selected priorities from schools' improvement plans. These build significant capacity for the school and provide research support for teachers involved. The PPD programme gives teachers a ladder for development to:

- post-graduate Certificate (60 M level credits);
- post-graduate Diploma (120 M level credits);
- masters (MA or MSc) (180 M level credits); and
- doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D) (540 D level credits).

The partnership is working towards a systematic, coherent, quality-assured accreditation of prior learning (APL) system, with mutual recognition between HEIs of

the first 60 points at Master's level (PG Cert), where the content is relevant. Participant HEIs collaborate on the consideration of applications to transfer credit for previous relevant/equivalent M-level learning between institutions. In cases where divergent credit systems are in use, the HEIs, LAs and other stakeholders provide advice to candidates, and facilitate appropriate APL applications in order to address barriers to progress.

Recruitment and participation

Collaborative publicity materials are distributed to all 2,200 schools in the region. In all the LAs, the CPD coordinators play a key role as advocates of PPD provision to headteachers. School-based CPD coordinators are therefore targeted and their skills are being developed to raise awareness of how provision can be enhanced, for example through identifying needs and matching individuals with appropriate courses. Pre-course information is made available to help schools appreciate and honour the time demands of the courses. The partnership also has a web-presence (www.cpdsearch.org.uk) for PPD online enquirers. More than 20 cold-call enquiries about PPD registration have come to the SDSA from the website. These enquiries are then dealt with by the most appropriate HEI.

Research carried out by the HEIs suggested that many teachers do not recognise that focused study of everyday activities can be used for M-level qualifications. Other significant reasons why teachers do not consider embarking on M-level courses, identified by the HEI research were: time, funding, school support, modes of delivery, confidence to work at M-level and location. The partnership aims to help prospective participants overcome these barriers through:

- regionally flexible provision;
- making teaching school-based wherever possible to reduce travelling by course participants;
- diversity of modules both school-based and centre-based options to suit individual requirements;
- flexible routes – M-level pathways allow for stopping-off and exit points (e.g. at 60/120 point levels). A Master's degree can be achieved over a 5 year period; and
- individually negotiated assignments to ensure that use is made of day-to-day in-school activities (through portfolios for example) for reflection and research.

In addition, formative tutorial and peer support is given throughout programmes, including personal meetings, coaching and mentoring opportunities, handbooks on writing at academic level, opportunities for drafting, feedback on presentations, VLE discussion rooms and other e-support. HEIs each employ a Head of Student Support for non-academic/non-professional aspects of support, and a Head of Learning Support, to support study skills, essay writing, and bibliographies e.g. through regular surgeries and email. Schools are also provided with boxes of introductory reading material.

Interest in PPD courses is gathering pace in the region. For example, two years ago, 15 teachers were engaged in PPD courses with Nottingham Trent University; a year ago, the number had risen to 70. Currently, 200 teachers are enrolled. Around 900 are enrolled on the whole programme.

Engagement in CPD processes

Courses are delivered on a collaborative basis, in schools or clusters and use collaborative approaches. Teachers are required to carry out practitioner research in order to trial specific pedagogies in their own and each other's classrooms. Peer and tutor observation provides a critical perspective as well as a measurement on the success of action research – thus creating the opportunity for more experienced colleagues to assist other colleagues. Coaching and mentoring modules focus on providing colleague support whilst student portfolios are used to explore the impact of support via coaching on pupil learning.

Tutorial support runs alongside each school-based programme and requires the teachers to evaluate the impact of their actions on pupils' attainment. The customised nature of assignments enables teachers to provide evidence of change and improvement. To help with this, teachers are shown how to access relevant data related to their own pupils' performance (e.g. pupil assessment trackers, value-added measures and OFSTED reports), how to interpret them and how to use them to judge the extent of improvement.

Research methodology is built into all programmes. Some modules specialise in research and teachers are expected to relate their own practice to the findings of research sources. Teachers are shown ways to improve their understanding of research sources and to sharpen their evaluative responses, e.g. through stating reasons for adopting a resource or strategy. Module outlines all include bibliographies of printed and electronic sources, and workshops on critical use of sources, development of an argument, addressing issues and overcoming of challenges, are regularly offered.

Assessed tasks (which include a wide variety of assignments beyond the traditional essay) focus on improvement of knowledge, understanding and pedagogical practice, requiring teachers to demonstrate how their knowledge, understanding and practice have changed, and how this has impacted on pupils' learning, as evidenced by interaction with other professionals in their department/school and by work sampling.

Learning outcomes and impact

The partnership monitors the impact of the PPD on pupil performance and how it has changed during and after the teacher's participation, through external examiner reports, programme evaluations, assessment tasks and headteachers' feedback. Whilst the partnership recognises that it is problematical to assume causal relationships, the impact on pupil performance reported by partner schools in terms of improved test results at different Key Stages has been greater than expected. Improvements in pupils' behaviour, engagement, motivation and participation in lessons have also been reported more extensively than expected.

From across the partnership, the highest occurring comments about the impact of the programme on teachers, as reported by teachers and CPD coordinators in reports, surveys and interviews, are:

- improved subject/process knowledge base;
- greater confidence and enhanced belief in teachers' own power to affect pupils' learning;
- greater reflection on practice;
- greater understanding of, and enthusiasm, for collaborative working;

- greater commitment to changing and improving practice; and
- improved motivation, engagement and achievement of pupils.

Teachers have commented, for example:

> *"During the summer term I worked with two members of staff and put a strategy into place affecting year5/6: 90 children. This is set to continue in the autumn term due to its success".*
>
> *"Over the last year, others in my workplace have been aware of my alternative approach, while they do not have in-depth knowledge of my research, they have discussed what I have been doing and I see this as a positive way forward".*
>
> *"I have learned to be reflective in my everyday practice, observing the children closely. I now understand how to review what aspects of my practice are successful (in particular to do with improving concentration) and what strategies I can use to develop concentration further".*
>
> *"It has enabled me to look deeper and more carefully into my practice as a teacher. It has also allowed me to use research and other researchers' ideas to help me understand what is going on in my classroom and beyond".*

In terms of improved pupil achievement, motivation and engagement, teachers have reported, for example:

> *"Pupils are more respondent to new teaching ideas and are more willing to get involved. As I currently teach no examination groups, it is often difficult to measure the impact but all pupils reach their targets."*
>
> *"Children are more confident and motivated. Achieve higher standards (all got L2 in Science and 42% got L3!). Have shown a vast improvement in attainment."*
>
> *"Highest SATs ever – 93% L4+ English, 96% L4+ Maths, 97% L4+ Science."*
>
> *"With PPD in place, the school has achieved its best results ever" (in external examinations) with KS3 results up by 10-12%, KS4 up by at least 10% from 2004, and A2 results up by 9%."*

The impact of PPD has increased quite significantly when groups of staff within one school or collaborative groups of schools have worked together – a classic case of *"'the whole being greater than the sum of its parts'"*. Evaluation in these situations has indicated how the PPD experience has unified staff groups, improved staffing and the maintenance of staffing, cascaded learning from the group to all staff, and become a significant vehicle for the empowerment of teachers and the creation of a learning community.

An area of impact that has been more significant than the partnership expected has been the development of networks of teachers within and between schools when they are engaging in locally-tailored courses. Although the PPD courses have provided enough flexibility to accommodate this, had the partnership anticipated this more closely, it may have factored in more innovative provision arrangements.

Case Study: Getting recognition for a good idea
Mel (a newly appointed Mentor of NQTs), used semi-structured interviews with NQTs to give him a better understanding of their needs. Reading national materials strengthened his understanding. Subsequently, he adapted this practice and spread it to other schools and to Higher Education-based teacher training courses. He was able to negotiate his assignment topics with tutors, to reflect the developments in his theory and practice. Mel completed a Certificate of Professional Studies in Education (CPSE) specialising in Mentoring and Coaching. He still teaches in the school, which is now a recognised Training School. He is a recognised trainer of mentors in a cluster of schools in partnership with the local University.

Case Study: Starting a project, gaining a certificate and getting ahead
Jenny, a Key Stage Coordinator, set up a peer-mentoring scheme for pupils. The scheme developed leadership skills in some pupils, and addressed the social skills and engagement of under-performing female pupils. She researched the ideas, wrote up the story of the scheme, evaluated it and gained an M-level Certificate in Special Educational Needs, worth 60 credits from an East Midlands University. The showcasing of these teaching/learning approaches contributed to Jenny's gaining AST status.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- The fact that TDA funding only applies to qualified teachers is divisive and inappropriate in the light of Every Child Matters, with multi-agency working and workforce remodeling.
- Teaching Assistants are not entitled to funding, yet they can be highly qualified with degrees etc and many are keen to undertake PPD.
- Funding is static, but HEI fees are continually rising.
- TDA to continue with funding to help level inequities between schools with supportive headteachers and others where headteachers are les supportive.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme

level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects were action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- *improved professional learning skills (26);*
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term 'self reflection' or 'reflection' as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the East Midlands Partnership to illustrate the extent to which responses from East Midlands students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 11 East Midlands students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/ leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to

retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

East Midlands responses
The participants interviewed on the East Midlands Partnership M level courses gave a variety of motivating factors. These included personal and professional development (6), flexibility of study (1), school encouraged classroom enquiry (1) and 3 participants explained that they were already involved in accredited work which could be transferred on the Masters courses.

The majority of participants (6) interviewed has received some partial assistance with funding, 2 were fully funded by their school and 3 were self-funding their study.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

East Midlands responses
The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers that they faced in order to take part in the courses, these included time (4), finance (3), maintaining a work/life balance (3), family commitments (3) and travel (1). Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course include increasing the amount of contact with tutors (2), library and journal access (2), funding (1), child care at weekends (1) and support with writing essays (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had

heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

East Midlands responses
The participants interviewed from the East Midlands Partnership had found out about the course through flyers sent to their schools (4), others had found out via tutors on the course (2), websites (1), existing links with the partnership (1), other accredited courses (2) and LAs (1). Participants gave a range of suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses including marketing through websites (1), other accredited courses (1), headteacher (1), making past students available to talk to about the course (1), advertising the different routes into the courses (1), TV (1), flyers (1), LAs (2) and teaching publications (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study, e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

East Midlands responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (6), whole-school (2), training colleagues (2), pupils (2), confidence (1), career path (1), greater involvement with parents (1) and reflective practice (1). One participant did say that they had not yet seen any impact from their involvement in the course, but felt that they had increased their knowledge.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Institute of Education

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: programme managers, course tutors, local authority (LA) special educational needs coordinators (SENCOs) and students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Special Educational Needs Joint Initiative for Training (SENJIT) is a partnership consisting of one higher education institution (HEI) (School of Psychology and Human Development, Institute of Education, which is the lead partner organisation) and 39 local authorities in and around London, including Slough and Southend. In addition to PPD programmes, SENJIT offers short courses, support groups, local training and consultancy for teachers and other professionals with inclusion and special educational needs remits. Strategic planning takes place at twice yearly meetings, where representatives from the consortium of local authorities discuss broader issues of course content, delivery and assessment.

The partnership is run on a day-to-day basis by the SENJIT Coordinator, who holds ongoing meetings with individual authorities throughout the year. In addition SENJIT funds an Outreach Programme Coordinator for three days per week. She is based at the Institute of Education where she also teaches on the School's Graduate Diploma courses. The Outreach Programme Coordinator leads on quality assurance, reviewing accreditation, programme design and quality of delivery. Programme tutors are based in the local authorities.

SENJIT provides a range of modules reflecting national and local priorities, covering specific areas such as Autistic Spectrum Disorder and Language and Communication Difficulties, as well as more strategic whole-school approaches to SEN. Consultation with SEN specialists at school and local authority level has led to several changes to the programme, as the partnership looks to match provision to local need. This has led, for example, to the development of modules on theories and practice of inclusion, and time management for SENCOs.

Each local authority buys courses en bloc for its practitioners, based on an analysis of what schools' needs are. This enables SENJIT to cost them at a rate which is less than the sum of individual participant fees. The partnership has been able to further reduce rates by drawing on TDA funding. Having a number of neighbouring boroughs involved in the programme enhances networking among SENCOs, and the sharing of practice and expertise. It also means modules can be delivered on an ongoing basis as they rotate from one LA to another, being constantly refined as they do so.

Often practitioners from several LAs are present on the same module, and a conference is arranged as a part of each module, at which SEN specialists from across the London area can exchange ideas.

For each module students gain 45 credits, which can be accumulated to gain the Graduate Diploma in Special and Inclusive Education. On successful completion of the Diploma (i.e. four modules), students can continue to work towards a Masters degree in Special Educational Needs, or transfer the credits into other Masters courses either at the University of London or other HEI.

Modules run for approximately one semester (September-March), typically with weekly 'input' sessions of 3 hours.

Recruitment and participation

Recruitment is mostly a result of training needs analyses completed by schools and local authorities. The SENJIT co-ordinator collates these and modules (either existing or specifically developed) are provided in response. Modules are often delivered in individual local authorities on a rotating basis, enabling SENJIT to direct students who cannot access the module in their own authority to a neighbouring LA where it is being delivered. In 2005-6 the partnership recruited 160 students to the PPD programme, all of whom completed at least one module.

As with other partnerships, SENJIT finds students with work commitments have difficulties completing assignments at M level. Course data for 2005-6 indicates that of the 172 students who registered for the programme, 168 completed participation (i.e. attended at least 80% of the sessions). However, of those only 93 completed the assignment necessary to gain credits.

SENJIT has put several strategies in place to encourage students to complete course work. Assignments for 45-credits are broken down into one 2000 word essay (15 credits), and one 4000 word report (30 credits) to be submitted at different times, so that the demand is less overwhelming. Tutors are conscious of the need to guide students on how to complete assignments and make themselves available for telephone support.

Despite advocacy for participation on the part of local authorities, the partnership nevertheless notes a certain reluctance among some headteachers to release potential students to attend the courses, if to do so entails costs for supply. Many heads would like their staff to participate, but say that they cannot afford the cover necessary to allow this to happen. In order to counter this issue, SENJIT is flexible in its delivery times, putting on sessions which accommodate the working patterns of participants.

Concerns have also been voiced by local authority special educational needs coordinators about the lack of ring-fencing of funding for SEN under future arrangements, and the potentially negative consequences if headteachers decide to spend the money on other priorities. This is not an area SENJIT feels it has a lot of control over, except in its role as advocate of the benefits of schools attending to the SEN capacity.

Institute of Education data indicates that the majority of participants on PPD courses are white females. There is BME interest in CPD courses, but this tends to be more

in the area of leadership programmes (Leading from the Middle) rather than the SEN-focused PPD.

Engagement in CPD processes

Each module is designed to develop research and problem solving skills. Students are required to read and understand set texts, and demonstrate their ability to link theory and practice. Students have access to the Institute of Education library, and in addition local authorities are encouraged to purchase key texts and place them in their professional development centres for students to borrow.

The work of a SENCO is by its nature collaborative, and so an important element of the course is to encourage collaborative partnerships both during input sessions and as teachers implement new practice. As they learn more about theory and the evidence base, students are often organised into small study groups to work jointly on a particular area of research, which they then disseminate to colleagues. Students also discuss and develop lesson plans within their study groups, and as part of their assignments may be explicitly asked to plan an intervention with a colleague.

Where a module is introducing students to new practice, they carry out action research, evaluating the impact of new practice and sharing outcomes with colleagues. Students maintain a journal as part of this process, in which they reflect on the work they carry out with individual children. They are also encouraged to video their developing practice, and share this with colleagues.

The programme also provides opportunities for students to see SEN issues from different perspectives. One SENCO reported organising 'learning walks' so that students could share and critically evaluate practice by experiencing how their colleagues work. On another module a parent was invited in to talk with students about what it's like looking after a child with dyslexia.

Learning outcomes and impact

Data on the impact of the PPD programme are drawn from a variety of sources, including:

- assignments with pupil impact data;
- ongoing completion of evaluation questionnaires for students;
- skills audits which students complete at the beginning and at the end of the modules; and
- focus groups with former students.

In addition, SENCOs in local authorities who arrange, and sometimes teach on, SENJIT courses are able to monitor the impact of the programme through other aspects of their work, such as the support they give schools with data analysis, and conversations they have with school leaders. Course tutors also report back to local authorities the impact at school level of staff participating on modules. One local authority has formalised the process by visiting previous students of a dyslexia course as part of a review of the effectiveness of the qualification.

Student feedback indicates increased self-confidence as an important outcome of the programme. SENJIT has identified other positive outcomes in terms of participants achieving job promotion as a result of gaining accreditation, or moving into posts more appropriate to their knew knowledge, skills and understanding. Other students

have reported being more effective in employing differentiation strategies, or in their work teaching assistants.

The PPD programme is subject to an annual review in accordance with Institute of Education policy. The Graduate Diploma is overseen by the Quality Assurance Committee within the School of Psychology and Human Development, which in turn reports to Institute of Education committees with responsibility for professional development programmes. A support meeting is held for tutors each time a module is delivered, at which the outreach co-ordinator talks through any issues that arise during course delivery.

External quality assurance processes include:

- scrutiny of sample assignments by an external examiner;
- OFSTED inspection report on the quality of SENCO training; and
- QAA audits.

Summary of messages to the TDA

One of the issues raised by tutors was the difficulty in persuading some headteachers to release staff to participate on the PPD programme. They felt that TDA could bring more influence to bear on headteachers to see the benefits of their staff gaining knowledge and experience in the area of special educational needs and inclusion.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and

we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects were action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;

- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the Institute of Education to illustrate the extent to which responses from IoE students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 5 IoE students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients

along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

IoE responses
Interviews with 5 participants on IoE M level courses found a variety of motivations for involvement including career development (2), personal development (1) and encouragement/recommendation from colleagues.

The majority of participants interviewed received some assistance with finance, 4 were fully funded and 1 was part funded.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

IoE responses
Two of the participants interviewed said that time was the main barrier they faced, along with travel (1) and finance (1). Generally participants were very positive about the IoE provision. However, one participant did suggest adding a local element to the course for those travelling to attend.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

IoE responses

The participants interviewed from the Institute of Education explained that they found out about the course from a range of sources including through their LA (1), school (1), word-of-mouth (1), flyer (1) and through direct contact with SENJIT (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course include flyers (2), word-of-mouth (2), directly into schools (2), through senior managers (1), LAs (1), SENCO forums (1) and TES (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

IoE responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice (4), promotion (1), improved confidence (1), knowledge (1), disseminating findings with colleagues (2) and parents (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Middlesex University (MIDWHEB Middlesex, Waltham Forest, Haringey, Enfield, Barnet)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with any supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, two local authority (LA) partners, two senior lecturers and five students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

MIDWHEB is a partnership between Middlesex University, and four large London boroughs: Waltham Forest, Haringey, Enfield and Barnet. The partnership also includes approximately 200 Primary schools and 100 Secondary Schools. Of these, 37 have been awarded 'training partner' status, six are PPS schools and one is a training school. The university has a strong, central administrative role, but as its name indicates, the partnership has been constructed to ensure equal responsibility amongst the partners for design, delivery and recruitment.

The partnership covers a wide area, but it is one of several providers in the region, including the London Institute of Education. MIDWHEB Partnership funding has stimulated Middlesex University to share its TDA funding with partner organisations for the delivery of programmes. The programme and qualification structure is varied. Whilst MIDWHEB offers the traditional model of PPD provision, (that is university designed and delivered courses), other more innovative courses are also on offer and now represent the majority of courses, including school-based, LA-based and online courses. The programme is increasingly being tailored to teachers' needs. The traditional style masters course offered by the university is more practitioner-focused, whilst the school-based programmes are tailored to the needs of individuals within school contexts. Examples of specific programmes include:

- Teaching and Learning;
- Leading from Within (a middle management programme);
- PSHE (alongside the DFES Certificate in PSHE);
- Special Educational Needs;
- Mentoring;
- Gifted and Talented Children in Education; and
- Citizenship.

All MIDWHEB PPD work fits within an M level framework, but teachers can exit at various points: PGCert (60 credits), PGDip (120 credits), full Masters (180), or no formal accreditation. The framework therefore allows for a great deal of flexibility,

which brings benefits in terms of recruitment and retention. For example, the framework's flexibility allows practitioners to start in a small way at 'starter' level, whilst knowing they can exit at several points makes the course feel achievable from the start. Once started, finding that they are able to work at M level encourages many practitioners to continue and complete the full Masters.

The partnership appointment of a full time Manager (Dr Ian Terrell) has allowed time to be spent with LA and school teams to continually customise the programme to meet different needs and contexts.
Having a full time Manager has led to:

- an increase in student recruitment;
- more LA and school based/focused programmes;
- better quality support materials for teachers;
- a central programme and networking across individual modules
- an online community of teachers;
- more effective evaluation of impact;
- attendance of HEI at LA CPD strategy forums;
- administrative support for the partnership meetings and activities; and
- new PPD activities in partnership with local authorities.

Recruitment and participation

Around 300 part-time students are currently enrolled on courses, which is less than anticipated, but numbers are increasing. The Programme Manager suggests the reasons for the under-recruitment include the many other professional development opportunities that exist for teachers in the region, such as the GTC's Teacher Learning Academy and the existence of other providers, such as the London Institute of Education. The partnership uses a number of recruitment strategies, including regional marketing by the university, and partners working at local level to recruit teachers through school networks. The key lever to recruitment is believed to be relevance to practical professional application. The partnership has increasingly developed its programme so that it directly meets the teachers' needs. All teachers do a personal and school needs analysis before they engage with the research aspect of the PPD work. These needs are then transformed into research questions for investigation by the teacher and integrated into the assignment or accreditation process. Teachers' enquiries have included, for example:

- a small-scale case study into the primary strategy and its impact on the achievement of white UK boys;
- an exploration of boys' learning in a reception class;
- the impact of a buddy strategy on boys' attitude and achievement in spelling;
- a critical analysis of leadership when implementing change with reference to writing standards at Key Stage 1;
- a case study of leadership of change in Primary SEN; and
- the impact of strategies designed and developed to achieve social inclusion in a mainstream primary classroom.

The partnership has found a number of barriers to teacher participation in the programme, including:

- workload – the difficulties of combining busy professional lives with the additional demands of course-work;
- distance and difficulty of travel;
- undertaking programmes in their own time;
- competing demands from family and personal life;

- not seeing the connection between improving standards and postgraduate study;
- cost of participation (which includes more than just the payment of fees if not supported by employer); and
- a perceived lack of currency and reward of the academic awards in comparison to other programmes (eg. NPQH, LPSH).

The partnership works hard to overcome such barriers. As one LA provider commented, *"We don't do barriers."* The partnership works to an inclusive model of widening participation. A Haringey LA adviser commented that *"if teachers are willing to give up time to engage with this kind of activity then they should be given a chance to engage with PPD at master's level".* As a consequence, the MIDWHEB partnership includes:

- more school-based and school focused delivery;
- the development of online learning communities;
- development of greater flexibility in assignments than through the use of new technology, web logs, digital images, CD-Rom, and video;
- the use of professional development portfolios and other assignments for assessment;
- development of the programme structure and modules; and
- development of a cost effective funding model for LAs and schools that ensures that teachers completing the programme are supported.

In addition, the MIDWHEB partnership works with partners and teachers on the perception of post graduate programmes as a means of:

- developing more effective practice;
- ensuring development leads to improvement;
- building in assignments into daily work and work based learning; and
- integrating postgraduate study into performance management processes and advanced skills teacher and threshold applications.

MIDWHEB's strategic approach to overcoming barriers to recruitment was highlighted in the PPD barriers project report 'Patterns of Participation for Black and Minority Ethnic Teachers and Teachers with Disabilities in PPD Programmes' (CUREE, December 2006).

Engagement in CPD processes

MIDWHEB provision is based upon a model of teacher research and problem-solving. The model includes:

- identifying individual and school development needs from an analysis of data including school performance data;
- planning a programme of learning, enquiry and research;
- developing practical strategies in schools and classrooms; and
- collecting evidence of improvements.

For example, the module 'Leading from Within' (a programme for middle leaders in primary secondary and special schools) involves workshop sessions with inputs on a variety of best practice research and theory on middle leadership. The programme is largely practitioner led, and research and development based. Participants report that the programme is:

- heavily based upon individuals planning, implementing and researching developments based upon school needs and priorities;

- explicitly and implicitly based upon national standards for subject leadership and on best practice literature, advice and guidance, for example about using data; and
- builds generic capacities for improvement through research skills, collegiality, teamwork, criticality, communication skills, confidence and leadership.

Participants are expected to construct a portfolio of evidence, including:

- a school based and focused project;
- personal and school needs assessment;
- a self-assessment;
- an action plan;
- a learning journal;
- a reading log; and
- workshop activities.

Learning outcomes and impact

MIDWHEB collects a variety of data used to analyse the impact and effectiveness of the programme, including:

- observation of learning activities records;
- analysis of assignments;
- surveys of participant and stakeholder perceptions;
- interviews with participants and stakeholders;
- analysis of school based data (e.g. assessment data, Ofsted reports, PANDA reports etc); and
- University assessment data.

The partnership found evidence of teachers (impact reports are available at: www.midwheb.org.uk):

- becoming familiar for the first time with school based assessment data;
- learning of the existence of national strategy materials for the first time;
- middle managers considering the notion of leadership for the first time; and
- using coaching (observation and feedback) for the first time.

For example, teachers have said:

> *"The course has encouraged me to whole heartedly implement AFL strategies in my classroom. This is something I have been thinking about for some time."*
>
> *"I can now look back and say that this module is one of the most interesting, mind broadening and stimulating experiences that I have encountered in my 15 years of being a classroom practitioner."*
>
> *"The programme has helped me not only to understand gifted and talented boys better, but has also improved my style of teaching them."*

The programme has also enhanced pupil achievement – as a result of the school and classroom-based assignments. The projects focused upon, for example:

- introducing a literate environment and using observations to improve assessment and improving parent-school communication in the Foundation stage;

- improvements in reading, writing, science enquiry and problem-solving in mathematics assessments in the Primary Phase; and
- developing an effective Gifted and Talented programme across the curriculum in the Secondary Phase.

In their assignments, teachers report improvements such as, enhanced performance in KS3 SATs scores for a target group of borderline level 4 pupils in English, and improved spelling scores in a year 2 class using VAK approaches to teaching and spelling. Teachers have reported their project findings to line managers, headteachers and governors and have used them as a basis for leading school INSET. There is evidence that some teachers have found that their findings have influenced changes to whole-school procedures and practice. These include for example, introducing new management policy and practice in an infant school, new ICT hardware and software, and developing capability for teaching creativity through a 'Super Science Day'. The programme has enabled considerable sharing across schools and leading the participants' network through the MIDWHEB partnership.

All modules, programmes and awards are validated and subject to the quality assurance procedures of Middlesex University (QAA procedures and documents of Middlesex University can be viewed at www.mdx.ac.uk/www/quality/index.htm). The quality assurance procedures and the assessment process are overseen by an external examiner who provides annual reports. The quality of each individual module is reviewed through:

- regular monitoring by the Programme Manager and team involving observations of the taught programme, discussions with participants, staff and stakeholders;
- informal mechanisms during programme delivery;
- end of module evaluations by survey, analysis of assignments and online discussions;
- programme annual review and board of studies monitoring;
- external examination; and
- reports to MIDWHEB management group.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- Continue with funding.
- Use the existing M level framework to provide coherence to wide variety of professional development provision for teachers.
- There is no reason why teachers should engage with anything other than M level professional development as a graduate profession.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 Partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence

as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing-impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term "self reflection" or "reflection" as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the

school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the MIDWHEB partnership to illustrate the extent to which responses from MIDWHEB students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 5 MIDWHEB students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback.

CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

MIDWHEB responses
The majority of participants (4) from MIDWHEB stated that their motivation for taking part in the M level study was career progression.

1 participant was fully funded in their study by their school, 2 were part funded by their school and part self-funded, 1 was fully self-funding and 1 participant received a bursary.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

MIDWHEB responses
The participants interviewed said that both finance (3) and time (3) were the main barriers that they face, with travel (2) also posing a barrier. Suggestion for improving the accessibility of the course include paying fees by instalments (1), access to the

libraries in holidays (1), access to tutors (2), support with funding (1) and running the courses locally (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

MIDWHEB responses
Participants said that they found out about the course by word-of-mouth (2), flyer (2) and from an existing course (1). Suggestions to improve the marketing of the course include the use of flyers (2), seminars with past students (2), through headteachers (1), email (1), word-of-mouth (1) and through linking courses to school CPD (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

MIDWHEB responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice (3), reflective practice (1), whole- school development (1), research (1) and disseminating findings to colleagues (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

The Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement (NASSEA) partnership with Birmingham University

The following report has been complied from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: Melanie Griffin, the PPD Programme Coordinator; and a headteacher and teachers from Bury schools. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with course tutors and students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The joint University/NASSEA programme (Bilingualism in Education) was devised in response to a long-standing need in the North of England for a postgraduate course specifically for teachers of English as an additional language (EAL) children. (NASSEA represents the Ethnic Minority Achievement Services of 32 LAs). OFSTED (2002), for example, identified that:

> *"There has been a sharp decline in the number of long-term accredited courses, particularly those for specialist EAL staff. The proportion of EMAG funded staff with appropriate qualifications is now as low as 30% in some LEAs."*

OFSTED (2002) commented on a lack of:

- high-quality training accessible to teachers on a regional basis;
- qualifications comparable in quality and status; and
- course content relevant and flexible enough to meet the needs of a wide range of groups.

The Postgraduate Certificate element of the programme consists of three modules, two of which have an action research assignment as the assessed component:

- introduction to bilingual education;
- academic language for bilingual learning; and
- teaching and learning relating to EAL provision.

Each module is assessed through a 4000 word assignment which seeks to help students make connections between research literature and their own practice. Students use their assignments to consider how their practice could become more effective in working with bilingual/EAL children.

The full Ed.D requires students to achieve 180 taught credits: 80 subject credits and 100 research credits. Students are required to complete modules on research design and can take a module on research specifically related to language in education. The course is structured so that students can progress from the Postgraduate Certificate, through the Diploma to a Master's level award and on to Doctorate level.

There is a strong practical element in all components of the programme, including assessments and practical activities. Tutors focus on planning and structuring action research during tutorial time and students are required to demonstrate research skills as part of their assignments. For example, to reach the required standard to pass the level M modules, students must:

- show evidence of systematic enquiry;
- use an appropriate variety and range of reading and other sources/ personal experience to provide supportive evidence;
- show an ability to review literature; and
- analyse and evaluate examples from practice.

The management group for the programme consists of a NASSEA representative, the university programme coordinator and the NASSEA programme coordinator. This group meets formally at least twice a year, with regular informal contact, to ensure the smooth running, regular evaluation and planning for development of the programme. There is also a steering group consisting of DfES, NASSEA, National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (NALDIC) and local authority representatives and a senior tutor.

Partnership with the University of Birmingham brings the academic knowledge (which appeals to students), whilst NASSEA brings a more practical focus and NALDIC brings a specific focus on children with English as an additional language. Tutors may belong to any of these three organisations or from elsewhere such as an LA. Being in partnership with Birmingham has made it possible to expand the programme nationally.

Recruitment and participation

Recruitment is by word-of-mouth, through LAs and schools. For example, staff in the same school often follow one another. Evaluations from completing students from 2003-4 identified the following factors as key to their accessing the programme:

- **distance learning** – distance learning materials allow students, many of whom have childcare responsibilities as well as full-time jobs, to study at a time convenient to them;
- **funded places** – the cost of a place on a postgraduate course is prohibitive for many potential students. The funding is used to subsidise places and many teachers have indicated an intention to continue their studies to PgCert and MEd level when funding is available for those parts of the programme;
- **links to classroom work** – teachers have found this useful in focusing their studies and facilitating access to new learning. One participant commented, 'the academic-practical balance appealed to me and had an impact on the school department and a colleague'; and

- **tutorials on Saturdays** – alternative arrangements, such as email contact or individual input are made if an individual student has difficulty attending tutorials.

Students also value support from tutors and mentors (both in person and by phone and email) and through peer observation. The nature of this support varies according to the needs of the individual student. Individual tutor input focuses on the area of study chosen by the student and their learning needs. Mentor observations can be increased in number if a particular student needs more support with applying their learning to their practical work. NASSEA and university structures provide pastoral support to students through the programme coordinators.

In addition, there is flexibility for students who have difficulty meeting the expected deadlines of the PgCert completion in one year, the PgDip in the second and MEd in the third. Students can defer until later in the year or until a later year, breaks can be taken between stages of the programme and credits are valid for five years. Every effort is made to facilitate students' completion. Arrangements for resuming study include readmission, additional tutorials and tutor support, support with resubmission of assignments and linking with fellow students in the same area.

Currently, 56 students are enrolled on the programme – 23 on the Diploma, 25 on the Certificate and eight on the full Masters courses. Sixteen out of the 56 students have BME backgrounds. The number of applications received far exceeds the number of places available – a sign of the programme's success. Over the past three years, the programme has become so successful that it is no longer confined to LAs who are members of NASSEA. Reasons for the great interest in a qualification fall within four broad areas. The desire:

- to have a better theoretical knowledge of the subject;
- for appropriate professional development;
- that skills staff feel they have acquired through the job are validated; and
- to learn new strategies that can be deployed to support pupils.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Engagement in CPD processes

Course design has a number of key features:

- **enquiry** – this is an important part of the action research element of the programme and a core feature of the in-class work is experimentation to enable teachers to try out new approaches. Teachers carry out action research (two modules have an action research assignment as the assessed component) to look at effective classroom strategies for developing the language of their pupils learning English as an additional language;
- **seminars** – these are held in three locations (Bury, London and Birmingham). Teachers living outside these areas are expected to travel to the locations;
- **tutorials** – the providers plan tutorial groups where there are concentrations of students. The main tutorial groups are in Bury, but other groups have been arranged in other areas, including Watford, Bristol and Birmingham. Tutors have good understanding of EAL and adopt a coaching role;

- **peer support –** as nearly every teacher in, for example the Bury EMAG service has completed the course, there is also a lot of opportunity for peer support. Students are expected to reflect on their peer observation in their action research assignments;
- **lesson observation by a mentor** – the observations are intended to provide students with the opportunity to reflect and discuss with an EAL expert, elements of theory and policy on their current practice. Students are asked to reflect on their lesson observation and subsequent discussion in their action research assignments;
- **learning journals** – teachers use these to evaluate their EAL teaching competence throughout the course (in addition to the formal assessments); and
- **writing** – teachers often express great anxiety about writing assignments and often need much support. To help tutors identify their needs more accurately, students complete a practice assignment before they start the course.

The flexibility of assignment titles allows students from a variety of working backgrounds to participate and make clear links between the programme content and their practice, including aspects which link directly to their school/service improvement plan, to their performance management targets or to other needs of their working situation. There is an emphasis in the taught parts of the course on reflecting on their practice in terms of policy, theory and empirical work. Participants are expected to show evidence of systematic enquiry through:

- using an appropriate variety and range of reading and other sources/ personal experience to provide supportive evidence;
- showing an ability to review literature; and
- analysing and evaluating examples from practice.

The programme tutors provide students with detailed comments on their assignments to guide them in reflecting on their work and identifying appropriate research methods and skills as well as appropriate academic skills. These are based on the criteria for marking assignments which require students to demonstrate research skills (detailed above). In addition, the programme competencies for the Postgraduate Certificate provide guidance for students on appropriate skills and understanding to be developed. The learning on research skills in the Postgraduate Certificate course is developed further through the compulsory Practitioner Inquiry in Education module of the PgDip/ MEd. Explicit in this module is the link made between developing research questions, investigation of available research methods and applying appropriate methodology.

Assignment topics are reviewed through feedback from regional tutors, the NASSEA programme coordinator, students' evaluations and the external examiner's comments. All assignments are read at least twice by paired regional tutors to ensure that they meet the University's competencies of a pass at the relevant graduate level. They are then submitted to the university where a selection is moderated.

Observations carried out by the mentors are monitored by NASSEA through a review of completed observation forms, feedback from tutors, mentors and students and through two observations per year of mentor observations. Mentors report on how course objectives and linked competencies impact on classroom practice.

Other QA procedures include feedback from:

- external examiner reports twice yearly in accordance with the University procedures;

- DfES (as part of the pilot qualification for specialist teachers of EAL); and
- OFSTED (as part of the DfES evaluation).

Learning outcomes and impact

The programme improves the knowledge, understanding and practice of teachers by developing a secure knowledge and understanding of theories of bilingualism, language development and bilingual education through the course materials, activities, tutorial input and discussion, and peer and mentor observation and support. Teachers are required to identify their progress in specified areas of learning in their learning journal. They are also asked to present data showing the impact on pupils, which they record in their learning journals. Examples include:

- knowledge about mathematical language;
- oral story-telling;
- improved knowledge about how to interact with pupils;
- group-work;
- experiential learning;
- developing language through drama; and
- supporting literacy through drawing.

NASSEA publishes the work of selected students as hard copies and/or electronically so that it is disseminated to a national audience within the field of EAL. Dissemination also occurs through an annual conference and through publication as a paper for NALDIC (National Association for Language in the Curriculum). Expertise and ideas have been shared through outside speakers, former students and students delivering presentations and workshops at the annual programme conference.

Participants have commented that they experienced an increased sense of status through taking part in the programme. This is particularly important to those teachers who work as peripatetics, as they often feel they do not have as much status as the class teachers they work with. One teacher commented:

> *"Good for CV, great to return to academic work, I have more authority and can counter uninformed attitudes."*

Another teacher was able to raise the profile of Urdu and Punjabi in the school.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- NASSEA would like to see the TDA funding made available for suitably qualified teaching assistants because they are increasingly taking key roles in supporting the learning of pupils for whom English is not the first language.
- Whilst TDA funding enables NASSEA to offset some of the costs for students it would be helpful if the funding kept in line with the increase in charges made by the university.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity'
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence

as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term "self reflection" or "reflection" as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the

school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for NASSEA to illustrate the extent to which responses from NASSEA students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 5 NASSEA students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback.

CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

NASSEA responses
Subsidies to fees were important motivators for NASSEA participants, as well as personal and career development.

The majority of participants received some assistance with funding and self-funded the remaining part of the fees.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

NASSEA responses
The main barriers identified by the participants are balancing the time and workload (3). The other barrier is finance (2). Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course include study release from school (1), improved organisation (1) and running courses locally to reduce the travel for some participants (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

NASSEA responses

Participants interviewed from NASSEA explained that they had found out about the course through their school (2), course tutor (2), existing links with the course (1) and the LA (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course included union magazines (2), flyers (2), email (1) and posters (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

NASSEA responses

Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (3), increased confidence (3), disseminating findings to colleagues (1) and increased knowledge and information (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

North East Consortium

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Consortium Manager, local authority (LA) managers, university tutors, headteachers and students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The North East Consortium is made up of four of the five universities in the region – Durham, Newcastle, Northumbria and Sunderland – and its local authorities. The consortium came together in an ambitious attempt to offer a more *"slick and efficient common forum"* for offering PPD in the region. Geographical and cultural factors, such as the size of the region and its relative isolation particularly in Northumbria, mean that it would be difficult for a single provider to cover it. The Consortium was seen as a way of making connections between school CPD, higher education institution (HEI) provision and local authority programmes, while aiming to remove some of the barriers to access and make provision more flexible and responsive to local needs. Durham local authority currently fulfils a brokerage role in the consortium and, as would be expected, there are uneven levels of participation among members. The consortium and stakeholders meet regularly to monitor progress and are developing an increasingly collaborative approach, although there is still progress to be made in this respect as provision remains very much institution-based.

Information submitted to the TDA indicates that the consortium as a whole offers 15 PPD programmes, 12 of which are offered at Postgraduate Certificate, Diploma and MA levels. These range from Special Needs and Inclusion Education, and Early Childhood Education to Educational Leadership and Management and Teaching and Learning with ICT. There are also Certificate courses in Leading CPD, and Mentoring, and a Diploma programme in Language and Communication Needs. For example, Sunderland offers six programmes and re-validated its provision two years ago in order to increase the availability of work-based learning and more radical, open modules. This movement towards offering more flexible programmes, often based in the community, was also reflected in the programmes offered by Northumbria University and, to a lesser extent, Newcastle. Flexibility is evident in the structure of many of Sunderland's programmes, some of which are taught weekly, others at weekend workshops or in the locality. It has also introduced three open modules in which individual content is negotiated with a tutor who then supervises, by directed study, the student's engagement with the module. This enables students to develop their research skills by being involved in a piece of reflective practice.

Sunderland has about 150 people on its TDA-funded Masters programme currently which represents a huge increase on previous numbers and its drop-out rate is said to be very low.

The value added by the consortium's approach to PPD provision can also be exemplified by the partnership between Durham LA and Northumbria University on Early Years provision. The local authority was clear that it did not have the necessary skills to deliver the programme and the university was able adopt a work-based approach, delivering training onsite and working alongside practitioners and children. This minimised the amount of time students had to spend out of their workplace. From the perspective of the local authority, this work-based approach had fulfilled all their expectations.

In general, there is evidence of effective collaboration at a strategic level and the consortium aspires towards sharing staff or ideas at the level of delivery, if institutional barriers can be overcome. The consortium has also faced the difficulty of integrating differentiated levels of commitment and speeds of development among consortium members. There was some talk of changing the consortium's membership, notably to bring in the remaining unconnected university in the region, and to attempt to increase the involvement of headteachers. It would appear that the role of Durham LA and its consortium manager will be crucial in broking ongoing participation and maintaining a strategic vision of PPD in the region.

Recruitment and participation

The students who were interviewed were generally content with the preparatory materials they were given before starting the course, but a minority felt that information was hard to get hold of initially. In terms of recruiting students, the consortium uses a range of methods but its strong regional presence and regular contact with schools were seen to be an advantage. For example, Durham LA's early years provision, highlighted above example, is marketed to all their schools every year and recruitment is now largely through word-of-mouth.

Students' motivation to begin M level study is similarly diverse. One student interviewed was drawn in by the e-mail flyer he received but he clearly stated that he would not have undertaken the MA at Northumbria if it had not been heavily subsidised. Another student on the MA in Autism programme also at Northumbria was motivated by a combination of a personal love of learning and the need to address more effectively the specific needs of children in her school. Other, more recently qualified teachers studying at Durham and Newcastle had been offered some credits towards postgraduate provision from their previous study and this had been a major motivating factor.

Students face a range of barriers in deciding whether to study at M level. Some were barriers, identified in the consortium's submission document, which are common to any educational provision or initiative, such as lack of time, lack of supply cover and the difficulty of balancing postgraduate work with the demands of school. These were pressing considerations for relatively inexperienced teachers. Conversely, more experienced teachers were felt to be more likely to be put off by the fear of returning to academic study many years after completing their teaching qualifications. Travel is also an issue, notably in the more rural parts of the region, along with funding.

The consortium and its constituent members have tried a number of ways to overcome these barriers. The emphasis on flexible delivery is one example. Some

provision, particularly in Early Years, has been targeted at areas with relatively low histories of participation in PPD and funding has been provided, although students or schools have been asked to contribute a nominal amount to underwrite their commitment. The universities of Sunderland and Northumbria, for example, have emphasised what was called *"distance delivery in the locality"*, as opposed to distance learning in the more usual sense, which has minimised the travel barrier for some students.

Engagement in CPD processes

As has already been indicated, there is a growing emphasis on work-based learning in at least two of the university partners, working with students in their local context and in their organisations, rather than on campus. The consortium is beginning to extend its members' practice-oriented provision and work-based learning to target specific groups. To do this, university provision and re-validation will need to be aligned more effectively. It was also interested in looking at the extent to which local authority staff could be used to provide a local and up to date 'flavour' to programmes.

Newcastle University's action research orientation was cited by some students as an important factor in attracting them to the programme. In Newcastle's MED in Practitioner Enquiry, for example, the pedagogic approach is based on exploring the links between practice, theory and research and students use both reflective and enquiry-based techniques in their professional context to construct a portfolio for assessment. Modules include the following:

- Coaching for change in teaching;
- Thinking through teaching;
- Creating and translating professional knowledge; and
- Policy and practice in assessment.

Some of the providers are moving towards assessing portfolios of evidence which include elements such as school-based projects, evidence from mentors, analysis of video observations, and presentations, as well as more traditional written assignments. There was evidence from students at one of the universities in particular of frustration at what might be seen as a more 'traditional' approach which clearly separates university study from classroom practice and prefers lectures over dialogue.

Learning outcomes and impact

Eighteen months into the programme, the consortium is beginning to focus on monitoring impact, having concentrated to this point on partnership development. Thus, while they are looking at collective, joined-up approaches to data tracking, there is still work to do in this area. The consortium's provision as a whole is overseen at consortium meetings and consortium members also spoke about developing new strategies for disseminating information and sharing knowledge, although it was recognised that this is expensive and has to be carefully planned. The consortium does feel, however, that headteachers' attitudes to PPD have shifted since the consortium had been established and they are now more open to the idea that professional development has benefits to the school, as well as the individual.

Consequently, evidence of improvements in pupil learning outcomes remains largely anecdotal. For example, one of the students undertaking the Autism MA at Northumbria had been able to influence school practice in a variety of ways, which had had an impact on the experience of pupils with learning difficulties. Classrooms and their seating arrangements had been changed to create more space and use colour less vibrantly. Along with new teaching methods and a simplified approach to rewarding and punishing pupils' behaviour, this was held to have dramatically improved the experience of one pupil with autism: "*He wouldn't have survived in school if I hadn't adapted and changed my practice"*. The pupil was more integrated into the school and had taken his Key Stage 1 SATs, which had not been expected in previous years. At the whole-school level, the approach to class-to-class transition had been changed as a result of the teacher's MA work, to make it longer and more structured, which was felt to have benefited all pupils. In general, the teacher felt that she had gained extra tools, resources, knowledge and ideas, all of which were relevant to her school context and the confidence to try them out. There was also evidence from one student of overall improvements in boy's writing through the adoption of a more multi-sensory approach as a result of her involvement in PPD.

The impact document submitted by the consortium to the TDA suggested that students tended to become more reflective practitioners as a result of M level study, as well as being more confident and better informed. It was also felt that students' assignments offered evidence of students' growing engagement with critical and relevant research in the context of their own practice. Emphasis was also placed on students valuing the relevance of what they were learning to their practice, which they felt had been successful in bridging research, theory and practice. Others felt that they had gained a broader experience of education and had been able to modify their practice through M level study.

In terms of developing research & problem solving skills in particular, several consortium members interviewed felt that there was still a fear of research among potential students, particularly among teachers who had left academic study many years before. Some students felt that they needed more consistent support with academic approaches and writing and while M level students welcomed the opportunity to develop research skills further, PG Certificate students were often reluctant to undertake research methods modules.

Summary of messages to the TDA

The consortium felt that, as well as being more joined-up in approach, it wanted to be more responsive to policy and be able to close the gap between M level learning and new initiatives in the region. On this model, the consortium would be able to use TDA funding to provide opportunities for staff to integrate M level study with work on evaluations, implementation studies etc. This was seen to be a potential way forward in terms of responding to the requirements of 'Every Child Matters' but it may pose problems for universities in terms of both capacity and timing. This links to a more general concern about extending PPD beyond teachers to support staff and others in connection with the 'Every Child Matters' agenda. Should providers like the consortium be able to use TDA funding to incorporate other agencies such as health and social services to develop a truly joined-up approach and joint PPD offer?

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term "self reflection" or "reflection" as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test

results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The prtnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the North East Consortium to illustrate the extent to which responses from North East Consortium students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 4 North East Consortium students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

North East Consortium responses
3 of the participants interviewed explained that the motivation to study at M level was personal learning and development, while 1 cited career advancement as their main motivation.

3 participants interviewed were receiving some assistance with half of their fees and one participant was self-funding their study.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

North East Consortium responses
The main barriers identified by the participants interviewed were time (3), financing the course (1), family commitments (1) and travelling to the venue (1). Generally the participants interviewed were very positive about the Consortium's provision. However, 1 participant did suggest tutors might come out to schools more. Opportunities for group work were seen as beneficial and valuable to participants.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

North East Consortium responses
Participants said that they had found out about the course from a range of sources including flyers (1), word-of-mouth (1), school (1), course tutor (1) and LA (1). Suggestions for ways of improving the marketing of the course included the use of posters (1), presentations by course tutors (1), school (1) and LAs (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

North East Consortium responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (1) and disseminated findings to colleagues (2). Two participants said that they had not yet seen any impact from their involvement in the course.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Open University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: John Ralston, the PPD Partnership Manager; Dr Nick Sutcliffe, the Director of Masters in Education courses; Janet Soler, Felicity Fletcher-Campbell and Jonty Rix, chairs of courses; and course tutors. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Open University (OU) has established a variety of professional relationships in a range of agencies and institutions across the country. A collaborative approach has been central to the development and maintenance of the programme, with regular contact and sharing of issues between tutors, administrators, teachers and students.

A number of agencies were involved in developing the three available M level courses (E804 Managing behaviour in schools, E801 Difficulties in literacy development, and E831 Professional development for SEN coordinators) including:

- local authority (LA) services (such as Derbyshire and Northamptonshire Schools' Psychological Service and Warwickshire Learning and Behaviour Service);
- higher education institutions (HEI) (including Edinburgh, Cambridge, Greenwich, Luton, Exeter, Sunderland, Christchurch Canterbury Universities and the London Institute of Education);
- primary, secondary and special schools; and
- organisations (such as the British Dyslexia Association).

Typically partnership activity occurs through a mix of telephone, email and face-to-face meetings with representatives of partner organisations. Cooperation between the OU and partners also includes the direct involvement of partners in the revision of materials, either as authors or as critical readers.

Masters degrees are awarded after completion of taught courses, programmes of research, or a mixture of both. Longer, research-based programmes often lead to the degree of MPhil. Also at this level are advanced short courses, often forming parts of CPD programmes, leading to Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Diplomas. The course content, assessment strategy and learning outcomes of this provision are designed to:

- improve teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice in relation to the teaching of children with literacy difficulties;

- enhance teachers' learning and development in the early years of their teaching career;
- promote teachers' abilities to provide INSET for colleagues in the area of literacy difficulties;
- raise teachers' awareness of the barriers to learning faced by some pupils as a result of their difficulties in literacy development; and
- support teachers in exploring and reflecting on appropriate curriculum responses to the needs of students who experience difficulties in literacy development.

Each course is equivalent to 60 points. Successful completion of one course leads to a Postgraduate Certificate in Professional Studies in Education. Where students complete two of the courses they are eligible for the award of Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Studies in Education (Special Needs/Inclusive Education). For a Masters award students need to complete any two of the three modules and an extended research module.

The courses have been developed in partnership with consultative support groups which include:

- teachers;
- aspiring and practising special needs co-ordinators;
- headteachers;
- LA special needs and literacy advisers; and
- learning support personnel.

LA educational psychologists, representatives from parents' groups, and academics also provide input to course design. The consultancy support groups advise on course content, presentation and the assessment structure. Film and audio materials have been produced in individual schools, identified as sites of good practice by OFSTED and/or other agencies. Teachers, headteachers, psychologists and academics have been commissioned to write texts and/or give interviews as part of the course texts.

Teachers' CPD needs were first assessed through national market research involving postal questionnaires to a wide range of schools. This identified priority areas of need in literacy difficulties and special education needs (SEN). Teachers' CPD needs were also assessed through scrutiny of TTA guidance, OFSTED inspection evidence, market research carried out by the OU, TTA and OFSTED documents relating to teachers' CPD as well as through discussion with local schools, and tutors and teachers studying OU courses.

All three courses are subject to OU internal quality control and assurance procedures, including that:

- the selection of content is scrutinised by internal and external assessors;
- assignments are designed to meet participants' individual current needs;
- tutors are employed against criteria which specify high levels of relevant experience and qualifications; and
- a sample of marked assignments is subject to independent comment on the effectiveness of the marking and teaching process.

The courses are also subject to external scrutiny. An external assessor is appointed to scrutinise the structure, balance, coverage, academic standard and professional relevance of the course and to provide external scrutiny of the assessment methods.

This includes its comparability with similar courses and qualifications offered by other higher education/in-service providers. Formal reports are required by the University, as is evidence that recommendations are followed up.

Recruitment and participation

Evaluation of e-conferences highlighted issues of barriers to participation. A number of steps have been taken to address them, including:

- re-negotiation of start and end dates of courses and cut off dates for assignments to fit the school year and teachers' workload;
- designing coursework and practical assignments to be compatible with teachers' regular work demands as far as possible;
- providing further development opportunities for tutors in supporting e-conferencing and use of course websites by teachers;
- amending course assignments in response to student feedback;
- broadening the means of communication between teachers and tutors to include e-conferencing as well as telephone and face-to-face tutorials; and
- facilitating support from the university library and students' help desk for accessing texts electronically.

The courses support a diversity of participant needs, and allow for progressive, flexible adaptation to suit individual needs. For example, they enable:

- conferencing among course members, tutors and the course team, with the aim of supporting professional development through collaborative problem-solving, and conflict resolution;
- direct correspondence between course members and the course team to promote course evaluation; and
- interactive discussion of issues and initiatives in the special and inclusive education area between teachers and guest experts.

The OU designs all its courses with the aim of reducing any barriers to study. This involves:

- supporting students to study at times and in places that are convenient for them and at their own pace;
- giving advance notice of all milestones to help learners plan the use of their time effectively; and
- making courses flexible, allowing teachers to fit study around their other commitments.

Around 800 part-time students are registered on the courses.

Engagement in CPD processes

All three courses feature enquiry and peer support.

Enquiry

The courses require classroom-focused research investigations. Participants are expected to draw up, implement and evaluate interventions designed to focus on particular barriers to pupils' learning that they have identified, and/or to improve the quality of provision for pupil learning in schools. The evaluation of these assignments has to include a critical reflection on ways in which pupil learning has been enhanced through linking theory to practice.

In addition, research and inspection evidence is incorporated into the course through participants' use of the course materials, relevant OFSTED reports and electronic research resources. Throughout each course, extensive use is made of case studies and research evidence drawing on and demonstrating effective practice. This provides teachers with the means of comparing their own classroom practices with examples of good and innovative practices in other schools. Examples of research findings that are used by teachers include:

- the outcomes of investigations into the implementation of the Code of Practice for the identification and assessment of special educational needs;
- approaches to teaching reading and spelling;
- studies of inclusive practices in schools, and colleges of further education; and
- approaches to the use of ICT to support pupil learning.

Peer support

Collaborative work among participants working in the same institution is actively encouraged. Another form of peer support is by video-conferencing and through an electronic blackboard which is used extensively by students. Tutorials also provide students with opportunities to meet and share ideas. Each course is designed to enable conferencing among course members, tutors and guest experts with the aim of supporting professional development through collaborative problem-solving, and conflict resolution. There is informal peer support from past M level students where current and past students are in the same school or locality. Where there are larger groups, for example, the Warwick Behaviour Centre, there are further opportunities for cross-phase peer support, although because of the range of schools and individual interests, associate lecturers have to first create a learning community. Online student conferences give students the opportunity to debate together and give tutors an insight in to what their problem areas are.

Learning outcomes and impact

Evidence about impact is derived from a number of sources including:

- students' responses via questionnaire;
- scrutiny of students' final assignments (research projects designed to make an impact on student learning);
- a report from one LA per course assessing the impact of the course on the schools of students enrolled;
- tutor feedback on the impact of the course; and
- external examiner's reports.

In all three courses, course assignments help the vast majority of participants to improve practice. There is evidence of:

- greater involvement of pupils in their own target-setting and self-assessment of progress;
- more effective inclusive practice;
- teachers being more responsive to pupils' needs;
- greater co-operation between different parts of the education system (for example, special/mainstream/Pupil Referral Units(PRUs)/Resource units);
- a positive effect on pupil behaviour;

- increased confidence in course participants informing senior leadership teams in their own organisations and contributing to school development plans; and
- whole-school involvement in examining efficiency and effectiveness of policy and practice (for example, individual education plans, behaviour management).

Some of the benefits to pupils' performance reported in participants' project reports include:

> *"Over a six-week study, small increases could be seen in the test results of some pupils. More importantly, their interest level in the subject itself seemed to increase and this motivation may be due in part to the meta-linguistic strategies offered to the class. In discussing multi-sensory approaches to learning, the pupils were able to consider different learning styles and this too encouraged them to become more active learners in the class by the end of the study".*
>
> *"Many children in both groups recorded substantial gains in reading accuracy, as measured by NARA. However, the improvement in percentiles achieved by the intervention group were quite remarkable and a tremendous source of professional fulfilment'".*
>
> *"All pupils made more progress in reading accuracy and rate than had previously been achieved in a comparable period".*

Tutors report evidence of impact on teachers' learning in a number of areas on all three courses, including:

- increased knowledge and understanding of, and confidence about, SEN issues especially with regard to those new to role (for example as SENCO);
- greater awareness of inclusion among colleagues (mainstream and special); and
- identification of personal development targets following critical reflection on own practice and execution of small-scale investigation in own context.

Reports from LA officers, based on students' written evaluations, verbal feedback and needs analyses, and discussions with school staff, contained very positive comments, such as:

> *"A gigantic stride in understanding the need to link theory and practice. I'd never thought about it before. I know that sounds stupid, but you just sort of do it, don't you, you manage behaviour in the way that people managed your behaviour, and you never think how that relates to theories of human behaviour. I've done the psychology before but somehow this course enabled me to link the two in a way I hadn't done previously'. "*
>
> *"From the point of view of those LA officers involved in training and supporting the professional development of SENCOs, the course has clearly promoted the knowledge, skills and attributes we are seeking to develop and has had a wider impact upon staff and schools".*

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to TDA

The OU has found the update conferences organised by TDA to be helpful in facilitating discussion with other providers and gaining a better understanding of what is expected of them. The OU would also value more exemplars of practice. Other aspects of PPD provision the OU would like TDA to consider are:

- the benefits of wider perspectives gained from work on inclusion across different countries;
- the opportunities for 'community building' afforded by electronic media; and
- the extension of the 'ownership' of inclusive education beyond SENCOs and the development of CPD approaches that involve managers, governors, heads of department and teachers in inclusive education.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;

- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the Open University to illustrate the extent to which responses from OU students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 5 Open University students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

Open University responses

All participants from the Open University gave career development as their primary reason for studying at M level, and personal development as a secondary reason.

Of those interviewed 3 participants were self-funding their study and 2 were receiving a contribution from their schools towards fees.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

Open University responses
Participants identified time (3) and finance (1) as the main barriers they faced when taking part in the M level study. Suggestions for making the course more accessible to participants included securing dedicated study time (2), increasing the flexibility of deadlines (1) and funding (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

Open University responses
Open University participants had found out about their course either via the website (3) or through their school (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course included presentations by course tutors (1), through schools (3), via headteachers (1) and flyers (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a

fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

Open University responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (3), reflective practice (2), disseminating findings to colleagues (1), improved management skills (1) and focusing more on pupils as individuals (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Oxford Brookes University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with Mandy Winters, the PPD Framework Leader and a principal lecturer; Erica Holley, the Cohort Leader for part-time MA students; Linet Arthur, the PPD Programmes Evaluator; Sarah Mossop, from Modern Art Oxford; and a number of tutors. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

Oxford Brookes University works primarily with five local authorities in the region: Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Swindon and West Berkshire. Provision is organised within Oxford Brookes' flexible Postgraduate and Professional Development framework of programmes, which lead to a Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma and MA. The framework has five core aims. To:

- support development of evidence-based practice;
- support development of personal study skills;
- develop and extend critical approaches to reading;
- highlight differences between educational research and other methods of research; and
- support pursuit and development of educational research.

Oxford Brookes University confers all the awards, but programmes within the framework are commissioned by its partners. To date, forty programmes have been commissioned in response to specific requests from LAs and schools and currently, over 60 LA and school staff are developing and delivering programmes off campus as Associate Tutors. Commissioners and Oxford Brookes staff co-design the courses. Examples of specific programmes developed with partners include:

- a programme in Oxfordshire for teachers working in schools in challenging circumstances;
- a programme to support school staff where colleagues wished to develop their mentoring practice;
- two programmes intended for teachers changing phases as a result of the recent Oxford City reorganisation;
- a programme for early career teachers, taught jointly with LA advisers; and
- a programme at the Mary Hare School for the Deaf in Newbury. This programme is planned by school staff with advice from LAs, regional partners and the University Liaison Manager.

Many of the programmes are specifically commissioned to address improving practice and reaching targets. For example a school in Buckinghamshire asked for a programme to provide assistance to a fairly new group of departmental heads in a school with a recent high staff turnover. In another example, at LA level, the 'Leading Improvement in Learning' programme developed for Oxfordshire is closely aligned to the LA target to raise achievement at secondary level in the county. All programmes begin with an individual needs analysis. Modules based on commissioned programmes are designed to meet the demands of the University's Master's Framework for accreditation purposes.

Brookes also offers bespoke 'Certificate in Advanced Educational Practice' (CAEP) courses, each worth 60 credits at Masters level. For example:

- advanced pedagogy for MFL teachers;
- advanced pedagogy for music teachers;
- advanced early years;
- cognitive acceleration in learning and teaching;
- mentoring new teachers;
- social, emotional and behavioural difficulties;
- teaching for personal development and well-being; and
- the autistic spectrum.

All modules – commissioned and bespoke – carry 20 credits (40 credits for a double module). With 60 credits students are eligible for the Postgraduate Certificate in advanced Educational Practice (CAEP). Those who have opted for the full Master's programme need 180 credits based on six modules and a 60 credit dissertation. Students working for a master's award are required to include a substantial amount of action research. Some external organisations allow Oxford Brookes to offer enhanced sessions so that teachers have the option of accrediting the work they are already doing as part of the training, for example, Cognitive Acceleration in Mathematics Education (CAME), the Society for the Advancement of Philosophical Enquiry and Reflection in Education (SAPERE), Leading from the middle (NCSL) and the National Association for Able Children in Education (NACE). Some of these organisations' tutors have been trained as Associate Tutors to enable this work to be undertaken within schools. In other cases university tutors are given a 'link tutor' role and responsibilities. Incentives are offered to schools and organisations regarding numbers of enrolments and the level of fees. For example if a school – or group of schools - can enrol fifty or more teachers on an M level course, the university waives the course fees for the teachers concerned. If schools cannot achieve this but can offer 15 – 49 enrolments fees are charged at a reduced level.

Oxford Brookes was the nationally contracted provider for Excellence in Cities (EiC) training in Gifted and Talented (G & T) for the DfES and G & T professional development continues to be a major focus of Brookes' work. Since the 'roll out' of training for G&T co-ordinators beyond EiC areas, Oxford Brookes has subsequently provided programmes in G&T education to 65 LAs nationwide. Designing the delivery of the national training programme for G&T co-ordinators in the Excellence in Cities programme gave Brookes considerable experience in designing M level courses which captured school improvement targets, for example, in terms of pedagogy and assignment design. Brookes was also able to build on previous relationships to develop the more ambitious portfolio of programmes.

Individual courses vary in actual delivery according to the needs of the group. They include twilight sessions, half days, whole days, semi-residential events, and can be delivered over a concentrated period of time or spread out. Sessions may also be delivered at a joint platform with the commissioning organisation. Over 80% of programmes are taught off campus in schools or regional centres.

Programme quality is assured by the CPD Course Committee (comprising representatives from regional LAs, representative teacher participants and university teaching staff) which meets three times a year on behalf of the partnership. Other mechanisms for quality assurance include:

- a formal staff peer review process;
- moderation of the work of associate tutors by university staff;
- external examiner reports;
- LA audits and evaluations; and
- participant evaluation forms.

In summary, the value of the partnership approach to PPD provision includes:

- joint planning of all programmes in the CPD framework with the commissioning school, organisation or LA;
- joint development and delivery of programme content by associate tutors from schools, LA and learning organisations; and
- joint programme review by partner schools and LAs (through membership of the CPD Framework Committee).

Recruitment and participation

Whilst LAs do still commission programmes for specific schools/teachers as we described above, increasingly, over time, Oxford Brookes forms relationships directly with organisations and schools through network meetings.

Discussions with various stakeholders revealed a number of potential barriers to enrolment. These included that:

- schools were not aware of the range and flexibility of the courses that were on offer, nor that the PPD courses were subsidised and usually twilight, so that costs were minimal and did not require supply cover;
- some teachers perceived M level work as beyond their capability, inaccessible and overly-intellectual;
- the traditional approach to distributing course information through LAs was no longer appropriate, as they have changed their mechanisms for contacting schools – for example, they no longer use the postbag system;
- email was not an effective method of communication with primary teachers/schools; and
- website information was difficult to navigate and did not cater to prospective students' needs.

To overcome these barriers, Brookes:

- makes courses more flexible and attuned to school needs;
- challenges the perception of M level courses as being only suitable for 'geeky' teachers by engaging directly with teacher in their schools;

- develops links with secondary head teacher associations (such as the Oxfordshire Secondary Heads Association and the Swindon Association of Secondary Head Teachers);
- targets schools directly;
- uses post and fax to send marketing materials to primary schools, not just e-mails; and
- continually makes improvements to the website. The site (http://www.brookes.ac.uk/schools/education/cpd2.html) now comes up in response to Google searches, and takes prospective students quickly to relevant information, specific enough to meet their needs.

Oxford Brookes has also developed the following marketing strategies designed to boost recruitment:

- a multi-aspect campaign during the autumn term 2006, which started with a press release, followed by radio advertising and bus advertisements, then a headteachers' briefing and book launch with drinks;
- attendance at two major exhibitions: the BETT show at Olympia in January 2007 and the Education Show at the NEC in March 2007; and
- the repackaging of flyers into a stylish booklet with updated artwork.

Barriers to participation and completion were identified through formal research projects and systematic evaluation of teachers' responses to programmes. The most commonly cited barrier was workload and lack of time. Nevertheless, participation rates are high (around 1,000 teachers annually) as are completion rates – on average, 60% of all teachers enrolled. Provision is designed to help participants overcome the difficulties of lack of time and heavy workloads through:

- negotiating with schools and LAs over delivery dates, venues and patterns of study so that they address issues of work-life balance. For example, the partnership facilitates local delivery, in participating school premises or teachers centres;
- providing remote electronic access to library resources at the university as well as providing readers for each programme, so that teachers do not need to visit the campus in person;
- providing an online element in programmes, which allows teachers to participate in online seminars at convenient times;
- encouraging LAs and school managements to set aside time for teachers to complete assignments. For example, group feedback on barriers in West Berkshire led to the LA funding an extra assignment support day;
- aligning programmes to other activities and priorities for schools, such as NCSL, LftM, the annual Oxfordshire research conference, BPRS, the Duke of Edinburgh leadership training and returners courses; and
- making assessments more accessible through portfolios and presentations. Teachers are also encouraged to submit a piece of written work early on to off-set potential barriers to submission. The completion rates for presentation-based assignments – over 80% – shows the effectiveness of such alternatives to written assessments at reducing barriers.

The move towards more local delivery (in order to meet local needs and address issues of work-life balance) has proved particularly popular with schools and has led to the development of a school-based MA, currently being piloted by two training schools in Bedfordshire. Providing an online component within programmes has (according to comments in the evaluation forms) had the added benefit of increasing teachers' confidence in using new technology.

Engagement in CPD processes

All courses are a blend of:

- face-to-face teaching;
- e-learning;
- tutorial support;
- in-school support (where possible); and
- way-staged assessment.

Coaching is a major aspect of the courses. Peer support, whilst not planned for, does take place when significant numbers of students from the same school or a group of schools are involved. Tutors comment how cross-phase peer interactions are valuable for creating a range of complementary perspectives, for example, for Special Educational Needs. Increasingly, programmes begin with an individual needs analysis so that teaching can be shaped to include particular contexts and interests.

Teachers' research and problem-solving skills are developed through the critical evaluation of evidence and research. Use and application of research/academic skills is built into all programmes. All bespoke programmes must incorporate school-based enquiry or action research. Tutors explain library procedures, literature search techniques and students are given tasks to practise these skills. The generic learning outcomes within the postgraduate framework require teachers to:

- locate, critically review and evaluate a wide range of published work relevant to the subject, to investigation or development activity;
- survey, evaluate and select appropriate methodologies for undertaking practice-focused investigations and development activities; and
- reflect on the process of school improvement.

Oxford Brookes has developed flexible and accessible mechanisms for teacher participants to access and evaluate existing research in their own practice. For example, the gifted and talented programmes are supported by an open access web site (www.brookes.ac.uk/go/cpdgifted) with content, commentaries and links to further sources of research. In order to support teachers' development of academic skills, tutors have created electronic 'Reusable Learning Objects', for example, for students to use when critiquing an article.

Assessment requirements are generally portfolio based. Interim tasks are designed to provide feedback and development of writing practice.

Learning outcomes and impact

The overall aims of the PPD courses are to:

- increase depth of knowledge and understanding;
- encourage engagement with the professional community;
- strengthen reflection on practice; and
- investigate and address pupil improvement.

Oxford Brookes analyses the impact of the PPD programme in a variety of ways, including:

- Reflective Professional Development statements – these are part of the assessed work for most CAEP courses and a core requirement of the MA;

- module evaluation questionnaires (completed by all participants in the final or penultimate session of each module);
- course impact evaluation questionnaires;
- external examiners' reports;
- partner feedback; and
- individual interviews with a sample of course participants.

The university is also currently exploring the use of pupil voice to collect feedback in the students' schools.

Participants have reported gains such as:

- improved knowledge of relevant teaching methods, differentiation and personalisation, resources, strategies, associated policy and practice, leadership styles;
- knowledge of action research techniques and using research to support ideas;
- broader knowledge base informed new practices and improved confidence and self-esteem, particularly in relation to managing colleagues;
- more effective planning, trialling and risk-taking with lessons to establish the best approach
- more extended range of strategies and materials used;
- changed interaction with children;
- more thorough assessment, targeting and monitoring; and
- increasing the challenge to all students, including gifted and talented.

One participant summed up the gains in these words:

> *"I have been able to use what I have learnt, or revisited, directly with youngsters in my teaching. It has given me the opportunity to reflect on my practice ... I feel more confident in my planning and although it is not always possible to find the perfect programme for each individual student straight away, it helps to know there is a range of alternatives there in your 'toolkit'. Before, I felt I had hands on experience – learnt something by trial and error, short courses and by working with more experienced colleagues, but now I have more theoretical knowledge".*

Another commented:

> *"More confident in assessing the different needs of young people and setting appropriate individual learning tasks to move children forward at their own pace. Improved knowledge of relevant teaching methods, resources and associated policy and practice. Able to effectively monitor and evaluate the impact of my chosen interventions on an individuals learning. Able to communicate with parents to explain my practice in relation to current research and involve them in their child's learning".*

Regarding the students' assessed work, external examiners have reported how all assignments focus upon different aspects and approaches to the development of professional practice and that all assignments are rooted in professional reflection, study and planning new action. They have commented, for example:

> "Such assignments will enable practitioners to enhance their understanding of the teaching and learning process".

"My reading of students' work leads me to conclude that their study and work impacts upon the potential learning and achievement of the pupils with whom they work."

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to TDA

Funding by the TDA has:

- enabled a more corporate and democratic way of studying for a M level award for teachers who might otherwise have felt excluded;
- enabled Oxford Brookes to discount the costs of studying at M level;
- allowed Oxford Brookes to be creative in the way it approaches schools and allowed it to develop a portfolio of differentiated provision; and
- helped Oxford Brookes to promote PPD by underlining the importance of the process.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';

- 3 ‘reflective reviews’; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a ‘professional development report.’

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers’ or schools’ own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);

- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;

- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for Oxford Brookes University to illustrate the extent to which responses from Oxford Brookes students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 7 Oxford Brookes students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

Oxford Brookes responses

The majority of participants (5) interviewed from Oxford Brookes said that their motivation was career development and the remaining 2 said that they were doing it for personal development.

3 participants were receiving some financial support, 2 were fully funded by their LAs and 1 was self-funding.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

Oxford Brookes responses

Travel (3), family commitments (2) and time (2) were the main barriers that Brookes students said they faced. The majority of participants explained that they found the courses very accessible. However, a number did make some suggestions for improvements including provisions for child care (1) and sabbatical time (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

Oxford Brookes responses

The participants interviewed from Oxford Brookes found out about the course from a variety of sources including website (3), word-of-mouth (1), course tutor (1), school (1), TES (1) and fliers (2). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course include presentations by course tutors (2), school (1) and making more information about the detail of the courses available (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

Oxford Brookes responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (2), improved confidence (1), improved mentoring relationships (1), improvements in whole school processes (1) and disseminating findings with colleagues (3).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Sheffield Hallam University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with Sean Cavan, the Partnership Manager; Guy Merchant and Bronwen Maxwell, the joint Programme Leaders; Tim Simkins, the Head of Professional and Curriculum Development; a number of tutors from Sheffield Hallam; and headteachers and teachers from the Sheffield area. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

Sheffield Hallam University's (SHU) main partners are Sheffield, Barnsley, Rotherham and North Lincolnshire LAs, and schools in the area (increasingly so) who express professional requirements. There is a Partnership Manager who has responsibility for developing and maintaining links with partners and finding new partners, and two Partnership Coordinators from SHU who are responsible for the day-to-day operation of the PPD programmes. Sheffield Hallam is not in a great deal of competition with other university providers but increasingly has private sector competitors such as Tribal.

The PPD programme has an advisory panel of teachers, school CPD leaders, headteachers, LA advisers, representation from NCSL Regional Centre and DfES Regional CPD advisors. The panel informs the strategic and operational development of the PPD programme in the context of local and regional needs and national agendas.

Following a recent re-validation the PPD programme provides six 'routes' to qualifications:

- learning and teaching;
- inclusion;
- early childhood;
- autism;
- PCET (post compulsory education); and
- leadership and management.

The hallmark of the programme is flexibility. There are flexible entry points and programme modules are delivered at times and venues to suit teachers' needs, often as twilight or weekend sessions in schools, at teachers centres or at one of the university's two campuses. (Over 80% of programmes are taught off-campus). Teachers can also take breaks from study if required. Teachers can opt to study as many or as few modules as they wish each year in order to accumulate credit, which can then be 'cashed' in for one of the masters level awards within the Professional

Development Programme in Education (Two modules are required for a certificate, four modules for a diploma). Accreditation is similarly flexible and includes accreditation of prior learning (APL) such as mentoring, as well as professional learning in the workplace. For a Master's award students must complete an extended action research project.

The philosophy that underpins accreditation is to *"add extra quality to what teachers are already doing in order to accredit their work and give the school something too".* For example, a new headteacher at a primary school wanted to create a learning culture and had heard about Professional Learning in the Workplace (PLW) modules that had taken place in another primary school. She contacted SHU who sent their PLW specialist to the school. Now five teachers in the new headteacher's school have started PLW modules linked to:

- effective writing strategies;
- early years speaking and listening;
- peer coaching; and
- raising attainment in maths.

In the words of the headteacher:

> *"Professional Learning in the Workplace has allowed us to work on projects in school to gain accreditation towards a Masters degree. They are projects we would have been working on anyway to develop staff skills to meet the needs of the pupils … The flexibility of the units ensured that staff could study at their own pace with full support from myself and the university tutor."*

Examples of other PLW projects include:

- investigations of particular areas of practice, for example, support for learners with special needs, communication processes within the organisation, the involvement of the community or how the organisation markets itself to its customers and clients;
- curriculum development initiatives, for example, the 14-19 curriculum, the use of information technology in the curriculum, or how to promote an international dimension in educational activities; and
- research projects, for example, examining the relative performance of boys and girls in public examinations, aspects of teacher-learner interaction, investigating the implementation and/ or impact of an initiative, such as the Investors in People standard.

The Faculty of Development and Society's Head of CPD has developed a new framework which allows the University to contract senior and highly experienced colleagues who work in Schools, Local Authorities, private sector providers as independent educational consultants, to work with SHU colleagues in the development and delivery of provision within the SHU PPD. This has given the PPD programme access to a broader range of experience, ideas and effective practice that can contribute to the development of participating teachers. Examples include:

- the creation of the new roles of in-school CPD consultants within two large Sheffield Secondary schools to work with SHU tutors in supporting their colleagues undertaking PPD modules such as Professional Learning in the Workplace module;

- working with NPQH and LfTM tutors and school-based senior managers to develop new accreditation processes for school colleague who have undertaken the NCSL's LfTM and NPQH programmes; and
- working with Geographical Association (GA) colleagues in developing new accreditation processes for the GA's curriculum making training programmes.

Recruitment and participation

Advertising is through flyers, leaflets and the website (http://students.shu.ac.uk/ds/cpd/about.html). Schools are also targeted to some extent for professional learning in the workplace. For example, the PLW senior tutor goes to schools, conferences, headteachers' meetings, LA meetings and CPD coordinators conferences to talk about PLW often taking some participating students with him. Currently, 719 students are registered on the programme. Recent recruitment data suggest that there has been a relative shift in students' interest areas from leadership and management towards teaching and learning.

Teachers have expressed a number of concerns about studying at M level, including:
- the rigours of academic study;
- lack of confidence;
- competing demands of course and school responsibilities;
- needing somebody to talk to about what they are doing on the course; and
- writing assignments.

To overcome such barriers to participation, SHU's PPD programme:
- focuses on the teachers' work in their schools to stimulate and reinforce school-based support from senior managers;
- has flexible entry points and clear guidance processes to suit individual's career history and progression plans;
- uses accessible and simple APL processes for teachers who wish to join the PPD programme with prior credit / experience;
- incorporates induction processes that encourage teachers to identify and discuss perceived barriers that affect them as individuals;
- makes use of twilight and off-site delivery in schools and professional development centres to minimise disruption to normal working patterns;
- incorporates a flexible approach so that breaks can be taken from study if required by unplanned changes to work or personal circumstances;
- uses assessment schedules that match and are informed and guided by the annual cycle of school activities;
- uses e-learning resources and other innovative approaches to encourage peer support;
- provides support materials that addresses:
    - use of learning resources;
    - M level writing skills;
    - school-based project management;
    - time management;
    - literature searches;
    - research methods;
    - project management; and
    - formative and summative assessment feedback;
- uses CPD toolkits (developed in partnership with South Yorkshire LAs) to enhance the capacity of CPD Leaders to support participating teachers; and

- includes specific accredited provision within the PPD for capacity building through developing CPD leaders in schools and LAs.

Engagement in CPD processes

SHU's teaching and learning strategies, delivery modes, use of learning resources and assessment instruments all emphasise the use of the working context as the focus of learning. In particular, teachers are expected to reflect on the impact which their learning has on enhancing their own professional capacities, and in turn how this enhances their pupils' learning experiences.

Thus, processes such as critical reading, professional dialogue, the encouragement of peer-to-peer learning and the creation of assessment portfolios based on real work-place issues are structured within flexible delivery methods. These facilitate personalisation and reflection on impact, with respect to teachers' own development and its subsequent impact on their pupils.

SHU's PPD programme:

- stimulates critical reading and encourages professional dialogue through face-to-face interaction and on-line learning communities to foster learning from peers as well as from more traditional resources;
- uses teachers' diversity of experience, good practice, real problems and solutions to enrich and illuminate the learning experience of all participants;
- uses portfolios, learning journals, e-links and other techniques to support structured reflection that helps to:
    - embed individual and group learning;
    - identify linkages between personal development and impact on the classroom/school; and
    - relate the individual's learning to their longer term career aspirations, performance management and their current and potential roles within their school;
- develops and uses learning materials that are informed by:
    - evidence-based practice;
    - classroom, school, LA and inspection data;
    - current research; and
    - national strategies and standards
- has flexible delivery methods that allow personalisation of:
    - the individual's pace of learning
    - the capacity to reflect on the impact that their learning is having on their pupils;
    - the identification of further learning needs; and
    - the use of available school-based mentor and peer support.

Enquiry methods are central to the PPD programme. Teachers progressively become more acquainted with research, enquiry approaches and research tools for action research. In all cases the first module of year 1 involves an in-depth look at practice and theory in the topic area. For example, the focus of the first Early Years module is how young children learn. The second module then requires students to develop an aspect of provision in their own setting. It is always about changing practice.

Peer support is another important element. Some tutorial sessions have time allocated for peer support. In the tutors' view, these have led to fertile exchanges between, for example, classroom and advisory teachers. Participating schools are

encouraged to identify senior members of staff to act as mentors to support participants' learning and embed that experience in school practice. A network of CPD leaders review, develop, inform and disseminate good practice in supporting teacher's learning.

In some cases, PPD students receive training in mentoring as part of a leadership and management module and then become mentors for ITE students placed in the school from SHU.

Assessment in most cases involves students in writing assignments. Recently the university has begun to explore other methods of assessment including presentations.

Learning outcomes and impact

Evidence to support the impact of the PPD includes:

- teachers' own analysis of the impact of their learning as presented in;
    - spoken testimony in SHU module sessions and emails
    - materials included by teachers in submitted assignments, which incorporate a requirement to address impact;
    - academic tutor forms which support students in monitoring their own professional development; and
    - module and programme evaluation.
- headteachers' and school CPD leaders' assessment of the PPD's impact on colleagues participating in the SHU PPD; and
- local authority colleagues – particularly CPD advisers', feedback to SHU programme leaders and other senior SHU staff at scheduled meetings.

Examples of impact gathered through teachers' email testimony (as part of student – tutor dialogue) include:

> *"Thanks for everything. I really enjoyed the leading and managing change course and benefited from it hugely. The results of leading a process of change was a 6% increase in GCSE A* to C pass rate and during the school's departmental review, my leadership skills were described as good with outstanding elements."*

> *"Just to let you know how I am getting on with the project. I know I was a little hesitant at the beginning but it is going really well. The class have really benefited from me taking part in the raising boys' achievement project. Having enrolled on the TLA I have learned lots about my own practice. Having attended a tutorial at Prince Edward school I saw a few good ideas for my own practice. One of these was the traffic light faces which I used for assessment for learning with my literacy group for the project, the rest of the teaching staff are now trialing it. As a result of me taking part in the TLA and me telling the headteacher about my experiences she has agreed to pay for me to take part in another project. So all in all it has been a very successful experience."*

Examples of impact gathered through teachers' reflection of impact issues in their assignments include:

<u>Improving Writing of Sci-fi Stories (KS2)</u>

"I feel that my understanding of children as writers and how best to facilitate this process has substantially changed. I am about to teach this story writing project again to a new set of Year Four pupils and look forward to putting into practice many of the things I learnt by carrying out this project."

Evaluating an Assessment for Learning approach to teaching narrative writing

"This has been a wholly worthwhile experience, and insight gained, once shared, will help us to make the teaching of writing a far more effective, enjoyable and beneficial experience for all pupils."

Differentiated work on Spelling with EAL pupils

"The children in the top group were happy that spelling groups were differentiated because they received special attention. The feel-good factor was an essential ingredient of success and related to high marks in their spelling tests."

Developing Group Interaction in the Foundation Stage

"The findings of this study show that this way of working has been particularly useful in helping the children to develop thoughtful responses to story where they can try out and listen to each others' thoughts and ideas."

Example of headteacher feedback:

"The teachers involved are visibly more confident about the work they have undertaken and the fact that their professional practice is "validated" in this way. They are reinforced in the view that they are "lead professionals" although they would be very shy about using such a term. Some if not all have won promotion internally or are now engaged in planning their career in a more systematic way than before."

Example of CPD advisor's feedback:

"The PPD has led to a learning culture and sharing of practice (within the school). Also learning from things that don't necessarily go as anticipated. Very valuable".

Dissemination processes occur through student conferences and, to some extent, through the web site. This is an area Sheffield Hallam would like to develop further. Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to TDA

Sheffield Hallam considers that TDA funding is valuable because it has more control of it than it would have under HEFCE funding. It is a major factor in offering Sheffield Hallam the resources to adopt more flexible and innovative approaches. TDA's position that M level learning needs to be relevant to practice and have an impact on it was very useful to Sheffield Hallam. The University used it as leverage during the re-validation process to allow it to shift to more practical forms of assessment and to hold a higher line around the debate about theory and practice.

The university recognises there is an issue about moving students on from Postgraduate Diplomas to Masters level, which was complicated by the removal of GTC's TLA funding.

There is concern about the current lack of funding to include non-QTS personnel in postgraduate programmes.

For example, the headteacher of High Storrs school (an 11-18 school) feels that the school owes its' 'High Performing Status' to the fact that the workforce is diversifying. The school has non-QTS instructors delivering key components of the post-16 curriculum and increasing diversification in support roles (Learning Mentors etc). All these individuals are at least graduates, with a number educated to postgraduate level. The school is proud of the fact that it has QTS, non-QTS and governors all studying side-by-side for an in-house Masters Degree with Sheffield Hallam University. It believes this enriches learning and thereby impacts upon standards and achievement. The failure of the TDA to fund these on an equitable basis flies in the face of the stated DfES policy of workforce reform and school innovation. The school also has a very successful GTP programme, and turns away potential graduate applicants at a rate of about three per week. On paper, many of these look to be high quality but funding streams do not permit the school to take them to QTS level.

The headteacher of Norfolk Park Community School comments how "*it is difficult to access good training for teaching assistants which supports children's learning. I would be interested to hear more about any developments in this area. We are well aware of the importance of small group and one to one work for our pupils to make progress. We have had a focus on a range of one to one reading interventions targeted at specific children, because we have been able to access good training for this area. We have been pleased with the development of understanding amongst the support staff involved. Data demonstrate that our children have made more progress in English than in Maths".*

The principal adviser for the Quality Improvement and Support Service says, *"Over the last three years we have adopted a city-wide approach to professional learning in the workplace which has reached a huge part of the workforce. A significant number have undertaken additional training and qualifications supported by the Sheffield Guarantee and in partnership with Sheffield Hallam; for colleagues to be able to access post-graduate programmes in the same way as qualified teachers would be a significant step forward in promoting equal access to training and professional development and I support the proposal to apply for additional DfES funding. The city council achieved Beacon Council status for its work in transforming the school workforce; this would make a further contribution to our commitment under the 'Sheffield Guarantee' and support us in our challenge as we move from a LEA to a Children & Young People Directorate. This not only increases the size of the workforce but brings additional training and development demands as we respond to the ECM agenda."*

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;

- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil

voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term "self reflection" or "reflection" as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers' new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts.

Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for Sheffield Hallam University to illustrate the extent to which responses from Sheffield Hallam students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 6 Sheffield Hallam students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

Sheffield Hallam responses
The majority of participants interviewed from Sheffield Hallam University gave personal and professional learning as their motivation to study at M level, such as 'always wanting to increase and expand knowledge', 'I started one project and got a lot out of it' and 'I felt it [the course] would improve my ability to deal with people'.

The participants interviewed were receiving a mixture of funding from their school (3), LA (1), part funded and part self-funded (1) and 1 participant was fully self-funding.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

Sheffield Hallam responses
The participants interviewed identified time (5) as the main barrier that they faced followed by finance (1) and studying at M level (1). Generally participants from Sheffield Hallam University said that they found the courses and tutors very accessible.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

Sheffield Hallam responses
The participants interviewed from Sheffield Hallam University explained that they had found out about the course from a variety of sources; word-of-mouth (1), school (3), LA (2), and course tutor or presentation (2). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses included presentations in school (2), flyers (2), website (1) and TES (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

Sheffield Hallam responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (3), reflective practice (1), improvements in pupils (2), disseminating findings to colleagues (1), improved management skills (1), greater confidence (1) and motivation (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Specialist School and Academies Trust

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February and March 2007, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, Coordinators, and Course Leader at Staffordshire University. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT) is responsible for a range of TDA-funded programmes offering a variety of subjects. The awards in Technology Education offered in partnership with the Staffordshire University are the only awards that qualify to be evaluated in 2006-07. Provision is essentially founded on distance learning with students being based all over the country. The partnership does not recruit large numbers of students local to the university, although it continues to attempt to increase its profile regionally (see below).

Provision is modular and students sign up to a maximum of five years' support from the university. Modules 1 and 2 constitute the Postgraduate Certificate, with Module 1 looking at project management and research methods, and Module 2 beginning to build up specialised knowledge and understanding by looking at technology and pedagogy including areas such as gender issues and ethics and values. In Module 3 students look at specialist technology issues such as computer-aided manufacture, as well as teaching and learning skills and sustainability for the Postgraduate Diploma. Students going on to complete the MSc have to complete a project and thesis for Module 4 and cannot begin this module until the previous modules have been completed.

The partnership between SSAT and Staffordshire University was described as being closer to a 'working arrangement' than a partnership at this stage in that it has not been established for long and the partners have quite separate roles and functions. SSAT is responsible for the finance, administration and marketing of provision, with the partnership manager and coordinators liaising regularly with the course leader at Staffordshire University. The university is responsible for programme delivery. SSAT staff have attended all the face to face days held at Staffordshire in order to maintain an overview of the structure and content of the course. Evaluation of the programme is done jointly and the partnership's submission document emphasises that quality assurance is shared across the organisations, encompassing scrutiny of provision by validating bodies and the monitoring of progress and completion rates. The added value provided by the partnership approach is seen to derive from the combination of

the SSAT's administrative capacity and national reach and Staffordshire's academic rigour and subject expertise.

Recruitment and participation

Provision has recently been validated to ensure it is relevant and attractive to students. The transfer of credits from elsewhere is not currently possible and all students must have at least two years' teaching experience and complete all four modules. It may well be that some prospective students see these factors as barriers to undertaking the course. Some materials are available to students before they begin, although care is taken not to overload them.

Overall responsibility for marketing and recruitment of students lies with SSAT. Strategies have included placing adverts in professional journals such as the D & T Association magazine; producing flyers for SSAT events and conferences; putting an article in the 'SSAT Bulletin' and 'D & T Update'; and producing e-flyers and newsletters for regional and electronic networks. Staffordshire University has also marketed provision through its own publications and tried to boost local participation by contacting all the Heads of D&T departments in all the local authorities in the region. Despite this, recruitment of students remains significantly lower than SSAT targets. The course leader at Staffordshire University attributed this in part to the declining interest in M level study overall in D&T over the last decade or so.

There are currently two cohorts taking the course. Cohort 1 began in January 2006 and currently has 6 students. Cohort 2 began in June 2006 and currently has 10 students. Plans are currently being made for a third cohort and there are currently 13 people interested in joining it.

Barriers to participation cited in both the partnership's submission document and the site visits include lack of time to invest and engage in postgraduate study; lack of mentors or coaches to maintain students' momentum; the pressure of working in schools; and the competing profile and demands of leadership qualifications such as NPQH. In addition, as already suggested, university processes and structures appear to place some limitations on the potential flexibility of provision. There are also issues around communicating with schools and potential students. However, it was not felt that drop-out rates were significantly different from Higher Education in general. The partnership has attempted to overcome these barriers in various ways, for example by ensuring that each module begins with an initial workshop day with taught sessions which introduce study and research methods and outline assessment procedures. This is seen to be crucial to anchor the course's foundation on distance provision. The supporting role played by students' school mentors and industrial tutors was also emphasised.

Engagement in CPD processes

Provision is intended to strike a balance between pedagogical and technical knowledge and to be applicable to the *"nitty-gritty of day to day teaching"*, acknowledging that students are practising teachers aiming to become better teachers and push the boundaries of their subject forward. As has already been indicated, provision is predominantly distance and workplace-based with students supported by an identified school mentor, augmented by the workshop days.

There is a self-evaluation process through which students audit their skills and needs, complete an action plan and sign a 'commitment contract' with a mentor in their school. Currently about 50% of students have completed this process.

The modules have recently been rewritten to focus more on meeting teachers' needs and developing project management skills. All course resources are available on CD, including assessment guidance; project management documents and research methods materials.

Each module opens with a starter workshop Saturday intended to introduce and address specific technical or pedagogical issues and includes an element of practical work. Ad hoc issues are also addressed and course participants are said to welcome this careful blend of activities and discussion. For example, the introduction to module 2 for cohort 2 included an overview of the course; a review of the use of CADCAM in schools; the use of PIC microprocessors; and a number of pedagogic issues. At the end of the certificate, students have to make a 15-20 minute presentation at one of these days on an aspect of their work. In addition, extra technical and pedagogic 'workshops' are planned in response to the needs of course participants as the course develops.

In module 1, students produce both an action research plan and a report, moving on to a mix of presentation, report and portfolio for the second module. Portfolios are intended to encourage students to reflect on current practice. Students are also encouraged to write for publication – one student has recently presented on 'Ethics and D & T' at a SSAT conference and is writing an article for 'D & T Practice'.

Learning outcomes and impact

SSAT has overall responsibility for collecting impact data and has conducted interviews with students about their progress. Early analysis of the impact of the course on pupils found that pupils were less self-conscious about their learning and more confident about the subject. In addition, teachers were found to be more supportive and meeting the needs of the learner more efficiently. There was also some evidence of informal pupil feedback being used more extensively by teachers.

Evidence from the partnership's impact report to the TDA suggested that in some instances the course had had an impact on participants' confidence in working with other teachers in their own department. One participant reported that he felt he had more 'legitimacy' in carrying out the role of head of department and that he felt comfortable in working with his colleagues to plan their professional development. Some respondents reported that their practice had become more student-focused, and they asked more questions of their students. Furthermore, the language used by participants in the data collected by the SSAT suggested that students had become more reflective in their practice and this had a positive impact on pupils' experiences.

Staffordshire could also offer anecdotal evidence of impact from the workshop days and students' course assignments. Assignments offer opportunities for students to demonstrate how these pedagogic issues impact upon their teaching. They indicated that students were engaging with the course document materials and set texts and reflecting upon and applying the learning to current practice in schools. Several students had critically reviewed their pupil project work in Key Stage 4 in schools in the light of the material covered and introduced 'pupil appropriate' project management techniques. Students were also found to have increased self-belief and

self-esteem and to be more confident, reflective and secure in their practice. They were said to welcome opportunities to reflect upon their own teaching and the pupils' learning in such areas as 'creativity' and 'the use of ICT', for example. Feedback from students and the external examiner has been positive overall.

Students' research and problem solving skills are developed over all four modules, all of which involve either action research or full research projects. The initial self-evaluation audits help to identify needs and gaps which are addressed as the course progresses. A Staffordshire report from November 2006 reported that "*All assignments so far assessed have shown the course participants reading widely through these course documents and academic education literature and reflecting upon their practice in the light of this wider review"*.

Various procedures are in place to ensure standards of quality in provision and assessment in line with university processes. These include external examination and consultation with colleagues.

Summary of messages to the TDA

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;

- 10 evaluations;
- 5 ‘portfolios of activity’;
- 3 ‘reflective reviews’; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a ‘professional development report.’

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers’ or schools’ own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and,

in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;

- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for SSAT to illustrate the extent to which responses from SSAT students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 3 SSAT students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

SSAT responses

All participants interviewed from the SSAT programme said that their motivation for doing the courses was a combination of personal and career development.

All participants received funding for their course.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

SSAT responses

Participants identified time (1) as the main barrier they faced.

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

SSAT responses

The participants interviewed from the SSAT said that they had found out about the course from flyers (2). Their suggestions for improving the marketing of the course included the use of fliers (1) and advertising in the TES and other teaching publications (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special

needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

SSAT responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (2), knowledge (2), greater confidence (1) and reflective practice (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Birmingham

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the PPD Co-ordinator and supervisors and tutors from the following programmes:

- Professional Studies (SENCO);
- Hearing Impairment;
- Visual Impairment;
- Learning Difficulties;
- Dyslexia Studies;
- Autism; and
- Speech and Language Difficulties.

Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

All TDA-funded PPD programmes at the University of Birmingham are developed in partnership or consultation with schools, groups of schools or local authorities (LAs). Many are developed in collaboration with teacher consultative groups and committees, and voluntary (parent-led) groups, e.g. National Association for Special Educational Needs (NASEN), National Autistic Society, British Institute for Learning Disabilities, the British Dyslexia Association, the Association for all Speech-Impaired Children (AFASIC). LA officers responsible for identifying CPD needs are involved in partnership arrangements with the School of Education (e.g. SENCO, Management of Inclusion, Autism programmes). Some programmes, such as Professional Studies (SENCO) training, are co-planned, co-taught and co-evaluated with local authorities such as Sandwell, Dudley and Wolverhampton, and are therefore much more firmly embedded in the region, but these programmes are exceptions. Much provision is distance learning, supported by a regional tutor structure along with school-based mentors in some cases, and overseen by an advisory committee. Some programmes such as Hearing Impairment and Visual Impairment are longstanding, mandatory programmes for people working in those areas.

There was acknowledgement that there is room for more partnership and collaboration among university colleagues involved in PPD provision. Tutors on different programmes did not share information and practice with each other as much as they would like and they would welcome a more collaborative approach in CPD in general.

Some courses such as Professional Studies (SENCO) are only offered at Postgraduate Certificate level, although students can use the credits from it to

transfer to a Masters qualification. However, some course tutors stated that relatively few students went on to a Postgraduate Diploma or Masters, possibly because the mandatory and specialist nature of many of the one-year certificate courses fulfilled students' needs. All courses are modular and students on distance courses are required to attend residential weekends and tutorials throughout the programme, along with skills workshops.

Recruitment and participation

The majority of TDA-funded PPD provision at Birmingham is in areas related to special educational needs (SEN), disability and learning difficulties and the university has an established record in these areas. Consequently, a large proportion of students are recruited by reputation and word-of-mouth. The mandatory courses recruit steadily and popular courses such as Autism are always oversubscribed. Provision which is offered and developed in partnership with local authorities, such as the SENCO training, is able to exploit its regional foundation to recruit students. LA mentors market that programme in the locality, encourage people to join the course and offer information about the support available. Another example is the Speech and Language Difficulties programme which is a distance education course that recruits through a combination of word-of-mouth, advertisements in speech and language journals, conferences and websites. It has also built up relationships with local authorities who regularly send students in areas such as Essex and South Wales.

Data about TDA-funded PPD programmes for 2005-06 show that there were 395 students in place, 25 of whom were full time. The most populated programmes were Autism with 97 students; Social, Emotional and Behavioural difficulties with 66 students; and Speech and Language Difficulties which had 37 students. In the current year, the two-year Hearing Impairment course has 42 students and is the largest course in the country.

Students' motivation for studying at M level varies according to the programme. The Learning Difficulties course, for example, recruits from nurses and head teachers as well as educationalists with a range of reasons for focusing on that area. However, tutors felt that there is relatively little encouragement for teachers to train in this area which means that numbers are consistently low, despite the fact that it is the only such course in the country. The programme focuses on building practical skills relevant to the classroom and is largely web-based, supported by two annual residentials. Motivation is more clear-cut for students on mandatory courses.

In terms of barriers to M level study, issues highlighted frequently included lack of time, workload pressures and competing work priorities. Interviews and the university's submission document indicate that these have been addressed in a number of ways. On distance programmes emphasis has been placed on using the local mentoring system and local tutorials to support students. Virtual email and web-based tutor groups have also been developed for isolated teachers who cannot easily access 'actual' tutor groups. Most campus teaching takes place in 'twilight hours' (5-8pm) to maximise the attendance of practitioners in full-time employment. Saturday or weekend schools are also arranged. On the SENCO programme different attendance patterns have been trialled. The potential focus of teachers' research in general has recently been narrowed to give them a firmer steer on how to conduct research, thus reducing the chances of over-ambitious projects that teachers subsequently abandon.

Engagement in CPD processes

As has already been indicated, the majority of the university's PPD provision is distance education, supported in many cases by regional tutors, placement supervisors and local authority mentors. The University has many years' experience of providing distance programmes in many of these areas. This allows flexibility as to when teaching materials are to be studied. Programmes are delivered locally to teachers via a network of regional tutors, and the dates for regional tutorials are agreed within each regional group. Several of the programmes emphasised their foundation on problem-based learning, an approach which presents students with a problem which is used as a starting point for new learning activities. The Visual Impairment programme, for example, was revised in 2004 to encourage greater engagement with employers. The use of online problem-based learning was introduced at this point and is now a standard part of the programme. Each module was redesigned around a problem-based learning case scenario, delivered through WebCT. The tasks for students were designed to address specific learning outcomes, for example, requiring students to research the presenting eye conditions of the case study child and analyse the potential impact on their learning and development (detail taken from University of Birmingham research report).

The Autism programme is another useful example in terms of CPD processes. It is delivered in both distance and campus-based forms. The campus-based programme has two study weekends in September and March, featuring a range of workshops, guest speakers and student presentations. The course was said to be founded on *"reflection on personal and professional practice"* and tailored as far as possible to students' expectations and requirements. Its success was attributed to the quality of its content and the quality and experience of its tutors, some of whom have been involved since the programme's inception in 1993. The University has also established a journal 'GAP' (Good Autism Practice) in partnership with Autism West Midlands and Autism Cymru, published by the British Institute of Learning Disabilities, which has featured student work. There are also two annual GAP conferences in which students are often involved. Most students were said to have had little prior experience of research and the first study weekend is devoted to discussing study skills and assignment writing. Later weekends have focused on a range of issues, including:

- teaching styles;
- classroom design;
- staff deployment; and
- examining the strengths and weaknesses of the public knowledge base.

By the end of the first year of study, students are expected to have been involved in an action research cycle and to be able to conduct a good literature search and write a good case study. The second year of study involves undertaking more sophisticated literature reviews and meta-analysis of the student's organisation. Emphasis is also placed on building relationships and working in partnership with other professionals.

Learning outcomes and impact

Birmingham's impact document states that the objectives of its PPD programmes centre on fostering pupil learning and performance, including academic, social, communicative and functional achievements, and pupil motivation. The aim was to

achieve this through developing teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice. It indicated a range of evidence that these objectives were being achieved, including:

- students' written assignments, projects and professional development portfolios;
- students' contributions to discussion in seminars and online discussions;
- reports of students increasing their influence at institutional level;
- reports from teaching placement supervisors on observed teaching; and
- completion rates.

Examples given at individual programme level included:

- one programme reported past students going on to develop regional and national 'tools' for professionals in the field, and setting up regional networks for inter-professionals in the field; and
- some students 'latched on' to a discussion about unstructured time in school. This led some to examine the role of their lunch time supervisors; others looked at introducing games and activities, others at the sanctions applied within their policies. All had the purpose of reducing behaviour incidents during breaks.

Several interviewees stated that the evaluation process had encouraged them to think more carefully about how they monitor the impact of the programmes. Impact is generally monitored through assignments, as well as through an initial audit of PPD needs, ongoing feedback and evaluation. It was felt by some programme leaders that the fact that most of the courses are distance courses makes it difficult to track impact on pupils in the classroom, although Teaching Placement Supervisors are required to highlight impact on pupils for the mandatory TDA courses.

Consequently, evidence of improvements in pupil learning outcomes is largely filtered through student feedback as exemplified by comments such as the following from Dyslexia Studies students:

> *"Students benefit from my wider knowledge and I believe, my greater enthusiasm"*
> *"The chance to consider and try new methods of delivery and support".*

The Speech and Language Difficulties programme emphasised the importance of the students' monitoring the impact of their work on pupil learning as a result of their action research orientation. In terms of impact on students and beyond, the tutors were able to point to the development of a speech and language audit tool in Essex which has had wide application, as well as students adopting new teaching strategies and pedagogies and progressing in their careers. In Visual Impairment, it was felt to be more difficult to identify specific examples of pupil impact as many students are visiting teachers working in partnership with a number of class teachers, although local support systems help students overcome such challenges.

In terms of research and problem-solving skills, both the documentation and interviewees stressed the importance of encouraging reflective enquiry and addressing students' anxiety about embarking on research head-on. Research is embedded in all the programmes and introduced at the introductory residentials. Students are also encouraged to disseminate their research through writing for professional publications such as 'SENCO Update'. Feedback summaries supplied

included comments such as *"Gained confidence, knowledge and very useful resource of information"* (Hearing Impairment student).

Summary of messages for the TDA

There were relatively few formal messages for the TDA, although some tutors felt that the TDA is currently not systematic enough about professional development in areas where provision is not mandatory or high profile, such as Speech and Language Difficulties or Learning Difficulties.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the

largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the

intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for University of Birmingham to illustrate the extent to which responses from Birmingham students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 8 University of Birmingham students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

University of Birmingham responses

All participants interviewed from Birmingham University said that their motivation to take part in M level study was career development.

The majority of participants (7) received funding to support their study from their LA or school. 1 participant interviewed was self-funding.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners

identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

University of Birmingham responses
Participants identified the main barrier they faced as negotiating time out of the classroom and supply cover (3). Time to study (1), travel (2), work/life balance (1), and regular changes to tutors (1) were also mentioned as barriers. Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses includes supply cover (1), funding (1), tutors to go into schools (1) and access to deaf education if participants are not already working in that area (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

University of Birmingham responses
The participants interviewed from the University of Birmingham said that they found out about the courses from a range of sources including school (3), website (2), word-of-mouth (1), LA (1) and a presentation given by course tutors (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the courses included fliers (1), website (1), advertising through school (1) and targeting of specific groups such as teachers working with deaf children (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special

needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

University of Birmingham responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (4), greater knowledge (4), disseminating findings to colleagues (3), improvement to whole school processes (1), leadership skills (1) and greater confidence (2).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Cambridge

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with any supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with the Partnership Manager and a senior lecturer. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Cambridge partnership is led by Cambridge University's Education Faculty (where the manager and administrative team are based), with input from Essex, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire local authorities (LAs), and schools and colleges from within the authorities. The Education Faculty at Cambridge has had a long tradition of partnership working and the PPD programme builds on these working relationships.

The faculty has created an M level framework and pathway that takes participants through to full Masters. Two types of awards are available *en route*: Postgraduate Certificates in Professional Study (Stage 1) and an Advanced Diploma in Educational Studies (Stage 2). Participants can enter and exit at different stages, but candidates need to fulfil the university's requirements to transfer from another institution to Cambridge, and continuation on the programme is not automatic. Candidates need to apply to continue from Stage 1, to Stage 2 and 3. (Further details of the PPD framework and progression route are available at: www.educ.cam.ac.uk/ptpd/index.html).

The faculty works jointly with its partners to plan, teach and evaluate all the courses.

These address such issues as:

- promoting and supporting school-based research and enquiry;
- developing dialogue and interaction in the classroom;
- fostering creativity;
- using information and communication technologies;
- teaching and learning in the early years;
- implementing major policy initiatives such as the Code of Practice and Every Child Matters;
- teaching and learning for pupils and students with a range of special educational needs, including autism, speech and language difficulties,

severe and profound and multiple learning difficulties, challenging behaviours and specific learning difficulties;
- leadership for school improvement and inclusion; and
- careers education and guidance.

The Certificate, Advanced Diploma and MEd programmes are all designed to meet the specific needs of teachers within the partner local authorities and schools. Individual participants on the courses are also encouraged to shape both the courses and their own enquiries in order to address particular issues, problems or priorities for the development of practice directly. Participants' assignments routinely make explicit connections between priorities for developments in schools and classrooms and participants' own studies and enquiries. The content of the programmes located in the consortia of schools or individual LAs and supported by the faculty, is constantly reviewed in the light of emerging issues and priorities that arise from the research carried out by practitioners.

There are a number of structures and systems in place to ensure that all partners are actively involved in the development of the programme, and that it continually builds on current practice. Standing Committees for Postgraduate Professional Development and Higher Degrees meet termly, with representatives from the LAs, headteachers, the Association of Colleges in the Eastern Region, DfES SEN Regional Partnership and faculty members. The Committee's remits include:

- providing guidance on the strategic development and quality of PPD courses offered by the university's education faculty;
- ensuring participants and course teams are aware of the criteria and standards required to achieve the relevant award;
- overseeing and monitoring evaluation and examination procedures;
- overseeing provision of accurate information to the University's Education Faculty Board on the entire programme; and
- identifying issues requiring the Board's consideration.

Other strategies for ensuring all partners are involved include:

- candidates for joint programmes are jointly interviewed and selected by faculty and LA staff;
- participants are asked to identify their own success criteria and review these as part of interim and final reviews of courses;
- interim evaluations carried out by course participants lead to regular reports to faculty Standing Committees and local advisory groups;
- regular *ad hoc* meetings between faculty link tutors and LA staff; and
- local advisory groups consisting of course participants, senior school and LA staff meeting with faculty staff responsible for overseeing and monitoring initiatives.

New courses are negotiated and planned by the faculty in conjunction with local authorities and school leadership teams. Issues that arise from the evaluation of courses lead directly to course revision, so that courses are adjusted and reframed to meet participants' needs more precisely. For example, the faculty is currently revising and restructuring the courses it runs for Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCos) in Cambridgeshire and Essex, in order to address the concerns of these professionals more effectively.

Recruitment and participation

Having a good reputation means that the courses at Cambridge are very popular with around 900 participants on the programme. The Cambridge partnership notes two main kinds of barrier to participation: logistical and progression. Strategies used by the partnership to address logistical barriers include:

- holding sessions in local teachers centres or schools;
- residential weekends;
- holding twilight and early evening sessions;
- posting lecture notes, readings and other relevant information on a dedicated website;
- provision of book boxes;
- access to on-line searches and journals;
- emailing draft essays and theses; and
- mailing to headteachers to advise about strategies to help their staff benefit from participation.

Strategies used to address barriers to progression include:

- providing short introductory certificated courses with clearly identifiable routes through to more advanced levels of study, thus enabling practitioners to develop confidence in themselves as learners gradually;
- students on the certificate courses meet with MEd students and MEd students have an input on certificate courses. All certificate students are encouraged and supported in applying for the MEd;
- liaison with the Gatsby Technical Education project to fund and support progression of NQTs to Masters and Doctorate levels; and
- offering courses to support teachers at different stages of their career in, for example, special educational needs, assessment, school improvement, language and literature.

Engagement in CPD processes

Course design is based on evidence of effective CPD. There is plenty of research on CPD and professional learning taking place within the faculty. For example, Donald McIntyre (author of seminal works on teaching and teacher education) is a Professor of Education and is quite involved in both the PGCE and PPD programmes. Course tasks typically take the form of one of the following:

- establishing a problem, collecting evidence and then addressing the problem based on evidence and reflection;
- conducting a review of evidence in a specific area as the basis for development or further enquiry; and
- conducting an enquiry as part of a collaborative group exploring an issue related to pupil learning.

The model of practitioner research adopted by the faculty and its various partners is based on one that integrates inquiry, collaboration and experiment. The PPD programme begins with training in research that explicitly links research to practitioners' experiences in school contexts. Teachers then select their own topics to research for their assignments and dissertations. They are expected to discuss these with members of their school's senior management teams and they are also

encouraged to make presentations and prepare accessible reports for colleagues of the findings.

Teachers undertake their own research projects with either tutorial support from faculty staff or school-based mentoring. The aim of the school-based enquiries is to enable teachers to make informed decisions about improving practice. To help make their projects successful, teachers are given guidance (through engaging in a variety of activities) on how to:

- keep reflective journals, to help them reflect on change, that is, new ways of thinking and behaving;
- identify their own learning strengths, to help them consider the strategies they use to study, research and write;
- find a focus for their own investigation, that is workable, manageable and interesting to themselves and their colleagues, whilst bearing in mind ethical considerations;
- develop research questions through considering their existing theories about classroom practice, for example a belief that boys' behaviour is linked to their self-esteem;
- choose and refine an appropriate method of investigation – research techniques and ways of collecting data;
- search the research literature;
- review and evaluate the data; and
- reflect and report on their findings.

Learning outcomes and impact

Discussions with course tutors and local authority advisers and inspectors carried out as part of the moderation of students' work and the review of courses, indicate that the PPD courses have a strong impact upon participants as people and as professionals. Comments show, for example, that participating in courses:

- helps participants to develop enhanced self-confidence;
- fosters self esteem in participants;
- raises participants' personal and professional status in the work place;
- leads to career developments and promotion; and
- brings participants back into study, often after long periods away from scholarly activity, and encourage them to continue and advance their studies and, in some cases, to proceed into higher degrees.

The partnership has also gathered evidence from school OFSTED reports that show that course attendance and the research and enquiry process have a strong impact on school and classroom practice. Interviews with participants and scrutiny of their written assignments show that this development work impacts positively upon:

- school culture and networks among teachers;
- teachers' personal and professional identities; and
- pupil learning in terms of attainment, metacognition, motivation and attitudes towards learning.

The faculty's external examiner this year noted the strong evidence of impact upon practice that students' work provided. In praising the faculty's PPD programme as providing a *"coherent and responsive programme of professional learning for teachers working in a wide range of educational provision"*, he identified and welcomed, for example, evidence of:

- *"carefully planned and systematic empirical studies"*;

- the application of theory *"in a range of professional contexts"*;
- *"rigorous"* and *"strong professional reflection and analysis of practice"*; and
- participants using theory *"to inform thinking about educational practice, but also to bring about change and development"*.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages to the TDA

- The lack of parity in funding for non-QTS students, such as teaching assistants.
- Many people who are not qualified teachers would like to benefit from PPD, but are unable to due to lack of funding – *"In the light of workforce re-modelling, this doesn't make sense."* (Course leader).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36. Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;

- 5 ‘portfolios of activity’;
- 3 ‘reflective reviews’; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a ‘professional development report.’

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning;11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers’ or schools’ own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;

- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for University of Cambridge to illustrate the extent to which responses from Cambridge students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 5 University of Cambridge students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

University of Cambridge responses

The majority of participants (3) interviewed from the University of Cambridge said that they were undertaking M level study for career development, while the remaining 2 were doing it primarily for personal reasons.

3 participants were self-funding their study, 2 were receiving some assistance from their school and/or LA.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

University of Cambridge responses

The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers including finance (3), negotiating time out of class (1), travel (2), time (1), motivation (1) and access to books (1). Generally the participants were very positive about the nature of the provisions and support provided by the University of Cambridge, making only 2 suggestions access to other libraries (1) and promoting contact between participants on the course (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

University of Cambridge responses

The participants interviewed from the University of Cambridge said that they found out about the course through their LA (2), a course they were already involved in (1), and flyers (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course include featuring courses in the 'vacancy booklet' which is produced regionally (2), through school (2), websites (1) and flyers (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

University of Cambridge responses

Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice (2), planning (1), pupils (3), reflective practice (2), disseminating findings to colleagues (2) and knowledge (1).

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Sussex University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with any supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, the Director of Student Support, a head of department, a senior lecturer, a local authority (LA) partner and three students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) programme at Sussex University School of Education currently involves the three main partners Portsmouth local authority (LA), West Sussex LA, and the Specialist Schools Trust (SST):

- Portsmouth LA has been working for two years with a team from the Sussex School of Education on three projects aimed at raising pupil and school performance in Portsmouth – assessment for learning; school-to-school collaboration; and student voice;
- West Sussex LA has worked with the School of Education for two consecutive years with two cohorts of teachers pursuing studies into inclusion and behaviour management; and
- the Specialist Schools Trust is targeting teachers within the Specialist Schools programme for bespoke and school-focused PPD.

In each case, the partners approached the school of education with their programme proposals for cohorts of key targeted teachers and all three worked closely with the faculty in planning the programmes of study within the framework of the MA/Diploma in Education Studies (see below). Recently, East Sussex LA has identified a need for a dyslexia project targeted at language and support service staff. Whilst the British Dyslexia Association is providing guidelines to work to, the tuition is to be shared between university and LA staff.

Originally two kinds PPD provision were available at the School of Education:

- MA in School Improvement and Professional Development; and
- MA/Diploma in Education Studies.

The School Improvement and Professional Development programme was a traditional type of MA programme which combined taught elements with action research, set specifically in the context of school improvement, and was geared to those with organisational responsibility. This programme is no longer running. The university found that teachers were less interested in this type of course. Rather, teachers prefer to study in their own time and in their contexts.

The MA/Diploma in Education Studies offers teachers a more flexible route. The programme does not necessarily contain taught elements (although it may if participants require). Core tuition is through one-to-one contact with a specialist supervisor (up to 10 hours per module) who advises the participant specifically on the project. The number of teachers enrolled reflects this highly individualised approach – currently 48 teachers, who range from early career teachers to teachers with 35 years experience. Teachers are enrolled on the programme for a maximum of 5 years, but the faculty expects them to complete in two or three.

Assignments are based on areas of enquiry identified by the individual teachers. The programme aims to develop teachers' research skills and to use these in an enquiry-based approach designed to illuminate an issue or issues of concern in their professional practice. Specifically, the programme aims to help teachers:

- develop understanding of knowledge, practice, contexts and current issues within an applied field of study;
- develop the capability to conceptualise, problematise and use knowledge resources to address issues and processes within an applied field; and
- engage in processes of reflection, enquiry, evaluation and communication.

The programme is accredited through written work produced under the guidance of the supervisor. The MA in Education Studies comprises a pattern of assessment on the basis of the participant achieving a total of 180 M credits. This involves 90 credits from a combination of the following:

- Minor Project 5,000 words 22.5 credits (1 term);
- Short Project 6,000 words 30 credits (1 term);
- Intermediate Project 10,000 words 45 credits (2 terms);

Followed by a dissertation of 20,000 words (2 or 3 terms). Submission dates for these written assignments are pre-set in order to conform with the requirements of the academic board.

The programme also provides teachers with the opportunity to prepare and submit for accreditation, work deriving from a number of activities. These include development and evaluation activities carried out in the workplace or non-accredited courses facilitated by Sussex School of Education faculty, by other institutions, or collaboratively by both. Education Studies students therefore include groups with a similar focus, often sponsored by their employers.

The faculty is known at both school and LA level as being a partner-friendly organisation. It achieved an *"excellent"* (22/24 points) in the last QAA review of postgraduate teaching and OFSTED graded the TDA funded masters work *"excellent".*

Recruitment and participation

Key barriers to participation in PPD – time, support and access – were identified via direct feedback from participant teachers; monitoring of participant records; discussion in review and planning groups; and a literature review conducted by the faculty for the TTA in June 2004. Strategies Sussex use to overcome the identified barriers include:

- flexible programmes which enable teachers to take account of changing circumstances both professionally and personally without deleterious effect on their studies. Pace can be adjusted to suit individuals, and the one-to-one approach enhances reflexivity and reflection in the planning stages of the projects. Participants have particularly welcomed this;
- support in school by senior colleagues – the focus of the programmes is always within the overall aims of the school/LA and senior colleagues are involved in identifying needs in the first place. The workforce reform agenda makes this even more critical as senior colleagues in school directly benefit from teachers investigation of practice; and
- improving accessibility – electronic data bases/search facilities enable participants to make use of the university library at school or from the comfort of their homes.

The faculty also found that many teachers had misconceptions about the amount of work and level of commitment required of Masters courses, which often prevented them from signing up for them. Teachers are now encouraged to sign up for an LA INSET programme which gives them a window into the MA. Sussex also allows up to 60 credits gained on the PGCE course to be carried over to the M level course to help make teachers more interested in undertaking postgraduate study. Credits can also be transferred from other M level courses. There is a high retention of students in the local area. Around 80% of PGCE students stay in the area, and the faculty is keen to encourage them to take up the M level courses.

Often, the programme is marketed directly to schools by the partners. For example, East Sussex, which aims to have one member of staff in each school qualified in dyslexia, markets the course to teachers working in the authority, by sending fliers to all schools and running 'come and try' sessions where teachers can find out about the courses by speaking to ex-students.

Engagement in CPD processes

Core tuition is through one-to-one contact with a specialist supervisor who advises the participant specifically on the project. Using such a 'person centred' approach means that there is some element of choice about the activities teachers engage in with their tutors. Tutorial sessions can, for example, be spent planning interventions, discussing evidence, responding to drafts, or simply talking through ideas and problems. For most students, the PPD takes the form of a cumulative or deepening analysis of an area of interest – that is starting with a literature review and research methods, scoping areas to focus upon and possible approaches, a small and then slightly larger pilot study, and finally a dissertation.

Teachers are required to prepare a number of written assignments reflecting their individual professional interests and stages of their careers that address key questions. Work is assessed (Distinction/Pass/Fail) against the following criteria:

1. knowledge and understanding;
2. use of knowledge resources;
3. reflection, enquiry and evaluation; and
4. communication and presentation.

In relation to the reflection, enquiry and evaluation criteria, for example:

- work at distinction level is expected to show ability to evaluate critically literature/evidence/policy and practice in an original or comprehensive way,

demonstrate the ability to design and carry out an enquiry as appropriate, where the processes and/or outcomes are of unusual professional or academic value and/or makes a significant contribution in advancing learning and/or solving problems;

- work at pass level shows the ability to evaluate critically literature/evidence/policy and practice, and demonstrates the ability to design and carry out an enquiry as appropriate; demonstrates ability to advance learning and/or solve problems; and
- work fails which shows inability to evaluate critically literature/evidence/policy and practice, demonstrates inability to evaluate critically literature/evidence/policy and practice, and demonstrates inability to advance learning or solve problems.

Learning outcomes and impact

Both the partner's and the faculty's interests are clearly on improved performance in schools, at school, at teacher and at pupil levels. This explicit intention permeates the programmes and underpins the individual teachers' projects. The following project titles give an indication of how the MA students have addressed their pupils' learning experiences:

'An Exploration of the impacts of distributed leadership in a new secondary school'

'Student participation: questions of quantity and quality, timing and motivation'

'An evaluation of adding work experience to the A-level Business Studies pedagogy'

'Does further pupil involvement in learning have an impact on attainment?'

Comments made by course tutors on student assignments reveal the impact (direct or indirect) of the projects on teacher's professional practice and pupil performance:

"You make clear, thoughtful comments on how this research is likely to affect your own professional practice".

"This is an interesting project, the findings of which are of great relevance to your professional role in school".

"The project's real achievement is in linking this [social theory] to practical professional concerns".

Another form of impact is through teachers disseminating what they have learnt on their course to colleagues – completing their study leads to them being viewed as experts. For example, a group of teachers from one LA researched topics related to behavioural management. On completion of the MA many of these teachers were appointed as leading teachers in this field, able to support and guide other teachers in tackling behavioural issues.

Further information about impact is provided in the analysis of student interviews and portfolio reviews.

Summary of messages for the TDA

The PPD programme includes a very broad spectrum of offer from diverse providers, and not all come across as paying the same attention to QA as others. For Sussex, quality and completion are important, whereas others seem to be focused on efficiency. Fees for providers like Sussex are high whereas others seem able to offer low or even no fees.

The economics of this are unclear to Sussex, and there is a suspicion that there is something in the funding mechanism that encourages providers to offer INSET or CPD where it is possible to achieve economies of scale, rather than M Level provision which is more individualised and therefore harder to make efficient. Sussex perceives this as a challenge to quality and a dilution of what it means to study at M Level.

Generally it experiences the funding mechanism as lacking transparency and feels disadvantaged in the way the funding works.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;

- 10 evaluations;
- 5 ‘portfolios of activity’;
- 3 ‘reflective reviews’; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a ‘professional development report.’

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers’ or schools’ own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and,

in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and post-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association);
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);

- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for the University of Sussex to illustrate the extent to which responses from Sussex students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 4 University of Sussex students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform Partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

University of Sussex responses

2 participants interviewed from the University of Sussex said that their motivation for studying for M level qualifications as part of their career development. The other 2 participants were studying for personal reasons 'mostly for professional knowledge', 'I've wanted an MA since I did my degree, more for my learning than for my career'.

Participants were funding their study from a range of sources including self-funding, through a loan and school funding.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

University of Sussex responses

The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers to engagement with M level study including finance (2), time (2), family commitments (2) and travel (1). Participants commented on the positive benefits of the flexibility of the courses, however did suggest that accessibility might be increased through additional funding (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

University of Sussex responses

The participants interviewed from the University of Sussex said that they found out about the course either through existing links with the university from previous study (2) or through the website (2). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course

include advertising through school (2), presentations by course tutors (2), word-of-mouth (1), LA (1) and website (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

University of Sussex responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (1), knowledge (2), improvements in pupils (1), dissemination of findings to colleagues (1) and reflective practice (1). Two participants said that they had not yet seen any impact from their PPD courses.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

York St. John University

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the site. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2007, and interviews with: the Head of CPD; the Head of Programme; the Dean of Faculty and North Yorkshire Business Enterprise Partnership (NYBEP) representative; and three MA students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

York St. John University offers PPD in partnership with the North Yorkshire Business Enterprise Partnership (NYBEP) and a number of local authorities (LAs), particularly the City of York, North Yorkshire, Doncaster and East Riding. Working in partnership is central to the university's philosophy and methodology of future development of CPD. Provision and delivery are very much led by the university. The university took the decision to apply for TDA funding for PPD as part of broadening its horizons in a strategic shift away from its historic concentration on teacher education towards offering advanced professional development to students alongside fellow practitioners. In addition, the university regards its fee structure as relatively modest and values the contribution made by TDA funding, especially as most of its students fund themselves. Funding has also given the partnership space to consider how to target schools and students more effectively.

As indicated, the partnership is attempting to extend its coverage of the region, but the combination of geographical factors such as the large size of authorities such as North Yorkshire and a cultural reluctance to travel has made that problematic. NYBEP adds value by organising CPD events and using its network of fieldworkers based in schools and colleges in the region to attempt to extend the partnership's reach (see below). Working with partners in this way has enabled the university to engage more widely with a range of stakeholders in the region. In particular, it maintains regular dialogue with NYBEP through regular evaluative and update meetings. A number of the university's programmes were developed in conjunction with LA Advisers who have contributed to and led some of the programmes. In addition, teachers, headteachers and LA officers are involved in the programmes' Steering Committee which oversees policies and practice and the CPD Consultative Group held in the university and attended by tutors and LA staff. The university has also been building stronger links with local schools, following the devolution of more and more responsibility for CPD to schools in recent years and is considering working with other partnerships, to develop further.

Recruitment and participation

The university's submission document identified a range of organisations and stakeholders that had been consulted to ensure that provision met local and national needs. These included UCET, to identify links with developments such as the GTCE Teacher Learning Academy and e-portfolios; consultation with Yorkshire and Humberside Regional CPD Forum, recognising the need for recognition and continuity with regard to leadership qualifications such as NPQH; and local authorities to develop programmes collaboratively. The PPD programme was developed specifically to meet the needs of busy professionals who need a vehicle for personal and professional development within the framework of school improvement. It is designed to address a range of needs and opportunities and offers specialist pathways, e.g. Leadership and Management which supports LftM, NPQH and LPSH and Learning which supports the Primary and KS3 strategies. In order to ensure they adapt to developments, the programme involves:

- ongoing monitoring and evaluation based on the outcomes of participating teachers' projects;
- ongoing consultation with stakeholders through regular timetabled meetings of the CPD Consultative Group and Steering Committee;
- regular discussions of the CPD team to review practice and make changes; and
- membership of external bodies such as UCET and the Yorkshire Humberside Regional CPD Forum to address national, regional and local trends and emerging needs.

Course preparations were generally regarded favourably by students interviewed, who also valued highly the degree of support offered by staff at the university. As has already been indicated, the NYBEP network of fieldworkers is used to get messages out to targeted schools, as well as the CPD days held on campus and in three localities. For example, an Action Research and School Improvement Event is being held at the university on 14th June 2007 which will focus on 'making a difference in the classroom through practitioner enquiry' as part of an attempt to encourage schools and local authorities to see the value of the practitioner-led approach in terms of school improvement. As well as working with local authorities and targeting schools directly, the university is implementing more radical recruitment and marketing strategies such as funding the recruitment of school research tutors. Their role is *"to promote a research-engaged school with staff and students becoming research active"* and to increase the engagement of young researchers. In relation to this, the university has approached five or six schools which are serious about developing CPD and teacher research to work in partnership with them.

These efforts are necessary as student numbers are relatively low on the PPD courses currently, with 30 students on the programme across three years. However, retention rates are felt to be high – the data submitted to the TDA for 2005-06 stated that of the 12 MA students registered at that time, one had completed and nine were expected to complete. In addition, new modules such as those on mentoring and coaching have been introduced to attract new students.

The three students interviewed during the site visit were motivated to undertake M level study for a number of reasons, including career progression, the opportunity to undertake action research, and an 'intrinsic' desire to learn and explore an area of longstanding interest. One student had done his teacher training at York St. John and had always planned to do an MA and was motivated by a desire to develop his

practice rather than his career as such. He also valued the MA's emphasis on development and change and the potential to tailor it to his and his school's needs.

A number of barriers to M level study were identified from the visit and the documentary evidence examined. Some, such as the geographical and cultural issues associated with the region have already been highlighted. Others, such as lack of time, the availability of suitably flexible provision, levels of support in schools and the demands of classroom practice, are common to all kinds of CPD. The university also felt that in terms of PPD work, penetrating schools can be challenging and therefore a number of different initiatives are being tried. Attempts are being made to overcome these barriers in a number of ways. The university is trying to break boundaries such as distance by using NYBEP network events to reach potential students, although there is considerable opportunity cost in doing this as the programme has very limited resources in terms of academic staff. In addition, the use of intensive study weekends, supplemented by face-to-face and email support from tutors, is designed to maximise the flexibility of provision and focusing on national and local priorities is a way to ensure programmes are both relevant and tailored to teachers' needs. Other initiatives such as the school research tutor project are attempts to get into schools more directly and build teachers' confidence in embarking on M-level study. It was noticeable that students interviewed were keen to highlight the importance of the high levels of support they received from both their school and headteacher and university staff in maintaining their commitment to the course.

Engagement in CPD processes

As has already been indicated, the programme emphasises action research and practitioner enquiry heavily and the University is looking at developing more flexible modes of assessment in response to comments from their external examiner. Use is made of WebCT, as well as delivery in the locality where viable, and the programme has adopted a more flexible approach to delivery. The external examiner's report commented that *"In the depth of professional development achieved by the students, I would argue that it exceeds that achieved by similar master's degrees at other universities."*

The MA in Educational Improvement, Development and Change is modular and based on two core practitioner research modules. It offers a number of specialist pathways including leadership and management; global education/citizenship; and mentoring and educational consultancy for professional learning. Modules are normally delivered through non-residential intensive short courses at weekends in October and February which run from 5pm on Friday through to Sunday evening. Students can also choose to stop at the PG Certificate or PG Diploma levels.

The University decided, when it revised its MA three years ago, to focus on practitioner enquiry and increasing the relevance to practice. Accordingly, emphasis has been placed on developing collaborative action research and reflective practitioners, building capacity and ensuring sustainability. It was thought that this would create a more powerful form of PPD. As indicated in its submission document, York St. John has also extended its reach by bringing together young researchers (14-17), teachers and undergraduate students, for example at residential weekends, as a way of sharing research and encouraging MA students to develop young researcher materials in schools.

Learning outcomes and impact

Impact is monitored and quality is assured by the University's processes and procedures and University staff were able to provide anecdotal evidence of impact from student feedback and assignments. The students interviewed felt, legitimately, that it was early (as well as problematic) to be looking for evidence of improvements in pupil learning outcomes. However, comments offered during interviews or from course feedback included the following:

> *"I have also become far more conscious of being able to widen pupils' knowledge through the correct/ varied use of questioning in lessons, and offering a variety of different feedback when completing my observations or marking pupils' work.*"(Student 1)

> *"The module made me reflect on my lessons more and I find I listen more carefully to the children's views and their reception to different teaching strategies… I am more willing to try new styles of lesson and I am differentiating lessons better."* (Student 2)

Student 1 also felt that she had become 'more open to the needs of the children' and more open to reciprocal teaching and learning with her pupils as a result of her research. Furthermore, some of her work on questioning has been written into the school's schemes of work and used in whole staff training. Another student felt that he had become more reflective and challenging than before and, although it was too early to judge the impact of his work on peer assessment and rewards systems in school, there had already been some opportunities to feed back to the school through presentations. The work of another student on writing scaffolds had *"sparked an enthusiasm amongst staff across both Key Stages"* both for the intervention in particular and for teacher research in general.

In terms of developing research and problem-solving skills, feedback and interviews indicated that students valued the programme's opening weekend which focused on making research and enquiry understandable by going through approaches, methods and issues in detail. This involved demystifying research by providing small scale, down to earth examples and getting existing students to talk to new students. Students are also encouraged to keep a research diary and present at the annual Research Impact Conference which takes place in July each year. While the University acknowledged that dissemination of research is an issue, one student has published an article about action research in PE in 'CPD Update' and another has produced a booklet for parents in her school.

In general, the University felt that students had developed new knowledge and understanding through their engagement with research and were more confident about innovating and engaging in action research. Module evaluations supplied included the following observations:

> *"The main benefits: learning about theories of learning styles, emotional intelligence, philosophy for communities and the critical analysis of all the 'theory' covered. Excellent handouts – excellent activities."*

> *"Being able to gain an insight into different perspectives of SEN practice. Excellent delivery of information."*

Summary of messages to the TDA

Although York St. John did not offer formal messages for the TDA, there was some frustration that it is not currently possible to widen participation in PPD by extending provision beyond teachers to people like FE lecturers and classroom assistants. There was also a feeling that there was a lack of clarity in schools about relative status of (and overlaps between) TDA-funded PPD and leadership qualifications or the GTCE's Teaching Learning Academy. In some cases this seems to make it difficult for schools to prioritise professional development.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers undertook an umbrella 'review' of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 20 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The researchers were looking for evidence to support the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews in five broad fields. We wanted to know the:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for students plus intended learning for pupils was;
- what sort of intervention processes the students undertook; and
- whether impact was evaluated, the tools/methods used for this and the nature of the evidence presented by the students.

In the event we had access to student work from 19 of the 20 sites and we looked at 100 samples of student work. This section of the feedback report offers a programme level overview from a reading of the outcomes of the portfolio review under these five headings. We have not used percentages as all numbers are out of a hundred.

Project/assignment type

The work we looked at reflected professional development projects/activities at various stages of progression and credit level. Hence they were not comparable and we used them to illustrate and complement the data already collected via documentary analysis and site visits.

The largest block of projects was action research based (36). Of the others, there were:

- 19 case studies;
- 15 literature reviews;
- 10 evaluations;
- 5 'portfolios of activity';
- 3 'reflective reviews'; and
- the rest were an assorted variety of different types of activity, including a teacher assessment report, a report of a seminar, and a 'professional development report.'

While it was not always possible to gain a clear picture of the exact focus of the work, there was a diverse range of which leadership and management (13) were the largest block, followed by AfL, inclusion and SEN (8 each) with the rest fairly evenly

spread between subject/curriculum based projects, team building, self-assessment, pupil voice, school processes, mentoring, ethics, project management, behaviour, student characteristics, theoretical/philosophical, sociology of education and ICT.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The learning outcomes for students were divided between improved teaching skills, with diverse foci (32) and improved subject skills – also 32. Other intended learning outcomes included:

- improved professional learning skills (26);
- improved knowledge of school processes (6); and
- improved leadership skills (4).

Sixteen studies referred to improved pupil learning; 11 to specifically identified literacy learning and a further 7 targeted improved knowledge, skills and understanding. 13 identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence as intended outcomes of the PPD work. All of these were targeted at specific groups of students. In 35 of the portfolios we reviewed, the impact on pupil learning as a result of the professional development was not precisely identified but was nevertheless assumed to be an important outcome of the PPD. Pupil learning was an explicit, if indirect goal of the activity. Five students tackled improvements in pupil voice and empowerment. Only 12 of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes, largely because of the nature of the assignments – e.g. school provision for hearing impaired children – where it would be extremely difficult to make such links explicit.

Intervention processes

Students on these 19 programmes were engaged in a very diverse range of activities and processes, reflecting the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. These ranged from partnership teaching, cross-age peer tutoring, coaching or mentoring colleagues, presentations and seminars to working with an individual student. In addition, as we shall see below, the majority of students were engaged in inquiry-based methods such as observation, interview and questionnaires.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in the reports we looked at (79) included an element of evaluation, or attempt to gauge the impact of the activities on the school/student and, in some cases, identified groups of pupils. The tools used for making judgements about impact included:

- observation (25) (in a very few cases the use of video was mentioned);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (29);
- survey questionnaires (21); and
- pre- and pos-test results (9).

Thirteen of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, ranging from analyses of pupil work during the course of the

intervention to pupil self and peer assessment. One student used national test data as a yardstick. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In some cases it was apparent that the types of evidence used reflected the preference of the accrediting institution: for example, in a small number of sites teachers used the term “self reflection” or “reflection” as one means of assessing the impact of their work; all five portfolios from one site made reference to pupil feedback (pupil voice ascertained through interviews and questionnaires;) and in the case of one provider the projects mostly involved an analysis of theory in relation to its potential impact on practice.

In some cases impact on pupils was attributed indirectly, by association with evidence-based impact on teachers’ new knowledge or teaching strategies. In 44 reports examples of impact data were included in some form: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. A number of projects (see above) were concerned with organisational or whole-school processes where it would be inappropriate to attempt to look for short-term associations between the programme activities and the potential impact on the school, teachers or pupils. Some projects were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Thirty-one of the portfolios we looked at included a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. Thus nearly a third of the student reports showed a very high level of engagement with enquiry methods.

Practitioner perceptions of PPD

During summer term 2007 CUREE researchers interviewed over 100 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 20 Partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The Partnerships were:

- Bury LA;
- Canterbury Christchurch University College;
- CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching);
- CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education);
- College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon));
- DATA (Design and Technology Association) ;
- Dyslexia Action;
- East Midlands Partnership;
- Institute of Education (1) - University of London;
- Middlesex University (MIDWHEB);
- NASSEA (Northern Association of Support Services for Equality and Achievement);
- North East Consortium - Durham LA;
- Open University;
- Oxford Brookes;
- Sheffield Hallam University;
- SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust);
- University of Birmingham;
- University of Cambridge;
- University of Sussex; and
- York St. John University.

The researchers asked questions under four umbrella headings:

- motivation to participate in PPD;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- the visibility and marketing of PPD programmes; and
- the impact of participation.

This section of the feedback report offers programme level highlights from a reading of the outcomes of the interviews under these four headings. The report then offers an alternative, comparative picture for York St. John University to illustrate the extent to which responses from York St. John students are the same as or differ from the overall picture emerging from the programme level analysis. 2 York St. John students were interviewed.

Given the size of our overall sample and the number of participants interviewed for each site, this information is provided for interest only and is intended to inform partners' discussions about their offer against the backdrop of their knowledge and experience of their context, rather than offering conclusive results or feedback. CUREE will be offering a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of the interviews to TDA in the main project report, which is due on 31 July 2007.

Motivation to participate in PPD

For most practitioners, the opportunities that PPD offers for personal development of various kinds were the main driver to participation. Roughly 30% of all participants interviewed identified career development as their principle motivator and another 30% said that improving their subject/pedagogic/leadership knowledge or advancing their professional learning was what spurred them on. A few saw PPD as a way to retrain and move away from a role in which they were unhappy. About 20% of practitioners interviewed saw PPD as a way of improving their practice.

Others identified pressure and/or expectations from their headteacher or other colleagues or availability or accessibility of the programme i.e. their place was funded or offered in such a way to make it hard to turn down.

Around half of all participants told us that their fees are fully funded by their Local Authority, their school or by another organisation (e.g. subject or professional association). 30% receive some help with funds, and those who receive this support from school also identified study leave and supply cover as important ingredients along with help for fees. Around 20% of participants receive no support at all, financial or otherwise.

York St. John responses

The 2 participants interviewed from York St John University said that their main motivation for studying at M level was personal development.

1 participant was fully self-funding their study and the other was receiving a contribution from their LA.

Barriers to participation and possible solutions

We talked to practitioners about the problems that they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD. Time was, inevitably, the biggest problem that most practitioners identified. Half of all those interviewed told us about the challenges of finding time to attend sessions and to study in amongst work and personal commitments. Lack of funding was a problem for around 10% and around 5% said that the level of challenge offered by their course made things difficult for them. Travel, the timing of meetings and finding cover in school when they needed to study were the remaining issues. 10% experienced no problems at all.

Practitioners' suggestions for making their lives easier and for removing barriers to participation for colleagues were evenly spread and included encouraging schools to support study leave, making sure the venue is accessible and providing online and distance learning opportunities. One third said that they thought that everything that could be done was already being done and 5% said they couldn't think of anything.

York St. John responses
The participants interviewed identified a range of barriers to their study at M level. These included time (1), availability of resources (1), travel (1), age (1) and access to the library (1). There was one suggestion for making the course more accessible, which was making the courses modular (1).

The visibility and marketing of PPD programmes

Around half of the practitioners we spoke to told us they had heard about their programme of study formally via their school or local authority and a further 10% had heard about it informally from a colleague in their school or LA. 15% had chosen their programme from a website following as a result of their own research on the Internet and another 15% already had links with the provider through a different course. One participant had responded to an advertisement in the Times Educational Supplement.

We asked participants for their suggestions about how to market PPD effectively to practitioners. Direct communication with schools and local authorities accounted for half of the suggestions. 20% felt that the opportunity to talk with tutors would help. 20% suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the Internet). The remainder couldn't think of any suggestions or thought that the current approach to marketing was "spot on."

York St. John responses
The participants interviewed from York St. John University said that they had found out about the course from a range of sources including school (1), presentation in school (1), a course they were already involved in (1), word-of-mouth (1) and website (1). Suggestions for improving the marketing of the course included highlighting the professional benefits of the course (1) and presentations by course tutors in school (1).

The impact of participation

85% of practitioners interviewed told us that PPD had made a difference for their professional practice. One third felt that their leadership of the organisation or of learning had improved. Another third told us about improvements to specific aspects of their teaching practice in response to approaches encountered on their programme of study e.g. to teaching literacy or to working with children with special

needs. 25% said that they had made major changes to their teaching by adding a fresh approach to their repertoire or overhauling their approach to e.g. planning or classroom management.

Of the 15% who had noticed no impact, around half were at a very early stage in their studies and thought it was just too soon to tell. The remainder had had no opportunity to apply their learning or were studying something unrelated to their practice. Five of the participants interviewed have changed their role and/or been promoted, they feel, as a direct result of participating in PPD.

York St. John responses
Participants attributed a range of impacts to their involvement in PPD. These included changes to teaching practice and techniques (2), disseminating findings to colleagues (2), improved pupil learning (1), taking risks (1) and reflective practice (2).

Appendix 3. Analytic Framework

Table name	Level	Data description	Values	Key	Type of data field	Field name
Organisation		Partnership provision ID (Provider ID)	Number	Foreign key	Integer(4)	ProgID
Organisation		Consortium partners	Free text		Memo	OrgName
Organisation		Number of consortium partners	Number		Integer(3)	NoMember
Programme		AutoNumber	AutoNumber	Primary key	AutoNumber	ProgID
Contact details	*	Provider ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer(4)	ProgID
Contact details	*	Lead organisation (Name)	Free text		Char(255)	Name
Contact details	*	Name (Forename/ Surname)	Free text		Char(30)	Forename/ Surname
Contact details	*	Address 1	Free text		Char(255)	Address 1
Contact details	*	Address 2	Free text		Char(255)	Address 2
Contact details	*	Address 3	Free text		Char(255)	Address 3
Contact details	*	Address 4 (Town/County/Postcode)	Free text		Char(50)	Town/ County/ Postcode
Contact details	*	Email	Free text		Char(255)	E-mail
Contact details	*	Telephone	Free text		Char(255)	Telephone
Programme		Partnership provision name	Free text		Char(50)	ProgName

2005-08 programmes		Course ID	Number	Foreign key		CourseID
2005-08 programmes		Region	Free text		Char(255)	Region
Region		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Number(4)	ProgID
2005-08 programmes	*	Priority areas (Logical fields for each of 6 priorities)	(Any of: Subject knowledge/pedagogy SEN 1st 5 yrs Mentoring Other national priorities Local priorities)		List	Priority
2005-08 programmes	*	Stages (6 logical fields)	Any of: Foundation KS1 KS2 KS3 KS4 Post 16		Logical	
Subjects		Course ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	CourseID

2005-08 programmes	*	Subjects (15 logical fields)	Any of: Art & Design History Music Science Citizenship ICT PHSE Design & Technology Mathematics Physical Education English Modern languages Religious education Geography Other		Logical	
Course		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Course		Course ID	AutoNumber	Primary key	Integer	CourseID
2005-08 programmes		Other priorities (Also 8 logical fields)	Free text		Char(150)	PriorityText
2005-08 programmes	*	Qualifications (4 logical fields)	Any of: Certificate Diploma Masters Doctorate		Logical	
2005-08 programmes	*	Awarding body	Free text		Char(255)	Awarding Body
2005-08 programmes	*	Number FT participants	Number		Double	NoFT
2005-08 programmes	*	Number PT participants	Number		Double	NoPT

2005-08 programmes	*	Course (Programme)	Free text		Char(255)	Course
Course		Number of female students	Number		Integer(4)	NoF
Course		Source	Free text		Char(100)	NoFSource
Course		Number of male students	Number		Integer(4)	NoM
Course		Source	Free text		Char(100)	NoMSource
Phase		Partnership provision ID	Number		Integer	ProgID
Phase		Type of school/ phase	Any of: Primary Secondary Special PRU Secure Unit Other		List	SchoolType
Phase		Source	Free text		Char(100)	PhaseSource
Experience		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Experience		Years of experience/teaching	Any of: NQT 1-4 yrs 5-9 yrs 10-14 yrs 15-19 yrs 20-24 yrs 25-29 yrs 30-34 yrs 35 yrs +		List	Exp
Experience		Source	Free text		Char(100)	ExpSource
Programme		Total FT registrations	Number		Integer(4)	FTTotal
Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	FTTotalSource
Programme		Of which have completed	Number		Integer(4)	FTComplete
Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	FTCompleteSource
Programme		Of which are expected to complete	Number		Integer(4)	FTExpect

Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	FTExpectSource
Programme		Total PT registrations	Number		Integer(4)	PTTotal
Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	PTTotalSource
Programme		Of which have completed	Number		Integer(4)	PTComplete
Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	PTCompleteSource
Programme		Of which are expected to complete	Number		Integer(4)	PTExpect
Programme		Source	Free text		Char(100)	PTExpectSource
Evaluation objective 1, 3 and 3.4 1. Effectiveness, quality and impact of course preparations AND Objective 3, 3.4 Directly involve teachers, schools and other local and regional stakeholders in planning, reviewing and developing provision to meet identified needs of teachers and schools in the region						
Programme	Level 1	What did the needs analysis involve?	Free text		Memo	NeedsAnalysis
Programme	Level 1	What are the issues and needs for schools and teachers?	Free text		Memo	SchoolIssues
Programme	Level 1	Have providers consulted with local stakeholders?	Yes (please specify) No Not known		Look up	Consult
Programme	Level 1	Please specify who has been consulted	Free text		Char(100)	ConsultText
Programme	Level 1	What processes of course accreditation are there?	Free text		Memo	Accredit
Programme	Level 2	Have teachers had an input to course design?	Yes (please specify) No		Logical	TeacherInput
Programme		Comment field: Clarification of answer to TeacherInput (Please state the input teachers have had into course design)	Free text		Text	TeacherInputText

Programme	Level 2	Have stakeholders had an input into the course design?	Yes (please specify) No		Logical	StakeholderInput
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Clarification of answer to StakeholderInput (Please state the input stakeholders have had into course design)	Free text		Char(100)	StakeholderInputText
Programme	Level 2	Has course provision been aligned with school goals and leadership?	Yes No		Logical	Goals
Programme	Level 2	If yes, please specify how?	Free text		Char(100)	GoalsText
Programme	Level 2	How did course preparations create a balance between the content or subject based new knowledge and skills (input) and the design for professional learning (embedding this new learning)? (i.e. what is the balance between what is learned and how it is learned)	Free text		Memo	Balance
Evaluation objective 2, 3.4, 3.5 and 3 Recruitment and Preparation AND 3.4 of Objective 3 Directly involve teachers, schools and other local and regional stakeholders in planning, reviewing and developing provision to meet identified needs of teachers and schools in the region AND Objective 3, 3.5 Reduce identified barriers to teachers' participation in PPD						
Barriers		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Barriers	Level 1 Barriers	What do the providers see as potential barriers to recruitment?	Any of: Transport Fees Timing Location		Look up	Barriers

			Childcare Nature of the provision Access Other (please specify)			
Barriers		Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please specify what the providers see as potential barriers to recruitment)	Free text		Char(100)	BarriersText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Do the providers mention race or disability as a barrier to participation?	Free text		Char(100)	RaceDisability
Steps		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Steps	Level 1 Barriers	What steps have providers taken to overcome these barriers?	Any of: Bursaries Nurseries Running courses locally Access Other (please specify)		Look up	BarriersOvercome
Steps		Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please specify the steps providers have taken to overcome these barriers)	Free text		Char(100)	BarriersOvercomeText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How is provision marketed?	Free text		Memo	Market
Programme	Level 1 Barrier	What sources of information are made available and how?	Free text		Memo	Sources

	s					
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Does the partnership provision marketing target BME and disability students?	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Target
Programme		Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please specify whether the partnership provision marketing targets BME and disability students)	Free Text		Char(100)	TargetText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Do providers monitor BME and disability data?	Yes No Null (please specify)		Look up	Monitor
Programme		Response to 'Please specify'	Free text		Char(100)	MonitorText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	What do providers do with BME and disability data that they collect?	Free text		Memo	UseData
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many apply for the provision?	Number		Integer(4)	Apply
Programme		Comment	Free text		Char(100)	ApplyText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many BME students apply for the provision?	Number		Integer(4)	BMEApply
Programme		Comment field	Free text		Char(100)	BMEApplyText

Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many students with disabilities apply for the provision?	Number		Integer(4)	DisableApply
Programme		Comment field	Free text		Char(100)	DisableApplyText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many enrol?	Number		Integer	Enrol
Programme		Comment field	Free text		Char(100)	EnrolText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many BME students enrol?	Number		Integer(4)	BMEEnrol
Programme		Comment field	Free text		Char(100)	BMEEnrolText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	How many students with disabilities enrol?	Number		Integer(4)	DisableEnrol
Programme		Comment field	Free text		Char(100)	DisableEnrolText
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	What is the evidence that participation is increasing?	Free text		Memo	Increase
Programme	Level 2	What is the timing of the provision? Length of sessions	1 of: Less than 2 hrs		List	SessionLength

			2-4 hrs 1 day Other (please specify)			
Programme		Comment field (Please specify the length of sessions if different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	SessionLengthText
Programme	Level 2	Content/subject input time	1 of: Less than 2 hrs 2-4 hrs 1 day Other (please specify)		List	InputTime
Programme		Comment field (Please specify the input time if different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	InputTimeText
Programme	Level 2	Learning/ embedding time	1 of: Less than 2 hrs 2-4 hrs 1 day Other (please specify)		List	EmbeddingTime
Programme		Comment field (Please specify the learning/embedding time if different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	EmbeddingTimeText

Programme	Level 2	Duration of partnership provision	1 of: 1 term 2 terms 1 year More than 1 year Other (please specify)		List	ProgDuration
Programme		Comment field (Please specify if the partnership provision duration is different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	ProgDurationText
Programme		Frequency of sessions	1 of: Weekly Monthly Termly Other (please specify)		List	SessionFreq
Programme		Comment field (Please specify if the frequency of sessions is different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	SessionFreqText
Location		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Location	Level 2	What is location of the provision?	Any of: Online In school In class Out of school Other schools Other (please specify)		List	Location

Location		Comment field (Please specify if the location of the provision is different to the options)	Free text		Char(100)	LocationText
Programme	Level 2	How have individual teacher's starting points been taken into account?	Free text		Memo	StartingPoint
Programme	Level 2	What pre-course planning and support was available to applicants?	Free text		Memo	PreSupport
Evaluation Objective 3 and 3.1 3.1 Lead to recognised qualifications at M level or above						
Programme	N/A	What is the qualification structure?	Free text		Memo	Structure
Programme	N/A	How long does it take full time? (please specify)	Free text		Char(100)	FTLength
Programme	N/A	How long does it take part time? (please specify)	Free text		Char(100)	PTLength
Programme	N/A	How many re-enrol?	Number		Integer(4)	Reenrol
		Comment field (Please explain any ambiguity in the number re-enrolling)	Free text		Char(100)	ReenrolText
3.2 Improve pupils' performance through embedded improvement in teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice						
Programme	Level 1	What evidence is there of improvements in pupil learning? Before	Free text		Memo	Improve1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Improve1Source
Programme		What evidence is there of improvements in pupil learning? After	Free text		Memo	Improve2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Improve2Source
Programme	Level 1	How have teachers' knowledge and understanding changed? Before	Free text		Memo	KnowledgeChange1
Programm		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	KnowledgeChange1

e						
Programme		How have teachers' knowledge and understanding changed? After	Free text		Memo	KnowledgeChange2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	KnowledgeChange2Source
Programme	Level 1	Have teachers' beliefs changed? Before	Free text		Memo	Belief Change1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	BeliefChange1Source
Programme		Have teachers' beliefs changed? After	Free text		Memo	BeliefChange2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	BeliefChange2Source
Programme	Level 1	How do changes in teachers' beliefs affect what they do? Before	Free text		Memo	BeliefAffect1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	BeliefAffect1Source
Programme		How do changes in teachers' beliefs affect what they do? After	Free text		Memo	BeliefAffect2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	BeliefAffect2Source
Programme	Level 1	What are teachers doing with their new knowledge and understanding? Before	Free text		Memo	KnowledgeAffect1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	KnowledgeAffect1Source
Programme		What are teachers doing with their new knowledge and understanding? After	Free text		Memo	KnowledgeAffect2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	KnowledgeAffect2Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course involve in-school training? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify)		Look up	InSchool1

			Not known (please specify)			
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	InSchool1Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course involve in-school training? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	InSchool2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	InSchool2Source
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether course involves in-school training)	Free text		Char(100)	InSchool1Text
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether course involves in-school training)	Free text		Char(100)	InSchool2Text
Programme	Level 2	Does the course involve real time, in-class modelling? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Modelling1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course involves real time, in-class modelling)	Free text		Char(100)	ModellingText1

Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Modelling1Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course involve real time, in-class modelling? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Modelling2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course involves real time, in-class modelling)	Free text		Char(100)	ModellingText2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Modelling2Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course address teachers' own concerns and issues? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Concerns1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course addresses teachers' own concerns and issues)	Free Text		Char(100)	ConcernsText1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Concerns1Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course address teachers' own concerns and issues? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please		Look up	Concerns2

			specify)			
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course addresses teachers' own concerns and issues)	Free Text		Char(100)	ConcernsText2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Concerns2Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course include demonstration, practice and feedback? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	DPF1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course includes demonstration, practice and feedback)	Free text		Char(100)	DPF1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	DPF1Source
Programme	Level 2	Does the course include demonstration, practice and feedback?	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	DPF2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course includes demonstration, practice and feedback)	Free text		Char(100)	DPF2Text
Programm		After source	Free text		Char(255)	DPF2Source

e						
Programme	Level 2	Is time built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Prep1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether time built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning)	Free text		Char(100)	Prep1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Prep1Source
Programme	Level 2	Is time built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Prep2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether time built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning)	Free text		Char(100)	Prep2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Prep2Source
Programme	Level 2	Are there planned opportunities for peer support? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	PeerSupport1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify'	Free text		Char(100)	PeerSupport1Text

		(Please explain answer to whether there are planned opportunities for peer support)				
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PeerSupport1Source
Programme	Level 2	Are there planned opportunities for peer support? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	PeerSupport2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether there are planned opportunities for peer support)	Free text		Char(100)	PeerSupport2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PeerSupport2Source
Programme	Level 2	Are there planned opportunities for classroom experimentation? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Experiment1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether there are planned opportunities for classroom experimentation)	Free text		Char(100)	Experiment1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Experiment1Source
Programme	Level 2	Are there planned opportunities for classroom experimentation? After	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Experiment2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify'	Free text		Char(100)	Experiment2Text

		(Please explain answer to whether there are planned opportunities for classroom experimentation)				
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Experiment2Source
Programme	Level 2	Is the course design based on effective evidence of CPD? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	CPD1
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course design is based on effective evidence of CPD)	Free text		Char(100)	CPD1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	CPD1Source
Programme	Level 2	Is the course design based on effective evidence of CPD? After	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	CPD2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to whether the course design is based on effective evidence of CPD)	Free text		Char(100)	CPD2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	CPD2Source
Programme	Level 2	Do teachers use feedback about student learning to inform their own professional learning? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Feedback1
Programm	Level	Comment field: Response to 'Please	Free text		Char(100)	Feedback1Text

e	2	specify' (Please explain answer to 'Do teachers use feedback about student learning to inform their own professional learning?')				
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Feedback1Source
Programme	Level 2	Do teachers use feedback about student learning to inform their own professional learning? After	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Feedback2
Programme	Level 2	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to 'Do teachers use feedback about student learning to inform their own professional learning?')	Free text		Char(100)	Feedback2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Feedback2Source
3.3 Develop teachers' research and problem-solving skills through the critical evaluation of evidence and research						
Programme	N/A	What are participants' perceptions of their research/problem solving skills? Before	Free text		Memo	Skills1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Skills1Source
Programme	N/A	What are participants' perceptions of their research/problem solving skills?	Free text		Memo	Skills2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Skills2Source
Programme	N/A	Are participants using evidence from research and other data? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Evidence1
Programm	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'Please	Free text		Char(100)	Evidence1Text

e		specify' (Please explain answer to 'Are participants using evidence from research and other data?')				
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Evidence1Source
Programme	N/A	Are participants using evidence from research and other data? After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Evidence2
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'Please specify' (Please explain answer to 'Are participants using evidence from research and other data?')	Free text		Char(100)	Evidence2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Evidence2Source
Programme	N/A	How do providers offer access to the public knowledge base? Before	Free text		Memo	PublicKnowledge1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PublicKnowledge1Source
Programme	N/A	How do providers offer access to the public knowledge base? After	Free text		Memo	PublicKnowledge2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PublicKnowledge2Source
Programme	N/A	How do providers offer access to the local knowledge base? Before	Free text		Memo	LocalKnowledge1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	LocalKnowledge1Source
Programme	N/A	How do providers offer access to the local knowledge base? After	Free text		Memo	LocalKnowledge2

Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	LocalKnowledge2Source
Programme	N/A	How do teachers use research skills to take their practice forward? Before	Free text		Memo	PracticeForward1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PracticeForward1Source
Programme	N/A	How do teachers use research skills to take their practice forward? After	Free text		Memo	PracticeForward2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PracticeForward2Source
Programme	N/A	How do they link this to solving learning and teaching problems? Before	Free text		Memo	LearnTeach1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	LearnTeach1Source
Programme	N/A	How do they link this to solving learning and teaching problems? After	Free text		Memo	LearnTeach2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	LearnTeach2Source
3.6 Be subject to internal and external quality assurance procedures						
Institutional evidence		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Institutional Evidence	N/A	What is the institutional evidence?	Any of: Course validation processes Monitoring processes External examining arrangements Course approval process Progression rates Grades/measured		Look up	InstEvidence

			achievement Other (please specify)			
Institutional evidence	N/A	Comment field: Allows input of options not in list (Please record institutional evidence other than that in the list)	Free text		Char(100)	InstEvidenceText
Ext evidence		Partnership provision ID	Number	Foreign key	Integer	ProgID
Ext evidence	N/A	What is the external evidence?	Any of: Inspection reports School feedback Other (please specify)		Look up	ExtEvidence
Ext Evidence	N/A	Comment field: Allows input of options not in list (Please record external evidence other than that in the list)	Free text		Char(100)	ExtEvidenceText
3.7 Provide specified management information and include an evaluation of the programme's (partnership provision) impact on practice in schools						
Programme	N/A	Have providers established a baseline from which to assess participant impact? Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Baseline1
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether providers have established a baseline from which to assess participant impact)	Free text		Char(100)	Baseline1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Baseline1Source
Programme	N/A	Have providers established a baseline from which to assess participant impact? After	1 of: Yes (please specify)		Look up	Baseline2

			No (please specify) Not known (please specify)			
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether providers have established a baseline from which to assess participant impact)	Free text		Char(100)	Baseline2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(50)	Baseline2Source
Programme	N/A	Has participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude (confidence, self efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	PerceptEval1
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude (confidence, self efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	PerceptEval1Text
Programme		Before	Free text		Char(50)	PerceptEval1Source
Programme	N/A	Has participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude (confidence, self efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact? After	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	PerceptEval2
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude (confidence, self efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	PerceptEval2Text
Programm		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PerceptEval2Source

e						
Programme	N/A	Have other indicators: satisfaction surveys, school feedback etc. been included in the evaluation of impact? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	OtherEval1
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether other indicators have been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	OtherEval1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	OtherEval1Source
Programme	N/A	Have other indicators: satisfaction surveys, school feedback etc. been included in the evaluation of impact? After	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	OtherEval2
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain answer to whether other indicators have been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	OtherEval2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	OtherEval2Source
Programme	N/A	Have provider assessment outcomes been included in the evaluation of impact? Before	Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	ProviderAssess1
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain whether provider assessment outcomes been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	ProviderAssess1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	ProviderAssess1Source
Programm	N/A	Have provider assessment outcomes been	Yes (please specify)		Look up	ProviderAssess2

e		included in the evaluation of impact? After	No (please specify) Not known (please specify)			
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain whether provider assessment outcomes been included in the evaluation of impact)	Free text		Char(100)	ProviderAssess2Text
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	ProviderAssess2Source
Programme	N/A	Have providers made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research techniques?) Before	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Tools1
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain whether providers have made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research techniques)	Free text		Char(100)	Tools1Text
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Tools1Source
Programme	N/A	Have providers made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research techniques?) After	1 of: Yes (please specify) No (please specify) Not known (please specify)		Look up	Tools2
Programme	N/A	Comment field: Response to 'please specify' (Please explain whether providers have made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research	Free text		Char(100)	Tools2Text

		techniques))				
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Tools2Source
Partnership						
Programme	N/A	How do they see their respective roles? Before	Free text		Memo	PartnerRoles1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PartnerRoles1Source
Programme	N/A	How do they see their respective roles? After	Free text		Memo	PartnerRoles2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PartnerRoles2Source
Programme	N/A	What added value has the partnership approach added to the PPD provision? Before	Free text		Memo	AddedValue1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	AddedValue1Source
Programme	N/A	What added value has the partnership approach added to the PPD provision? After	Free text		Memo	AddedValue2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	AddedValue2Source
Programme	N/A	What are the characteristics of the partnership from which the sample is drawn e.g. is there a full time paid partnership manager? Before	Free text		Memo	PartnerChar1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PartnerChar1Source
Programme	N/A	What are the characteristics of the partnership from which the sample is drawn e.g. is there a full time paid partnership manager? After	Free text		Memo	PartnerChar2
Programm		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PartnerChar2Source

e						
Programme	N/A	What are the organisational structures involved in the partnership? Before	Free text		Memo	PartStruct1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	PartStruct1Source
Programme	N/A	What are the organisational structures involved in the partnership? After	Free text		Memo	PartStruct2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	PartStruct2Source
Programme	N/A	What is known/reported about the ways in which the partners transfer knowledge and practice from one context to another? Before	Free text		Memo	Transfer1
Programme		Before source	Free text		Char(50)	Transfer1Source
Programme	N/A	What is known/reported about the ways in which the partners transfer knowledge and practice from one context to another? After	Free text		Memo	Transfer2
Programme		After source	Free text		Char(255)	Transfer2Source

Appendix 4. Profile of Partnerships

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
Anglia Ruskin University	EA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/ Colleges/ NLC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Barnsley Educational Psychology Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bath Spa University College	SW	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/ research centres/ educational foundations/trusts	Head of CPD & Chair of the Professional Master's Programme	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Bishop Grosseteste University College	EM	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ Schools/ Diocese of Lincoln Board of Education	Educational Development Services Manager	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Bradford College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bury LA	NW	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	HEI/ LAs/ schools/ NLC/ national agencies	Education Adviser	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Canterbury Christchurch University College	SE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/schools	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
CIMT (Centre for Innovation in Mathematics Teaching)	SW	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	Director, Centre for Innovation on Mathematics Teaching	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education)	LON	0	0	CLPE	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
College of St. Mark and St. John (SWIfT (Marjon))	SW	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	Dean	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
DATA (Design and Technology Association)	WM	0	0	DATA	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ DATA/ NAAIDT/ Ofsted	Chief Executive	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
De Montford University	EA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/schools/ CPD provider/ SIP	Head of School of Education	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Dyslexia Action	SE	0	0	Dyslexia	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ Dyslexia Inst.	Head of training	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
				Action																				
East Midlands Partnership	EM	0	0	SDSA	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ SDSA /SEN partnership/ leadership centre/ schools	Chief Executive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Edge Hill University	NW	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	Dean of Faculty of Education	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Institute of Education (1) - University of London	LON	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	Dr	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Kingston University	LON	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ schools/ Children's Services Development Agency/ Council for Education in World Citizenship/ Early Years and Childcare Service/ Education Business Partnership etc.	Head of INSET/ CPD	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Lancashire County Council	NW	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Lancashire Professional Development Consultative Committee	Head of Service	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Leeds Metropolitan University	YOR	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ EAZ/ NLC	Principal Lecturer in Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Liverpool Hope	NW	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ NLC/ TLA	Prof	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Liverpool John Moores	NW	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ EAZ/ DfES Early Years Regional Leadership Centre/ Creative Partnerships	Head of Centre CPD	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
London Metropolitan University	LON	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	Academic Leader for CPD	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
London South Bank University	LON	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
Manchester Metropolitan University	NW	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ schools/ NCSL/ GTC/ NAS/ NAGTY/ British Dyslexia Assoc.	Prof	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Middlesex University (MIDWHEB)	LON	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	Pro Vice Chancellor/Dean	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
NASSEA	NW	0	0	NASSEA	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ NASSEA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
NCETM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newman College	WM	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	Programme Leader for CPD	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
North East Consortium - Durham LEA	NE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	Chief Inspector	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Open University	SE	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/ British Dyslexia Assoc.	Dr	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Oxford Brookes	SE	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	Academic Director CPD & Postgrad programmes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Sheffield Hallam University	YOR	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/ EAZ/ NCSL/ DfES/ CPD steering group/ Regional Science Learning Centre/ GTC/ NAS/ cCDU Ltd/ Benjamin Curtis Foundation	Head of CPD	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Slough Partnership ITTP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SSAT (Specialist Schools and Academies Trust)	LON	0	0	SSAT	0	1	0	0	0	0	SSAT/ HEIs/ IFST/ IEE/ CCFRA/ Sector Skills councils	Director - Specialism and Vocational Networks	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
St Mary's College (1)	LON	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ Catholic Education Service/ Local dioceses/ C ATSC	Programme Director	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
School of Education (St Mary's College (2))	LON	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/ NLC/ NCSL	Director	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
St. Martin's College	NW	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ schools/ staff development officers/ EiC/ Centre for Educational Leadership	PGCDMA Programme Leader	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Staffordshire University	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The Networked Learning Partnership	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University College Chester	NW	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI	Prof	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University College Chichester	SE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	Director of Teacher Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Bath	SW	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	Director of Studies MA Programme	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
University of Birmingham	WM	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	Dr	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Brighton	SE	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	Head of School	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Cambridge	EA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	PPD Co-ordinator	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Central England	WM	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ LA/ SIP/ Birmingham Advisory & Support Services/ EAZ	Dean	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
University of Derby	EM	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	Assistant Director, School of Education, Health and Sciences	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of East Anglia	EA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/East Anglian Partnership Group	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
University of East London	LON	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/Schools/CLPE	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
University of Exeter	SW	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	Programme Director	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
University of Gloucestershire	SW	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/Gloucestershire Association of Primary Headteachers/ Secondary Head Teachers/Special School Headteachers	Head of Continuing Professional Development	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
University of Greenwich	LON	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	MA/MSc Programme Leader	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
University of Hertfordshire	EA	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/Hertfordshire Children, Schools and Families	Head of School of Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Huddersfield	YOR	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	Dean of the School of Education and Professional Development	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
University of Hull	YOR	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	Professor	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
University of Leeds	YOR	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/LA/schools/SEN Strategy Group/School Support Teacher Unit/SEN Advisory Group/ITT Partnership Management Group/Deaf Children Steering Group/Sing Bilingual Consortium/National Deaf Children's Society/Royal National Institute for the Deaf	CPD Coordinator	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
University of Portsmouth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University of Reading	SE	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/LA/schools/teachers unions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Southampton	SE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/ContinYou/local Diocesan/NCSL/ schools		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
University of Sussex	SE	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/SSAT	Head of Department, School of Education	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1

Partnership Provider	Region	Lead Partner			Size of partnership				Constituency of partnership			Partnership manager title	Number of programmes of study				Total planned recruitment					Phase(s) targeted		
		HEI	LA	Other (specify)	1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	HEI/LA	HEI/LA/school(s)	Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
University of the West of England	SW	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/School/ Weston Education Partnership	Dean, Faculty of Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
University of Warwick	WM	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/SSAT/CP/Inclusion Network/LA/NAGTY/ Council for Religious Education	Professor	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
University of Winchester	SE	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	HEI/LA/Early Years Childcare Unit	Professor	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
University of Worcester	WM	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	Head of Institute of Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
York St. John University	YOR	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	HEI/LA/CPD Forum/NCSL/Tony Leach Associates	Head of CPD	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1

References

- Bell, M., McKenley, J. & Mitchell, H. (2006) *PPD Barriers Report: Patterns of Participation for Black and Minority Ethnic Teachers (BME) and Teachers with Disabilities in PPD Programmes.* Coventry, CUREE.
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Evans, D., & Firth, A. (2005). The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning. Review: What do teacher impact data tell us about collaborative CPD? In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Isham, C., Evans, D., & Firth, A. (forthcoming) How do specialist inputs in CPD affect teachers, their learning and their pupils' learning. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B., & Evans, D. (2003) The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning. In*: Research Evidence in Education Library. Version 1.1**. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Thomason, S., & Firth, A. (2005). The impact of collaborative continuing professional development (CPD) on classroom teaching and learning. Review: How do collaborative and sustained CPD and sustained but not collaborative CPD affect teaching and learning? In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1981) *Effective evaluation: improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Guskey, T. & Huberman, M. (Eds) (1995)*Professional development in education*: *new paradigms and practices.* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Guskey, T. (2000) *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Ofsted (2000) *Inservice postgraduate training courses for teachers: an overview of inspections of courses funded by the Teacher Training Agency.* London: Ofsted.
- Ofsted (2004) *Making a difference: the impact of award bearing in-service training on school improvement.* London: Ofsted.
- Robinson, C. & Sebba, J. (2005) *A review of research and evaluation to inform the development of the new Postgraduate Professional Development programme.* London: TDA.
- Schulman, L. S. (1987) Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, pp. 1-22.
- Soulsby, D. & Swain, D. (2003) *A report on the award-bearing Inset scheme*. London: TDA.
- Timperley, H. (2005) Distributed leadership: developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37 (4), pp. 395-420.
- Timperley, H. et al. (2006) *Professional learning and development: a best evidence synthesis of impact on student outcomes*. Paper presented at AERA 2006, San Francisco.
- Vygotsky L.S. (1978) *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes.* Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press.
- Wilkes, M. & Bligh, J. (1999) Evaluating educational interventions. *British Medical Journal,* 318, pp. 1269-1278.