

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

RESEARCH REPORT YEAR 3



4 Copthall House,
Station Square
Coventry CV1 2FL

☎ +44 (024) 7652 4036

☎ +44 (024) 7663 1646

✉ info@curee.co.uk

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	4
Partnership.....	4
Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations.....	4
Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment.....	5
Improve Pupils’ Performance through Embedded Improvement in Teachers’ Knowledge, Understanding and Practice.....	5
Pupil Outcomes	5
Teacher Outcomes.....	5
Predictive Indicators of Impact	5
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.....	6
Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures	6
Background to TDA PPD Evaluation QA Strand Year 3.....	8
Year 1 Findings.....	10
Year 2 Findings.....	12
Methodology	15
Sample.....	15
Key Questions.....	15
Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations	15
Effectiveness of Activities Designed to Recruit and Prepare Participants for the Course	15
Impact on Pupils and Teachers.....	16
Impact.....	17
Year 3 Findings.....	18
Partnerships	18
Origins and evolving nature of partnerships	18
Characteristics of PPD Provider Partnerships.....	19
Working and Learning Relationships Between Partner Organisations	19
The Relevance of Effective Partnerships for PPD	20
Provider feedback	21
Conclusion	22
Findings Relative to the Evaluation Objectives	23
Evaluation Objective 1: Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations	23
Indicators.....	23
Needs Analysis.....	23
Predictive Indicators.....	24
Opportunities for Teachers/other Stakeholders to have an Input in Course Design.....	24
Alignment of Course Provision with School Goals and Leadership	25
Balance between Content (Input) and Design (Processes) for Professional Learning	25
Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of Participant Recruitment and Preparation Activities	26
Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment and Retention	26
Evaluation Objective 3: Improve Pupils’ Performance through Embedded Improvement in Teachers’ Knowledge, Understanding and Practice	29
Pupil Outcomes	29
Teacher Outcomes.....	30
Predictive Indicators of Impact.....	32

Research and Enquiry Skills	34
Evaluation Objective 3.6: Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures	36
Typology of effective PPD partnerships	37
Appendix 1. Methodology	38
Sample	38
Desk Research.....	38
Evaluation Objective 1: Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations	38
Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of Participant Recruitment and Preparation Activities	39
Evaluation Objective 3: Provider Performance Funding Criteria and Quality Threshold	39
Site Visits	40
Student Portfolio Reviews	41
Student telephone interviews	41
Report writing.....	41
Appendix 2. Individual Site Reports.....	43
University of Bath	43
Bath Spa University.....	55
Bishop Grosseteste University College PPD partnership.....	68
University of Brighton.....	83
University of Bristol	97
University of Derby	110
University of Exeter	125
University of Greenwich	138
University of Hertfordshire.....	153
Liverpool Hope University	167
Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU)	180
University of Portsmouth School of Education and Continuing Studies	194
St Mary’s University College	208
The Slough Partnership	221
Staffordshire University.....	233
The Learning Institute (TLI - formerly Networked Learning Partnership)	247
Warwick Institute of Education (WIE)	261
University of West of England, Bristol.....	275
The University of Winchester	291
Appendix 3. Analytic Framework	305
Appendix 4. Profile of Partnerships.....	333
References.....	341

Executive Summary

Partnership

1. It is clear that the partnership models and operations have developed over the three years of the project. In particular, schools have become more knowledgeable consumers of professional development. Partnerships also tend to be more equal and schools are making a more substantial contribution (for example in the design of new modules in response to a specified need) than appeared to be the case at the start of the project. HEIs appear to have developed processes and systems which enable them to be more responsive in terms of both content and delivery.
2. There were indications from three providers that they were positively encouraging schools to develop their contribution as an equal partner, rather than a purchaser of what the provider had to offer. On this evidence, there may be more scope for providers to review the actions they take to help schools build their muscles to define their own CPD needs and exploit the partnership for solutions and specialist resources.
3. Evidence from students' perspectives this year has provided an insight into areas where partners are unaware of some of the student experience when the learning does not take place on their site. In particular, providers did not seem to share the concern of over half of the sample teachers that schools were not providing them with support. Similarly providers did not reflect in their evidence the level of observation and feedback which students reported they had received. This apparent increase in support for CPD taking place in schools, in comparison with previous cohorts, suggests that providers need to increase their intelligence gathering in order to keep in touch with and respond to changes in the learning environment in schools.
4. The evidence collected over the course of three years gives a sense that PPD, with its requirement for careful planning around and demonstration of the effectiveness of partnership working, has made a difference to the CPD landscape in England. The impetus of the PPD funding stream has led to the emergence of partnerships actively seeking and developing relationships with specialist partners and networks, some from beyond the school system. The emergence of partnerships is further evidence of the potential energy in the system to develop CPD provision that has been unlocked by this targeted funding.

Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

5. Consistent with the findings from Year 2, there was evidence from all partnerships that they used a form of needs analysis to shape their programmes. Again the cohort for the third year focused much more on local needs analysis rather than taking into account messages emerging from agencies at a national level. While all but one of the partnerships claimed to draw on teacher generated data, such as assignments and assessment, to design courses, evidence that teachers contributed to course design in more active ways across all of the 19 partnerships was more mixed. There emerged a pattern of stronger and weaker forms of consultation, where in only the strong forms could teachers be said to be truly contributing to the shaping of their course or the identification of needs.

Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment

6. Of the barriers identified over the three years of the evaluation, finding time to participate in PPD activities has consistently been cited by both providers and practitioners. Sixty two per cent of the teacher sample said this was an issue. While providers considered finance and course resources to be an issue, only 10% of the teacher sample considered this to be the case. It seemed that partnerships used a good proportion of the funding to subsidise the costs of participation, which may explain why the providers rather than participants considered this to be a particular issue.
7. With regard to funding, there was also evidence that partners including schools and local authorities were pooling resources to ease the financial burden on participants.
8. Partnerships in this cohort made efforts to develop the flexible approaches noted in previous years, particular timing and located sessions so they fitted in with teachers' busy lives.

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

Pupil Outcomes

9. In line with Year two, most providers referred to improvements in pupil motivation and engagement as important outcomes of teachers' participation on PPD. Considerably more of this year's cohort of partnerships also referred to achievement as an outcome than last year's and appeared to be less tentative about making such a link.
10. It is possible that there is a link here with the fact that many more of the students' portfolios reviewed for this year's evaluation were based on action research – suggesting that handling and discussion of pupil data was a more common feature of this cohort of partnerships.

Teacher Outcomes

11. Teaching and learning, and subject knowledge development were the most commonly reported foci of PPD provision, followed by support for particular groups of pupils (including SEN), and leadership. Providers drew most commonly on teacher reflections, school feedback, assignment, assessment and attainment data to ascertain teacher impact.
12. In addition to developing subject knowledge and teaching practice, a large number of providers reported development of action research and collaborative skills in particular as an important outcome of attending a PPD course. Increase in confidence was perceived much more by the providers as a benefit (18/19), than by the sample teachers (6%). This might possibly point to a tendency for PPD to attract those practitioners who are confident about taking their practice further in the first place.

Predictive Indicators of Impact

13. The Year three evaluation threw up some interesting data particularly around the strategies of collaboration, observation and feedback and modelling of practice.
14. Most providers claimed to be encouraging collaborative learning and development, and a large majority of teachers reported this to be happening. However, the fact that only just over half of teachers felt that they were being supported by their schools suggests that many were seeking out collaborative partners on their own initiative. In addition, the momentum of PPD may have meant that there are more teachers who are not part

of the management team available and willing to support their colleagues. Certainly, the evidence that three quarters of students reported trying to involve their school and colleagues in their PPD work, would point to the potential of a programme like PPD to create an appetite for facilitating others' learning. However, although teachers were identifying collaborative partners, the evidence would suggest that some school leaders could be more proactive in showing and providing support for their staff's PPD activity. Lead providers may have a role to play here, in terms of creating a picture of what school leaders do when they support PPD well, as a basis for consultation with leaders of schools whose teachers do not feel so well supported.

15. Some evidence emerged which suggested that two CPD strategies, linked in the public knowledge base with positive benefits for teachers and for students, were not always a core concern for the providers. The strategies that were not strongly present were the direct or indirect modelling of new practices and the creation of opportunities to learn from observing others and from being observed coupled with debriefing. Only one provider reported explicitly observation occurring as part of their programme, and yet more than half of the teacher sample reported this taking place. This may be an issue of perceived lack of resources to facilitate this on the part of the providers. It may be valuable for them, however, to explore in more depth with their own students how observation as a tool for learning is arranged in their schools or how they have arranged it themselves, to provide more guidance on this to future students. Considering the lack of support so many students claim to receive from their school, it would be interesting to find out who, in all cases, was doing the observation or the modelling that did take place.
16. Modelling of practice was rarely mentioned by providers as a feature of their PPD, and only one fifth of students said that they had experienced it. Again, the reasons for this may be a lack of resources for specialists to carry out modelling in person, in which case providers might like to explore those examples of the use of video to demonstrate practice.

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

17. Action research appeared to be a stronger feature of PPD provision among the Year 3 cohort, than in previous years. All 19 providers reported it being included as part of their provision, and more examples of action research were provided by partnerships for the Year 3 evaluation than in the previous year. The high level of action research activity taking place may explain the increased confidence in referring to pupil data when assessing impact already discussed.

Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures

18. Student evaluation of the impact of PPD was a central feature of quality assurance across all the providers, backed up by school feedback and analysis of assignments. While statistical data on attendance and completion rates informed programme evaluation processes among the majority of providers, progression figures only appeared to be scrutinised by two providers.
19. Given the comments in paragraph 3 concerning possible gaps in providers' knowledge of what provision looks like in school, there is an opportunity for providers to focus

specifically on areas such as observation and support from school leaders as part of the quality assurance process.

Background to TDA PPD Evaluation QA Strand Year 3

20. 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.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.

27. The findings in this report represent the outcomes of the third year of the evaluation, and are based on evidence collected from 19 partnerships. In the presentation of the findings for year 3, reference is sometimes made to corresponding findings from previous years. This is done in order to highlight trends in the development of the PPD programme as a whole over time. It is not an attempt to compare the performance between PPD partnerships whose evaluation was carried out in different years. This would not be valid in circumstances where partnerships in Year 3 evaluation have had more opportunity to develop, and take on board the messages emerging from previous evaluation findings.

Year 1 Findings

28. The first year evaluation found that:

- *Effective partnership working added 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.*
- *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.*
- *While course preparations took account of the need to align provision with school and student priorities, we were not able to draw out evidence that the design and preparations had taken into account the specific contributions of the course deliverers/tutors in terms of the CPD models and learning processes.*
- *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, where these were taking place and that they were reporting improvements in pupils' achievements and learning as well as a range of affective outcomes.*
- *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.*
- *Quality monitoring and evaluation of design and outcomes 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.*

29. 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 make recommendations as to how these might be addressed.*

30. Two of the principal recommendations arising from the Year 1 findings were:

- *that the nature of the specialist or expert input - for example modelling, demonstration, practice and feedback from observations, or building in time for preparation and teacher planning, should be specified in the course design. Our questions about CPD activities and processes were only able to unearth detailed evidence about processes in this first year in a small number of cases. Whilst careful thought about processes may well be happening, it is not centre stage in design and monitoring activities. Providers could benefit from taking account of the evidence about the skills and processes necessary for instructional facilitation of professional learning; and*
- *that the 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.*

Year 2 Findings

31. The second year evaluation found that:

- *Partnerships were responding to consumer demand, increasingly tailoring provision to needs, developing outreach work and using partner resources to embed in-school support for students.*
 - *Most HEIs reported increasing flexibility, particularly around the location and timing of delivery and in tailoring assessment more closely to practical activities.*
 - *Local authorities are contributing strengths in terms of brokering, aligning existing in-house provision with Masters level demands and supporting alignment between provision and school needs.*
 - *There was also some evidence that schools are developing increasing depth and confidence in identifying and expressing needs, contributing to tutoring and facilitation and supporting students in their studies.*
- *All sample providers used a form of needs analysis to help shape their course content.*
 - *Across the sample, providers appeared to have developed to the point where they were focusing increasingly closely on local needs and school priorities.*
 - *The needs of participants appeared to have contributed very substantially to the programme delivery (e.g. timing and/or location). Over three quarters of the sample reported planning and designing course content and delivery taking account of school priorities. The same proportion reported planning around teacher need – such as NQT support for example.*
 - *Nearly all providers worked with teachers and schools to ensure that the teacher enquiry/research projects were focused on substantive classroom issues which were relevant for individual teacher's daily practice.*
 - *Providers reported a range of delivery processes of which coaching, experimentation and peer support were most common.*
- *The potential barriers to recruitment were:*
 - *time and workload;*
 - *timing of sessions;*
 - *access to centrally delivered provision;*
 - *assessment and assignments;*
 - *lack of confidence in ability to undertake academic/accredited study;*
 - *lack of school and colleagues' support;*
 - *accredited provision seen as irrelevant to daily priorities; and*
 - *finance and course resources.*
- *Many providers were actively trying to address these barriers, most notably through increased flexibility in terms of the timing and location of courses, aligning content with school and teacher needs and reviewing assessment requirements.*

- *Practitioners had concerns about the burden of assessment and accreditation and such perceptions continued to be identified by practitioners and providers alike as a barrier to recruitment.*
- *Most providers were able to cite evidence of improved pupil outcomes, including motivation, engagement, behaviour and attendance. Nonetheless, it was evident that all but one provider had taken active steps to find ways in which to explore the impact of the PPD programmes on student and pupil outcomes. Most providers also included a range of other sources of which participant feedback and assessment and attainment data were the largest groups.*
- *The sample partnerships, between them, covered a wide range of provision, including leadership, subject specialisms, SEN and pedagogy. Teacher impact data were gathered by providers from assignments and school-based projects, self-evaluation, school feedback, surveys, interviews and assessed tasks.*
- *New knowledge, understanding and skills embraced teachers' action research skills and their skills in reflecting on practice. Improved collaboration skills, improvements in pedagogical practice and in teacher subject knowledge were also reported by more than half the provider sample and half identified changes in teachers' management and organisation skills.*
- *Most of the providers reported improvements in teacher self-confidence and all reported that they had become more reflective practitioners. Over half said that the teachers were engaged in plans for future professional development. The majority also reported that teachers had changed their practice.*
- *All sample providers made attempts to ensure programmes addressed teachers' concerns. Half of the provider partnerships specifically designed opportunities for peer support into their courses and most of the rest actively encouraged their students to work together. Half the sample said that delivery involved specialists in in-class modelling; and most used real-time or video observations of practice. However a more detailed picture of the uses of observations was hard to obtain.*
- *Most sample providers used diverse approaches to introducing evidence-based problem-solving techniques to teachers. The majority used school-based data in addition to the more conventional research journals and around half of the providers introduced students to the use of regional and local data. A detailed analysis of student portfolios revealed a close engagement with evidence that was related to practical, professional issues.*
- *All sample partnerships recorded a multi-layered approach to quality assurance of which evaluation of participant learning outcomes was a key component. Typically, core quality assurance processes included evaluation by course tutors and mentors, participant surveys and external examiner audits, overseen by a board of studies or equivalent scrutinising body. Quality assurance procedures across the sample appeared to be both thorough and rigorous and to involve stakeholder and participant perspectives and outcomes, as well as internal review and validation procedures.*
- *Many 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. Similarly, most providers have tended to add impact on pupils as an additional layer of analysis from the data which they already collect for quality assurances purposes, detailed above. However, many providers also included the outcomes of student inquiry work amongst their impact indicators.*

32. Following the Year 2 evaluation, we refined further our approach to data collection and the analytic framework to gain a sharper view of partnership operations and learning and support processes. These included an explicit request to providers prior to site visits that they prepare to talk in detail about how their partnership worked, what the particular issues have been, how they have gone about overcoming them, what the particular benefits have been and what lessons they have learned from partnership working. We also added a series of questions with regard to CPD processes to the student interview schedules to ensure that we had data with which to triangulate the evidence from providers.

Methodology

Sample

33. A sample of 19 course providers/partnerships was selected for detailed investigation in Year 3, which constituted the remaining partnerships which had not been part of the evaluations in Years 1 and 2.
34. During Year 3 of the evaluation, CUREE team members attended the TDA Partnership Managers' Conference on 10th December 2008. This provided an opportunity for partnership managers to meet the CUREE research team, to learn about the project, to hear the findings from Year 2 and to ensure that the project was appropriately connected to other related development work.
35. As in the previous two years, CUREE's approach in Year 3 was to unpack the specific evaluation objectives into a series of key questions, amenable to either quantitative or qualitative manipulation, or both. We employed the detailed menu of actions and processes relating to the different evaluation objectives developed in Year 2.
36. In order to gain a closer perspective on the CPD processes actually put into practice on the PPD programmes, we incorporated more questions relating to this aspect of the evaluation in the schedules for student interviews in Year 3. This has enabled us to report in more detail on CPD processes.
37. We have listed the key questions below. The detailed methodology can be found is attached as Appendix 1 and the analytic framework is attached as Appendix 3.

Key Questions

Effectiveness, Quality and Impact of Course Preparations

Level 1

38. 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)?
- subjected the courses to academic accreditation processes and peer review?

Level 2

39. 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?
- 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

Level 1

40. 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)?
- providing access to on-line support, printed materials.

Level 2

41. 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?
- pre-course planning involvement and support of students?

Impact on Pupils and Teachers

Level 1

42. Is there evidence of:

- improvements in pupil learning (where appropriate depending on course content)?
- changes in teacher knowledge and understanding?
- application of new knowledge and understanding in professional contexts?

Level 2

43. 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?
- 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

- What are participants’ perceptions of research/problem solving skills using evidence from research and other data?
- How do providers facilitate access to the public and local knowledge base?
- To what extent do providers tailor this to context and offer a menu from which teachers can choose?
- How are research and problem-solving skills applied in professional contexts, including skills in interpreting the implications of data for context?

44. 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.

Impact

45. 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).
46. For a detailed account of the evaluative methodology see Appendix 1.

Year 3 Findings

Partnerships

47. During the Year 3 evaluation we were asked in addition to our ongoing analysis to probe, in particular, for greater detail around the area of partnership working: how it operates and the perceived benefits of this approach to PPD provision (see paragraph 32).
48. One of the most striking findings from the samples of the previous two years is the variety of ways partnerships have been formed to respond to the needs of their local schools and/or the areas of teaching and learning they support. These earlier findings illustrated the potential of a partnership-based programme like PPD to enhance providers' ability to construct innovative professional development programmes relevant to a range of constituencies and focused on school, student and participant priorities. Data collected during Year 3 have confirmed this trend and provided more detailed examples of the range of provision and partnerships that the PPD funding regime has encouraged.

Origins and evolving nature of partnerships

49. What is clear from the three years of evaluating PPD partnerships is that very few indeed were started specifically to develop a PPD programme. In the majority of cases partnerships between universities, LAs and schools were already established, (prior to PPD) primarily to facilitate coherent ITE provision. Some of the partnerships had been operating for up to 10 years before they applied to run PPD programmes. Universities also provided postgraduate courses for individual teachers to progress to education-related Masters level qualifications.
50. Evidence from partnership documentation and the site visits show that PPD funding is linked with unlocking the potential for both existing and new partnerships between universities, LAs, schools and specialist organisations to develop bespoke programmes for professional development. In many cases these have built on the expertise and capacity already existing in the system. One feature of this is the dynamic interrelationship between ITE programmes and CPD programmes which the partnerships manage. For example, one partnership has developed modules specifically for serving teachers to become ITE mentors, while many others provide mentoring modules which can fulfil this function. Another partnership offers teachers accreditation of prior learning to help them progress towards Masters level qualifications as a quid pro quo for their schools' accommodation of ITE students.
51. Furthermore it would seem that the focus on and dedicated PPD resource for professional development has encouraged the seeking out of additional partners who can provide niche specialist input, such as subject associations, or wider CPD networks, such as TLA. This is described in further detail below.
52. That the PPD programme is linked with unlocking initiative and enthusiasm for partnership working is further evidenced by the collaboration between several PPD partnerships in the south coast region. The Southern Partnership for Professional development is a consortium of four local authorities and six universities, representing a total of six PPD partnerships, which work together to maximise PPD coverage across the region and discuss the complementary nature and distinctiveness of the programmes offered.

Characteristics of PPD Provider Partnerships

53. As with the sample from Year 2, nearly all of the partnerships in this year's sample¹ were led by HEIs (17). The two exceptions were a partnership led by a grammar school in liaison with a university and LA partners, and one led by an independent professional learning and development body.
54. In all but two cases, partnerships included local authorities, usually three or four, while one university worked with a total of 12 LAs. The numbers of schools reported as members of the partnership ranged from four or five to 400. The degree of variation in the reported numbers of partner schools is partly due to how partnerships defined 'partner school'. The cases ranged from:
- one where the school was the lead partner;
 - core schools acting as active contributors to the development and direction of the partnership; to
 - teachers attending the PPD programme.
55. Where partnerships were led by a university it was also not always easy to see if schools were participating through direct liaison with the university or via the local authority. In at least one case schools which had previously participated on the programme through the local authority were now developing their own programme directly with the university. The benefit of this for the school was that their staff did not need to travel to another site and they had greater control over the content of modules.
56. Specialist organisations were a feature of more than half the partnerships (11). These included teacher networks (e.g. TLA, NCSL), subject specialist organisations (e.g. Science Learning Centre, National Association of Teachers of English), specialist local services (e.g. Ethnic Minority Achievement Service, Education Psychology Service), and other agencies (e.g. Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), Wiltshire Wildlife Trust). The Warwick Institute of Education partnership is an example of how multiple partners can provide access to a range of expertise which in turn enables the partnership to be responsive to very diverse cohorts of education professionals. The partnership includes SSAT, RSC, the United Church School Trust and the United Learning Trust, Maths Education Institute (Manchester) and Teacher First, as well as LAs and schools.

Working and Learning Relationships Between Partner Organisations

57. The nature of the relationship between partners in the Year 3 sample was similar to that reported in previous years. That is to say, in most cases the HEI provided partnership management and administration, accreditation, communication and quality assurance. There is evidence, however, that over the three years of PPD the relationship between universities, local authorities and schools in particular, is maturing. Schools and local authorities are increasingly taking the initiative in articulating in precise terms the type of support they require from HEIs, be it accreditation for existing CPD provision, or bespoke modules.
58. While schools in particular were taking the initiative in developing Masters level CPD within PPD partnerships, there were also signs that at least three of the HEIs were anxious that the arrangement was seen this year as equals co-developing appropriate modules, rather than one in which the HEI prescribed provision. One HEI described their conversations with senior leadership teams as being about establishing relationships with individual schools, clusters and LAs, and not about 'selling courses'.

¹ Evidence was collected from a total of 19 partnerships during the Year 3 evaluation.

59. As in Year 2 the majority of partnerships (16) believed their provision was aligned with school goals and priorities and there was evidence from all but one partnership that teacher needs fed into programme development. Partnership activities which ensured school and teacher priorities were addressed by PPD programmes included:
- an advisory group of serving teachers who meet to discuss the quality and impact of the programme;
 - a programme committee consisting of teacher and LA representatives to discuss school needs identified by the LA, for example the need to increase the number of teachers with an early years qualification;
 - marketing visits by the HEI to schools to find out the type of PPD provision they would like; and
 - negotiation between schools and the HEI over the content of certificate and diploma levels of the award to meet organisational development needs.
60. In Year 2 of the evaluation we identified a range of ways partnerships demonstrated customer responsiveness. Data collected from the Year 3 cohort provide an opportunity to test the degree to which these findings recur. As in Year 2 we found examples of experiential, school-based CPD organised around schools' development needs and responsive to the work rhythms of the school. Mechanisms for securing this included:
- building on the capacity for school-based learning provided by existing ITE networks;
 - using ITE partnerships to offer partner schools access to Masters level professional learning and development for their serving teachers;
 - validating and contributing to the development of entirely school-based modules, involving school leaders as associate tutors; and
 - negotiating bespoke M level CPD with groups of schools and LAs to address the needs of pupils in the local area.
61. The various forms of liaison described above illustrate the many points of contact at which partners have had the opportunity to learn from each others' experience and practice. In all cases this occurred through formal structures such as programme advisory groups and similar forums, and on a day-to-day basis through the collaboration of partner members, for example through co-delivery of modules. Dissemination activities provided further opportunities for learning across partners. In at least four this occurred through an annual research conference. There was evidence from one partnership that staff encouraged students to publish papers on the internet, and another produced a journal which showcased students' work. One partnership exploited the opportunities provided by Teachers TV to have students' learning stories captured on video and posted on You Tube.

The Relevance of Effective Partnerships for PPD

62. The Year 2 evaluation uncovered extensive reports that partnership working was seen as being linked to effective PPD provision, in particular in terms of its potential to:
- expand and create flexible provision;
 - target local needs;
 - extend the reach of the programmes; and
 - create economies of scale.

In the light of these findings, in Year 3 we set out to probe further perceptions of the added value of partnership working.

63. All of the providers saw additional benefits to CPD provision through the PPD model. These were in particular in the areas of facilitating recruitment to programmes (12), enabling an expanded offer of module foci (12), creating access to a greater range of expertise (11), and providing access to Masters level learning to more teachers (9).
64. The evidence in the Year 2 evaluation of the contribution partnership working could make to expanding and creating flexible provision is reinforced by the findings in Year 3. Among this year's cohort too there was evidence that LAs and other partners substantially added to the needs assessment and delivery capacity of providers, not least because of partners' ability to extend the pool of specialists providers could call upon to design and deliver modules. Illustrative of the expanded offer partnership working has made possible are the following partnership activities:
- *LA specialists make major contributions in behaviour and SEN courses, particularly in relation to the local emphasis on raising achievement through the MA.*
 - *LA advisers have led taught sessions on monitoring pupil performance and analysing pupil data as part of the school effectiveness and improvement course.*
 - *When citizenship became a key issue for schools, contact was made with the Association for Citizenship Teachers and the county council advisor for citizenship, and a new module was put together ... Between 20 and 25 teachers have completed this citizenship module each year for the past three years.*
 - *Working closely with local authority partnerships has enabled provision to join up policy and academic expertise. Local authority officers have been involved in planning and delivering programmes.*
 - *The university involves subject specialists from respective associations in the delivery of the programme in order to bring expertise and cutting edge knowledge to the MA provision.*

Provider feedback

65. The energy with which partners were taking forward their PPD programmes was reflected in their messages to TDA.
- Seven partnerships were keen to emphasise the benefits of the PPD project, for example:
 - *PPD has been very highly valued by participants in terms of their development as teachers and impact on practice in the classroom. PPD should be placed at the heart of performance management systems in schools.*
 - *PPD is extremely valuable because it conveys the message that there is a priority on post early professional development.*
 - Three providers highlighted the value of partnership working, for example:
 - *There was wide agreement among the partners that they had developed a strong model of collaborative practice making use of existing skills and talents whenever possible.*
 - *The partnership approach to PPD was supported as being the best way to ensure quality and breadth of provision.*
 - Eight providers expressed the view that resources should be made available so that the wider school workforce could benefit from PPD activities, for example:

- *Could the funding be extended to others such as TAs who are also engaged in pupils' learning but who are ineligible for TDA funding as they are non-QTS? In this respect, the partnership believes that the evolution of the Every Child Matters agenda is widening the circle of professionals involved in education, which is being reflected in the range of people interested in PPD courses.*
- *More than one interviewee stressed the importance of providing access to PPD for staff without QTS. Several unqualified staff have wanted to enrol, some of whom were put off by the full fee which they would have had to pay.*
- Six partnerships felt that it was important to maintain funding to encourage participation, for example:
 - *The partnership finds TDA funding helpful in a number of ways, including subsidising the costs of the course for students, supporting the employment of the partnership coordinator and helping to meet the costs of local promotion and advertising.*
 - *The existing funding arrangements make PPD a possibility for a large number of teachers and schools. Should the funding decrease, PPD will become inaccessible to many of them.*
- Four partnerships specifically requested clarity over the future of PPD or successor programme, for example:
 - *There is a need for greater clarity about future funding, especially as the partnership has already recruited students to begin the programme in September 2009.*

Conclusion

66. The detailed data from the Year 3 evaluation have added to the picture of maturing partnerships identified in Year 2. In particular, schools seem to be increasingly taking the initiative to define the type of professional development support they need from the HEI and HEIs for their part responding to school needs flexibly.
67. Another feature of maturing partnership evident from this Year's sample is the development of wider networks of expertise, as providers involve a number of specialist partners to shape their response to schools' needs in increasingly sophisticated ways.

Findings Relative to the Evaluation Objectives

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

Indicators

68. 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 (e.g. 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

69. All of the partnerships used some form of needs analysis to inform their PPD programmes. As was the case in the Year 2 sample, needs analyses tended to focus on local issues rather than those raised at national level. Needs analysis for programmes was primarily based on consultation with local authorities (19) and exploration of teacher needs (18). The latter was ascertained most commonly via the outputs of participants' study (16), such as a critique of current practice and assessment (9). Consultation with head teachers was also common across the partnerships (14).

70. While ten of the partnerships reported consulting with national agencies, this appeared to be with local networks of national agencies, for example NCSL. Reference to national indicators such as national strategies (6), national standards (2) and those provided by Ofsted was less likely to inform programme development.

71. We found evidence that the outcomes of needs analyses were acted on by partnerships, which as a result developed new modules, including:

- the development of a module aligned with workforce remodelling initiatives;
- collaboration between lead HEI and a school to write an MA in Leadership programme; and
- the creation of a maths pedagogy module among a cluster of 16 secondary schools and the lead HEI.

72. Flexibility is also built into PPD where partnerships offer a menu of modules based on areas of identified need from which schools and individual teachers can select those most appropriate to their context. A typical menu offers modules in subject knowledge and pedagogy, behaviour for learning, special educational needs, mentoring and coaching, and leadership and school improvement.

73. The main foci for schools and teachers which emerged from consultations were:

- teaching and learning (18);
- subject knowledge/development (14);
- supporting particular groups of pupils (12);
- leadership (11);

- performance management (6);
- assessment (4); and
- ICT (3).

Predictive Indicators

74. In collecting a 'second dataset' for this we were probing for elements of practice which were consistent with the best research evidence of effective course design 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 the individual course provision with school goals and leadership; and
- created a balance between content (input) and design for professional learning (what is learned and how).

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

75. In contrast to the findings from the Year 2 evaluation, there was less evidence that teachers themselves had a direct influence on course design across the cohort of partnerships. Instead there emerged a stronger and a weaker form of engagement with teachers to influence course design. The stronger form can be defined as the 'clear and detailed processes for including teachers' perspectives when tailoring their programme provision' described in the Year 2 evaluation, whereas the weaker form was a pre-course discussion with participants which aimed to allay their concerns and clarify course processes and aims. It is only in the stronger form of consultation where teachers can be said to have an input in the course design.

Examples of the stronger form include:

- *At the start of each module ideas and expectations of the cohort are "brain stormed" and the module content is then adapted accordingly. This is repeated at the end of the module to ensure that expectations have been met.*
- *In workplace modules the MA Ed team negotiates with school staff a tailor made programme which meets CPD needs identified in the school. The programme is then delivered mainly by associate tutors (school staff who have completed their own Masters and have been trained and accredited)*
- *Individual teachers negotiate their needs and interests with their head teacher prior to the start of the Masters programme and also in relation to the final research project.*
- *Participant teachers co-designed an extended programme for a second year, to undertake specific practitioner research on the changes they had implemented in the previous year.*

Examples of the weaker form of consultation include:

- *Pre-course planning and support come in the form of pre-course meetings - for the groups to get to know each other and cover course issues and information.*
- *Initial discussions where typical concerns regarding academic work and participation in the programme were raised and addressed, e.g. stressing the flexibility of the programme, what is expected of the participants and how they can achieve the objectives, etc.*

- *Tutors carry out a preparatory visit to a cluster of perspective schools to meet the CPD coordinator and staff. The CPD coordinator provides information on school priorities and issues, and a semi-formal question and answer session with staff is used to identify fears or reservations about PPD.*

Alignment of Course Provision with School Goals and Leadership

76. In all but three of the partnerships there was evidence from providers about ways of aligning course provision with school goals. In each case the student research project was aligned to the school improvement and development plan. In fourteen of the nineteen partnerships in this sample there was evidence that senior leaders identified goals specific to their school for PPD participants. The following illustrate how partnerships went about aligning provision with school goals and leadership:

- *At the start of each module an initial meeting with the school CPD coordinator, together with others such as the head, curriculum manager, ASTs, LA link adviser or CPD coordinator determines the needs. This is followed by a meeting with teachers in which their needs are clarified and their specific interests in improving pupil performance, e.g. through a focus on literacy, on uses of emotional intelligence in the classroom or on developing interpersonal skills in potential leaders can be voiced.*
- *Optional modules constitute a bespoke pathway and enable students to take up practice-based study in line with their own and their schools' interests. For example, certificate level students designed a module for teachers supporting children with autism. This is now running in a special school and is an accredited module.*
- *In each outreach centre, whether it is a local authority or a specific school, there is a coordinator who links with the students and the university tutor. The coordinator is key in terms of identifying the needs of the students, schools and local authorities and negotiating the content and delivery of the programme.*

Balance between Content (Input) and Design (Processes) for Professional Learning

77. As with the Year 2 sample, the majority of programmes in the Year 3 cohort were reported to make explicit use of key elements of effective learning models. Peer collaboration and experimentation were once again frequently found across the cohort. However, there was less evidence of in-class modelling among the Year 3 sample - this feature was identified in only three partnerships. Subsequent telephone interviews with students confirmed the evidence emerging from the partnerships – 83% of students said they had been working collaboratively with one or more teachers and 74% said that they had had opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom. In contrast, only 22% of interviewees had experienced tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations.

78. The features of effective CPD design most commonly reported among the Year 3 sample of partnerships were:

- ongoing review/evaluation/development (17);
- the tailoring of provision to needs (17);
- experimentation (16);
- collaboration (16); and
- building on student experience (14).

79. It was notable, however, how little evidence we found among providers of observation of student practice – only one site was explicit that this occurred. This is in contrast with

the message emerging from student telephone interviews, where 56% reported that observation had played a role in helping them develop their practice. This may be a result of schools taking on the responsibility of organising observation in the absence of partnership leaders being explicit about the need for it to take place. Certainly the student interviews pointed to strong learning structures within school – 83% of interviewees said that they worked collaboratively with one or more colleagues. This may be evidence that some of the strengths of PPD are increasingly growing from the development of improved professional development arrangements with schools.

Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of Participant Recruitment and Preparation Activities

Awareness of and Overcoming Potential Barriers to Recruitment and Retention

80. The key barriers to participation identified from provider data in Year 3 were broadly consistent with those reported in the first two years. They were:

- time and workload;
- timing of sessions;
- access to centrally delivered provision;
- lack of confidence in ability to undertake academic/accredited study; and
- finance and course resources.

81. In contrast to findings from previous years where lack of school or colleagues' support had been seen by partnerships as an issue, none of the providers in this cohort mentioned this as a problem. Interviews with students, on the other hand, revealed a more mixed picture – of the 145 practitioners who expressed their views, only 53% felt that their schools provided professional and/or moral support.

82. Finding time to participate on a PPD programme was the main barrier mentioned by nearly two thirds of teachers (62%) during the telephone interviews. Other potential barriers were only considered such by relatively small numbers of participants, these were:

- personal commitments (19%);
- shortage of funding (10%);
- lack/absence of resources (10%); and
- travel (7%).

83. When asked about course content and the way it was delivered, almost one third of students (30%) said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Where students did identify issues, these tended to centre around the challenge of writing up assignments (18%), and the content/relevance of parts of the course (15%). The quality of individual lecturers was also a concern for 10% of interviewees, while a small minority (6%) felt that the structure and/or expectations had been unclear.

Time and workload

84. The flexibility noted in the Year 2 report was also a central feature of provision among this year's cohort. The modular structure of programmes with multiple entry and exit points was common across all programmes.

85. Flexibility in terms of location and mode of delivery was a feature of all partnerships. Eighteen were identified as providing at least some sessions on school premises, while just over half were actively developing online learning via virtual learning environments

(VLEs) (10). The following examples illustrate the range of development and application of VLEs:

- *Over recent years e-learning has been extensively developed; a number of modules are now available in online mode and one of the Masters pathways is offered entirely by e-learning. Around 30 participants are currently undertaking their courses via e-learning, distance learning and blended learning.*
- *The new PPD model is moving towards more flexible, portfolio-based assessment, with the critical reading networks offering students opportunities to evaluate each other's work. It also builds on the HEI's blended learning approach in which the VLE is intended to function as both a repository of content and a space for conversation ... Although students can participate entirely online if they wish, the programme is centred around four days on campus.*
- *A geography module is taught in a large secondary school with students being supported by the school's CPD coordinator who encourages peer collaboration and uses the school's MOODLE intranet to communicate with students.*

Timing of sessions

86. There was strong evidence of partnerships aligning the timing of sessions with teachers' busy work lives. All but one of the providers arranged for sessions to be held after school and just under half arranged for weekend sessions (9) and sessions during school holidays (8).

Access to centrally delivered provision

87. The trend identified in Year 2 of partnerships towards making efforts to make access easier to participants by using a variety of locations for delivery was also evident among the Year 3 cohort. All but one of the partnerships offered at least some sessions on school premises and made arrangements for in-school practice. In one case provision was exclusively held in schools, which brought the partnership (not led by an HEI) additional benefits in keeping down premises costs. There was evidence that five of the partnerships were also utilising LA development centres and specialist organisation premises, such as the Science Learning Centre South West.

88. Partnerships' efforts to make locations for delivery accessible appears from student interview responses to be meeting the needs of at least a substantial number of them. Asked how accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions, and with regard to making venues accessible, only 11% mentioned that venues could be made more accessible. Other student recommendations for making courses more accessible were:

- ensure accessible venues (11%);
- encourage schools to support study leave (9%);
- provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%);
- better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%); and
- more funding of supply cover (5%).

Assessment and assignments

89. An interesting departure from the findings from the Year 2 evaluation was the lower number of partnerships who felt that concerns about academic work were a barrier to participation. Whereas all providers in Year 2 had identified assessment requirements as

a barrier, this diminished to just over half (10) for the Year 3 cohort. Student responses indicate that writing up assignments was only a particular problem for 18%.

90. Student interview data reveals that written essays continue to be the staple form of assessment on their course - 85% said this was the case for them. Other forms of outputs that students were assessed upon were:

- presentations (30%);
- dissertation (19%);
- action research (13%);
- portfolio (13%); and
- DVD/posters/journal (11%).

Lack of school and colleagues' support

91. As noted in paragraph 81, only 53% of students interviewed felt their school provided professional and/or moral support. This is less than the two thirds of students from the Year 2 cohort who felt they were well supported by their schools. It indicates there is still some way to go for partnerships to engage the co-operation of some leadership teams. This message is reinforced by the number of students saying they had no support from their schools at all, (9% of those interviewed), the same as for the Year 2 cohort. Interestingly providers themselves did not identify this as a priority issue - only one provider identified lack of support from school leaders as a problem, stating that some head teachers, particularly in the primary phase, did not see the value of CPD/PPD.

Finance and course resources

92. The large majority (86%) of students interviewed said they had received financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. This is a higher number than the Year 2 cohort where the figure was 77%. As with the Year 2 sample, just over half (51%) said their course was fully funded, and 35% said they had some help with funds. Only 18 students (12%) in the Year 3 sample said they received no financial help at all, a lower figure than that from the previous year (22%). Many providers highlighted the importance of PPD funding as a way of keeping participation costs down and so helping overcome the financial barrier to participation. Providers have also come to arrangements with individual schools and LAs to share the costs of delivering modules. In one partnership, for example, the local authority funds 48 places on the PPD programme, i.e. 12 of each of its four modules.

93. Similar to the findings of the Year 2 evaluation, the majority of partnerships (16) agreed that marketing strategies were most effectively carried out within networks. While information was made available in newsletters (13) and on websites (12), partnerships were heavily reliant on more direct means of marketing, such as recommendations via word of mouth (13), talking with potential participants in CPD sessions (10) and at events (9) and talking directly with heads. One provider described the value of such direct approaches to marketing PPD:

- *Previously our marketing strategies were heavily dependent on traditional handbooks and flyers. Whilst such strategies continue to be used to ensure maximum coverage, we have now developed a focus on direct relationship building. Current evidence indicates that this results in an increase in take-up and a greater return on the development of long term collaborative planning.*

94. About one third of students interviewed had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A smaller group (17%) said they had found out

about the course informally, through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded to an advertisement or flyer, 13% knew of the course as the result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

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

Pupil Outcomes

95. In line with the findings from Year 2, there was evidence that providers were making considerable use of pupil data in assessing the impact of PPD activities, measured in all cases through assignments. All providers apart from one made reference to pupil impact as reported by individual teachers in their impact evaluations, the exception referring only to teacher impact. As in previous years, several providers (7) stressed the need to be cautious about making links between PPD activity and impact on pupil learning. However, the providers were using this caveat as a way of putting their evaluation findings into context, and all seven went on to describe in detail examples of pupil impact. Providers' adoption of evaluation practice which includes scrutiny of students' assignments to identify pupil impact is in line with our recommendation at the end of Year 1, when we encountered widespread caution about making causal links, and in some cases resistance to the idea of including pupil outcomes in the evaluation of the PPD programme.
96. Analysis of the student portfolios (n=96) revealed that the large majority (72) reported on action research – substantially more than the 50 portfolios in the year 2 evaluation. Of the remaining, fourteen were descriptive studies, four evaluations, four case studies, three were portfolios of activities, and two examples of resource development. Subject teaching and learning was the focus of nearly half of the research carried out (46). The number of studies which focused on inclusion, well-being and SEN (18) was consistent with the Year 2 sample. Teachers' professional learning (including reflection, and mentoring and coaching) was the focus of seventeen studies, reflecting the number of partnerships in this year's cohort who were offering modules specifically designed to develop these skills. Other issues explored by students included creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT.
97. The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1), and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. These numbers are consistent with those from the Year 2 cohort, except for MFL which was the focus of only two research projects in the Year 2 sample. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:
- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
 - professional learning skills (17); and
 - leadership and management skills (5).
98. School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting groups of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

99. Fifty-two per cent of the studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. This is lower than the 63% in the Year 2 sample. Twenty-one per cent of studies explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation, and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to in indirect terms in 24% of the studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.
100. In addition to student assignments, partnerships also used a range of other sources to assess impact, the most common being:
- anecdotal evidence/reflections from participants (15);
 - direct head teacher and CPD coordinator feedback (9); and
 - assessment and attainment data (7).
101. From the perspective of the providers the most common outcomes for pupils whose teachers participated in PPD were in the areas of involvement/engagement (12), motivation (12) and achievement (11). Providers also identified improved behaviour (6) and subject knowledge (3) among pupils as a result of their teachers participating in the PPD programme.
102. Examples of the changes taking place in schools from among the Year 3 cohort include:
- *The programme has developed five school based staff groups for collaborative learning which has succeeded in enhancing pupil learning experiences and data shows significantly raised pupil achievement. One of our partner schools comments that "students have achieved the highest results in all key stages in the history of the school (since the advent of PPD)".*
 - *The co-operative learning is having an extremely positive impact on our students; we have noticed a change in attitude and an increase in their level of motivation and self-esteem.*
 - *One school reported positive trends from new strategies to improve outcomes in GCSE English and mathematics. In two other schools, interviews with pupils suggested improvements in confidence in tackling new work, peer collaboration, questioning and seeking help from teachers.*
 - *PPD participants have reported sharing their ongoing learning experiences as students on award programmes with pupils, for example discussing issues related to assignment deadlines, research skills, study and presentation skills and insecurities 'as learners where you think everyone else knows the answers'... This has led to discussions of shared experience of 'ourselves as learners' and what 'lifelong learning' actually means and an acknowledgement of the importance of 'modelling learning practice';*

Teacher Outcomes

103. Providers identified changes in teacher knowledge, skills and behaviour most commonly through assignments and school-based projects (16), evaluation (11), interviews (10), and assessed tasks (9).
104. Increases in teachers' knowledge and skills in many respects followed the pattern of the Year 2 sample. Development and improvements in action research skills (14), collaboration skills (13) and teacher subject knowledge (10) were consistent with the outcomes of the Year 2 cohort. There was more evidence that partnerships were noticing greater awareness of pupil learning than in previous years (12, compared with 7

in both Years 1 and 2). Eleven partnerships identified evidence of improvements in teachers' leadership skills. Other areas of improved knowledge and skills were reported as management (4), supporting parents to deal with issues at home (2) and ICT (1).

105. Consistent with reports in Year 2, there was a widespread perception that teachers who participated on the PPD programme increased their confidence (18) and had become more reflective (18).
106. Also in line with Year 2 findings were the improvements partnerships noted in teachers' pedagogic practice (16). Examples of what this might mean in practice include:
- *'Since taking the unit I have different views about my teaching, we can't know how things will turn out with the environment so I now teach children to critique what they hear e.g. about climate change, its completely changed my view of teaching...'*
 - *I have been able to take children I've worked with into new areas of learning. Created a number of different opportunities for children proving to fellow professionals and adults that children are able to take responsibility and be trusted to conduct their roles efficiently and professionally.*
 - *The main method I have used during my inquiry is interviewing due to the young age of the children. ... It also became clear that many children had carried out some good learning but did not always have the language to express this. With this in mind, I made ... 'reflection fans' for the children to use as an aid to discussing their learning. ... The 'reflection fans' also enabled those children facing a language barrier to be included in our discussions and gave them the visual understanding of the views of their peers.*
 - *A discussion group revealed how children found parts of some PE lessons inaccessible and others wanted the opportunity to take part in extra swimming lessons. Actions from this have included working with the school's PE coordinator to develop practice and to further include those who have on occasions felt marginalised.*
 - *I am generally more knowledgeable with regards to key issues and am also keen to find out more about educational issues. I now have the ability to do this in an analytical and evaluative way, meaning I can audit something and suggest a way forward. Specifically, after doing two action research pieces has led to changes in the areas of student voice and gifted and talented provision. For example identifying the best model to accelerate G&T students - this has now been adopted. Changes to student voice provision in terms of participation should come on line this year.*
107. During telephone interviews 87% of students said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice, 9% said their leadership skills had improved. Students also said that as a result of participating on PPD they had:
- become more reflective (17%);
 - implemented a policy or project (14%); and
 - become more confident (6%).
108. Student responses also indicated that for them it was the collaboration with colleagues which participation in PPD had facilitated that was one of its most significant features. Three quarters said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their

PPD providers to share their learning or research with others and 59% said they had managed to do so. 14% of the target audience were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Predictive Indicators of Impact

109. As with the Year 2 evaluation, we explored the design of PPD programmes to identify those elements of CPD which have been linked with effective student and pupil outcomes. These 'predictive indicators' therefore help to establish the likelihood that the PPD programmes are having an impact on student learning. The elements of effective CPD that we set out to discover were:

- addressing teachers' own concerns and issues;
- using in-class modelling;
- practice and feedback from observations;
- allowing time for preparation and teacher planning;
- including planned opportunities for peer support; and
- designing planned opportunities for classroom experimentation.

Addressing teachers' concerns

110. There was direct evidence from 18 partnerships that attempts were being made to address teachers' own concerns and issues. Several providers emphasised the 'flexible' nature of the modules they developed, specifically so that teachers could address issues of immediate relevance to them while completing the modules. Action research was also frequently cited as an opportunity for teachers to focus on areas of particular concern/interest to them.

- *The course allows and encourages teachers to bring their own concerns and issues, especially within the research modules and the peer led sessions.*
- *The Masters programme is designed to be flexible and adaptable through the 'negotiated module', without the need to revisit university validation regulations... Assessment tasks are negotiated according to individual needs and should be grounded in teachers' own practice, providing opportunities for teachers to apply their growing skills and knowledge to real issues in their schools.*

In-class modelling

111. Of all the specialist inputs, modelling of practice was the least evident among the sample. Only three sites reported real time in-class modelling of practice, roughly in line with the one fifth of students who said that this was a feature of their course. This contrasts with the findings from Year 2, where modelling of practice was evident in half of the sample of 20 partnerships. As both sets of data were confirmed by what students were telling us during telephone interviews, this indicates that it really does depend on the approach to professional teaching and development adopted by the schools in the partnership as to whether this takes place and there is some way to go to persuade all partnerships of the benefits of in-class modelling.

112. Three partnerships used video recordings of practice to demonstrate teaching strategies and it is possible that this might be promoted as a more flexible less resource-intensive alternative to in-class modelling.

Practice and feedback from observations

113. As with Year 2 of the evaluation, we experienced difficulty identifying the amount of observation of developing practice taking place on programmes. Provider evidence suggested this was only a feature of the provision of three partnerships. Students' responses, on the other hand, indicated that observation and feedback were more widespread, 56% said that they had been observed and received feedback. This discrepancy may reflect that more observation is taking place than providers are aware of and/or an attitude among providers that it is for participants and schools themselves to arrange observation. One provider, for example, told us that participants are encouraged to work with their head teachers to find opportunities for observation.

Time for preparation and teacher planning

114. A similar discrepancy between provider perceptions and student reality was apparent when we looked at the evidence for allowing time for preparation and planning. While less than a quarter of providers (4) claimed that this was a feature of their programme over half of students interviewed (54%) said that they had built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

Planned opportunities for peer support

115. Fifteen providers designed opportunities for peer support for teachers participating in the programme. In comparison with the ten providers in last year's sample identified as being active in this area, this suggests an increase in the attention providers are paying to collaborative CPD. It is certainly a feature of PPD provision that students recognise: 83% of those interviewed said they were working collaboratively with one or more teachers. It follows, therefore, that peer support is also something the schools are starting to put in place as a way of maximising the value of CPD. Peer support occurred most frequently during tutorials (14) and collaborative activities within school (14).

116. Peer support tended to take the form of opportunities for critical friendship, to talk through ideas and make presentations. The most commonly cited rationale for encouraging peer support was in order to provide opportunities for:

- sharing practice and expertise (13);
- developing of critical reflection/dialogue skills (13);
- developing teachers' confidence (13);
- building collaborative skills as an area for development in itself (9); and
- developing problem solving skills.

117. Thirteen providers also claimed that they were using VLE sessions to encourage collaboration. While some described the system as available for students to make use of, others were making deliberate efforts to ensure students did use the VLE for collaborative work, one provider for example, reported that:

- *All participants are required to access the online discussion groups and bulletin boards. Some activities are delivered via the VLE and there are monthly 'action learning set' meetings facilitated by tutors which foster peer support.*

Planned opportunities for classroom experimentation

118. All partnerships incorporated experimentation into their programmes, not least within the framework of action research projects. A small number of providers (5) explicitly arranged for collaboration between teachers in order to support experimentation. Three quarters of the teachers interviewed recognised opportunities

to experiment with new practice in the classroom as a feature of their PPD programme (compared with 81% in the Year 2 evaluation).

Research and Enquiry Skills

119. There was evidence from across all partnerships that providers supported students in accessing evidence, both from within their own schools and classrooms via action research (19) and from the wider research base (18). All providers made available library facilities and all but one were reported to provide access to online resources. There was evidence that nine partnerships provided participants with an Athens password to access journals online.
120. Data sources students most commonly accessed were research articles and journals (18), followed by school data (15), national (11) and regional (10) data.
121. In all partnerships teachers were employing their developing research skills to carry out action research projects, to develop assignments and tasks and to link research to their classroom practice. Teachers used feedback on pupil learning for the purposes of reflection (19), action planning (17) and to write summaries of the impact of their project (15).
122. The following selection of students' portfolio objectives provide an illustration of the range and depth of student engagement with research and evidence.
- Do boys see themselves as more successful MFL learners when using an IT resource?
 - Is the creation of a highly structured, personalised behaviour and learning system effective in reducing negative behaviours exhibited by a child during a period of instability?
 - Why do students at Key Stage 4 seem to dislike Religious Education and what do they suggest could be done to improve this situation?
 - Learning and Teaching Strategies Employed in the Teaching of Pupils with Moderate Learning Disabilities
 - Can self-assessment lead to behaviour improvement in the classroom?
 - An investigation to demonstrate a critical awareness of current practices in CPD in response to new regulations for performance management
 - An exploration of the question types used by students when working collaboratively
 - A reflection on personal professional development related to the role of a mentor
 - Should video-conferencing be promoted in the teaching of Primary MFL?
 - Managing Pupil Behaviour
 - Bullying in Year 7: What is the Student Experience?
 - Building a bridge between Year 6 and Year 7
 - A case study into attitudes and standards of writing of Year 5 boys
 - How can the use of AfL techniques in Year 9 English lessons be improved to make progress towards FFT targets?
 - What approaches to learning will best extend Gifted and Talented students in a Year 10 GCSE History class?
 - What are the real and potential impacts of globalisation on English comprehensive education?

- How can I work within the government's perspective of 'Gifted and Talented' but still remain true to my own living values?
- An investigation into student learning in a Year 11 Geography GCSE group
- The Implications of Cross-Age Peer Mentoring for Secondary School Girls: Raising Self-Esteem and Academic Success
- An investigation and critical reflection on the conditions necessary for making effective starts to lessons in a secondary environment
- Using Learning Journals to Develop Peer And Self Assessment
- Why I'm Not Cool at School: Examining the Under-Achievement of Black Boys
- From Failure to Outstanding: Transforming the English Curriculum in an Especially Challenging Urban School
- A Good Question Makes the Mind Buzz: Using Higher Order Thinking Skills with Year 2 Pupils to Improve Their Writing Skills
- Combating Social Isolation: Supporting the Learning Experiences of 'Looked After Children' in KS3
- How is the way NQTs develop their teaching practiced in the Induction Year supported by and reflected in the way the Induction tutor orders and organises the agenda for the weekly meetings?
- The Perspectives, Benefits and Concerns of Teachers and Students Involved with a Student Voice Initiative
- Deafness and Technology
- How effective are Learning to Learn ideas in a classroom for improving motivation and achievement
- How can I develop positive learning dispositions in my year one pupils, with a specific focus on reciprocity?
- An intervention to examine whether there is a link between Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and pupil behaviour
- An outline of how ICT is used in A-level teaching at a typical comprehensive school with a discussion of the benefits and problems ICT usage may have at this level
- Offering appropriate curriculum choices for bilingual students arriving new to UK schools into Key Stage Four
- What impact can self esteem and identity have on the learning and progress of EAL learners from Foundation Stage to the end of Key Stage 1?
- Can the development of learning communities at the college (through the tool of the TLA) impact upon its attitude towards risk?
- Does the use of success criteria and model answers, along with self and peer assessment, improve the responses of year 12 students to exam questions?
- 'It Takes a Whole Village to Raise a Child' Inquiries into the Impact of Digital Music Library Usage on Professional Learning Communities within a Secondary School
- How can I significantly improve the orientation, engagement and ability to learn across a whole primary phase group?
- The experience of bilingual learners at this school in relation to their home language; in particular their perception of their own linguistic ability

- Girls and Physics: A review of some aspects of the literature
 - The Nature of Science, Research, Curriculum and Practice
 - Science Update: Climate Change
 - Does the introduction of bioethical issues into the Science classroom promote discussion and critical thinking?
 - Science Wars and Constructivist Confusion
 - School Improvement Plan: Raising the attainment of children for whom English is an additional language
 - What are the factors that motivate and demotivate teaching staff at Slough Grammar School?
 - An investigation into the links between theories of Social Capital, Aspiration, Motivation and Achievement
 - Changing embedded teaching practice in a successful school - How and why?
 - The Impact of Restructuring the Teaching Assistant Role in a Rural High School
123. During telephone interviews, we asked students what they thought the benefits of engaging with research were. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other benefits mentioned by interviewees included sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing benefits to the school as a whole.

Evaluation Objective 3.6: Internal and External Quality Assurance Procedures

124. Student evaluation of the impact of PPD was a central feature of quality assurance across all the providers, in many cases backed up by school feedback (14). Providers also took the opportunity to assess the quality of provision through analysis of assignments. While statistical data on attendance and completion rates informed programme evaluation processes among the majority of providers (13), progression figures were reported to come under less scrutiny (2).
125. As during the Year 2 evaluation we found the quality assurance procedures across the sample to be thorough and rigorous. They involved stakeholder and participant perspectives and outcomes as well as internal review and validation procedures. All partnerships' quality assurance procedures were designed to ensure specified learning outcomes which were monitored utilising a variety of tools including:
- participants' written evaluations/reflections (18);
 - student assignments (17);
 - student interviews/discussions (10);
 - participants' reflections/learning journals (10);
 - external examiner reports (9);
 - head teacher evaluations (8); and
 - committee meetings.

Typology of effective PPD partnerships

Over a period of three years we have observed at close hand the workings of 59 PPD partnerships. The evidence we have collected coupled with the extensive research base of what makes effective professional learning which has informed the evaluation has enabled us to identify a range of features which would signal that a partnership is delivering PPD effectively. These would include:

- Strategies for ensuring that all stakeholders, but especially teachers and school leaders, have a clear and effective role in the design of the content and the delivery methods of programmes.
- Strategies for ensuring that specialist partners, whether from within or beyond the schools system, are used to contributing to bespoke modules designed to meet specific capacity learning needs.
- Lead partners/CPD providers work proactively to help schools build their capacity to assess and articulate their own professional learning needs, and to identify sources of specialist expertise within and beyond the partnership.
- Providers have strong models of consulting with teachers at the beginning of modules, to ensure learning takes into account and builds on their starting points.
- Partners work with a shared understanding of the features of effective professional learning, and develop quality assurance processes which ensure all partners are clear about where and how these are taking place.
- Partners place a growing emphasis on overcoming obstacles to enabling teachers to make use of important approaches to embedding learning in day to day practice, such as enabling learning from observations and from the modelling of new approaches.
- Partnerships systematically assess the level and type of support teachers are receiving from their school and take action to ensure equity of access to effective professional learning where possible, and to encourage all school leaders to provide the help that teachers receive in the most supportive schools.
- Partnerships encourage participants to focus on gathering evidence of the impact of their changing practice on pupils, for example through action research and collate such evidence as part of their evaluation of the impact of the programme as a whole for pupils.
- Partners support teachers to work collaboratively and offer, as part of their provision, opportunities for teachers to develop their skills in supporting each others' learning, for example, through mentoring and or coaching.
- While the list is not exhaustive, it represents the salient features observed over the course of the evaluation.

Appendix 1. Methodology

Sample

1. A sample of 19 course providers/partnerships was selected for detailed investigation in Year 3. This was a departure from the sampling methodology in Year 1, where a stratified sample was chosen rather than a random sample, because we wanted to include 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 Year 2 the following 19 partnerships were included in the sample:
 - University of Bath
 - Bath Spa University
 - Bishop Grosseteste University College
 - University of Brighton
 - University of Bristol
 - University of Derby
 - University of Exeter
 - University of Greenwich
 - University of Hertfordshire
 - Liverpool Hope University
 - Manchester Metropolitan University
 - University of Portsmouth
 - St Mary's University College
 - Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
 - Staffordshire University
 - The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
 - University of Warwick
 - University of the West of England
 - University of Winchester

Desk Research

2. CUREE continued to use the analytic framework developed in association with the Project Advisory Board and in consultation with the TDA, based on an adapted version of the EPPI systematic review data extraction tool to analyse documentation. The analytic framework is based on three key evaluation objectives and predictive indicators. It was designed to be capable of storing and analysing multi-method data types.
3. The Analytic Framework was based around three key Evaluation Objectives:

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

4. Existing literature in this area shows that professional learning is most effective when it is relevant to everyday teaching concerns (Cordingley, P. *et al.*, 2003-07; 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 influences the effectiveness and impact of professional development (Robinson, C. & Sebba, J., 2005; Cordingley, P. *et al.*, 2003-07).

5. 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.
6. Level 1 indicators investigate whether providers have:
 - 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 indicators investigate whether providers have:

- 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

7. 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).
8. Level 1 indicators interrogate whether providers were:
 - 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 indicators interrogate whether providers paid attention to potential barriers in terms of:

- delivery – timing, location (e.g. all provider based; all school based; and a 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

9. 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.
10. 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 stakeholders 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.

11. Level 1 indicators interrogate whether providers have:

- 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 indicators interrogate whether the course includes:

- 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.

12. The 'desk research' phase of the project took place in autumn 2008. This involved the qualitative and quantitative analysis of documentation submitted to TDA by the partnerships. The documents analysed included submissions documents, impact evaluations and data returns.

13. In Year 1, a PPD database was designed and built to store and analyse data collected by the researchers. The database was reviewed and some improvements made to functionality at the beginning of Year 2. Further improvements were made to the design of the database in Year 3 and researchers were trained in the use of the new functions.

Site Visits

14. Site visits were undertaken by the CUREE researchers between January and March 2009. This fieldwork phase allowed the researchers to collect further data on the sites, to clarify any ambiguities thrown up by the desk research and to gain an experience of the partnership 'on the ground'.

15. 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.

16. For each of the 19 sites the researchers met with and interviewed the Partnership Manager; they also 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 order to quality assure and to moderate the site visits, members of the research team were accompanied by a project director where relevant.

17. The data collected from the site visits was entered into the PPD database and from this the researchers wrote 19 individual site reports. The reports present both an outline of the findings across the sample as a whole and the more detailed findings for each site.

18. Site reports were validated by each provider.

Student Portfolio Reviews

19. The sample providers were requested to provide five portfolios of student work (preferably action research or practice-based work) for review from each site. In total, 100 portfolios of student work were reviewed against 18 criteria developed from the analytic framework for:

- intended learning focus for student (teachers) and pupils;
- type of student work (e.g. action research, evaluation, literature review etc.);
- intervention and any connection with MTL themes;
- evidence of building on existing knowledge;
- any specialist or peer coaching;
- problem based learning;
- focus of work and processes;
- assertions and evidence in support (including contradictory evidence); and
- evaluation of impact.

Student telephone interviews

20. Sample providers were asked to supply 10 student volunteers to take part in a telephone interview. During the spring term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year. The interviews lasted between 20 and 30 minutes and focused on students' motivation to participate in postgraduate study; barriers to participation and possible solutions; support for students; marketing and availability of information about the course; effectiveness of teaching, assessments and support provided; impacts of studying at M level; and perceptions of the CPD processes.

Report writing

21. The CUREE team collated all the data collected from the different phases of the year 3 evaluation (submissions documents, impact evaluations, data returns, student portfolio data, student telephone interview data, site visit data including interview data, additional documentation and observation data) and analysed and synthesised evidence across the different data strands to produce their report. The PPD database was used to run comparative queries from the content for indicators (Level 1) and predictive indicators (Level 2). The analysis and synthesis phase of the Year 3 evaluation distilled the main findings, illustrating these with examples from the partnerships.

22. The synthesis phase of the Year 3 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.

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

Appendix 2. Individual Site Reports

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Bath

The following report has been compiled from examination of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the provider. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the University in February 2009. Interviews were held with the Director of Studies for MA Programmes (Professor Chris James); four programme tutors; two programme administrators; and three partners: a local authority officer for Bath and North East Somerset, a Youth Programme Manager from the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust and an Assistant Headteacher from one of the key school partners.

Partnership

TDA-funded PPD provision at the University of Bath is integrated into the Department of Education's extensive Masters level programme. The University has established partnerships with local authorities, notably Bath and North East Somerset and Wiltshire; with individual schools; and with other organisations such as the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, where the partnership focusing on sustainable schools has drawn on the University's expertise in environmental education. The University of Bath's approach in building these partnerships was said to be founded on combining flexibility and responsiveness in determining course content and structure and they have begun to move towards establishing more secure and durable partnership arrangements. The school-based programmes and the partnership with the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust are both examples of this approach. Working closely with local authority partnerships has enabled provision to join up policy and academic expertise and local authority officers have been involved in planning and delivering programmes. The Director of Studies characterised them as '*eager to be as creative as possible*' in their provision, based on a philosophy of '*creating space in people's heads*', identifying teachers' needs and encouraging them to reflect on their practice and challenge their thinking. Provision is overseen by an MA Liaison Group which draws its membership from the University, local authorities and partner schools and meets two to three times a year to quality assure provision.

For the University, the partnership approach was said to have increased their connection into the classroom and helped to dissolve artificial barriers with schools, enabling them to build a '*consensus of approach*' together. The partners interviewed valued the University's flexibility and academic prestige, emphasising the importance of allowing them to follow their own lines of enquiry and validate and extend what they were already doing. Regular contact with and visits from the liaison tutor at the University were also regarded as key to the success of the partnerships.

The MA in Education at Bath has six study pathways:

- Educational Leadership and Management
- Environmental Education

- International Education
- Language in Education
- Learning and Teaching
- Sports Coaching.

Provision is delivered via a range of routes which students may combine as they wish. They include on campus sessions; a Postgraduate Summer School which takes place in July every year; attending a study centre in the UK or overseas; independent study through an educational enquiry unit; or by distance learning. Students can exit the programme at various points: by completing a Postgraduate Certificate in Educational Studies (30 credits), the Postgraduate Diploma in Education (60 credits); or at full Masters level.

Recruitment and participation

Students are recruited via established partnerships and the University's reputation. Newer partners, such as the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, were said to have been crucial in targeting students and resourcing provision. Some students have been recruited as NQTs either through a taught module and small scale enquiry undertaken at the University's summer school immediately following their completion of the PGCE or a critical reflection based on their induction year portfolio. TDA-funded student numbers represent a relatively small part of Bath's large scale MA provision, making up around 10% of their total of around 1500 M level students overall.

Areas selected for study by students have included the following:

- How have my experiences of Year 2 SATs influenced my perceptions of assessment in teaching and learning?
- How do I sustain a loving, *receptively responsive* educational with my pupils which will motivate them in their learning and encourage me in my teaching?
- How can I work within the government's perspective of 'Gifted and Talented' but still remain true to my own living values?
- Can children carry out action research about learning, creating their own learning theory?
- How can I investigate the influence of 'identity' on student writing at the transition from foundation to honours degree level?

The University of Bath identified a number of barriers to teacher participation in the M level provision which clustered around teachers' misconceptions about the geographical and theoretical distance of M level study from classroom practice. They have attempted to reduce such barriers to entry by teaching more units in school and building on their existing action research expertise to become even more practice-driven, especially in Year 1. Practice-led enquiry modules focus on assessing the impact on pupils, using that as a 'hook' to engage teachers. School-based provision has been relatively small scale but intense. For example, one school-based programme has involved 8 teachers so far, plus one additional teacher from another school. This programme has been popular but it was said that some of the more newly qualified teachers have found it difficult to sustain their engagement.

Engagement in CPD processes

As has already been stated, provision at the University of Bath emphasises flexibility and responding to teachers', schools' and other organisations' needs. Thus a range of approaches is employed, most of which are context-led. Use is made of a virtual learning

environment (Moodle); coaching and mentoring; and enquiry-based approaches. Provision is largely based on an action research cycle, grounded in the classroom and designed to assess teachers' influence on pupil learning. Interviewees repeatedly emphasised the centrality of focusing on helping teachers to understand and critically evaluate their own practice. Understanding the difficulty of engaging teachers in PPD programmes began by encouraging teachers to focus on an area of interest, which they then explored, supported and challenged by tutors and peers within the academic structure provided by the University. While interviewees spoke of the importance of encouraging peer collaboration and '*creating a community of learners*', they felt that the University achieved this through allowing students to feel they were both contributing to and benefiting from the community of enquiry that had been established.

Learning outcomes and impact

The University of Bath collects a range of data to analyse the impact and effectiveness of the programme, including:

- feedback from students;
- scrutiny of submitted assignments;
- feedback from PPD and staff-student liaison committees (SSLC);
- feedback from the programme's External Examiners;
- student questionnaires; and
- student data (e.g. attainment data; attitudes) collected as part of teachers' educational enquiries.

Impacts identified include the following:

- teachers more reflective and critical of their own practice;
- teachers' professional knowledge, understandings and skills improved;
- enhanced theoretical knowledge; and
- improved pupil attainment.

The programme's action research orientation ensures that the assessment of impact into provision is integrated into students' learning. In theorising their own practice, teachers have to consider how to develop evidence and ways of evaluating success continuously. They are encouraged to be creative, for example through integrating video into presentations of assignments, and assignments and papers are published on the internet. The University is adapting its approach to assessment further to meet students' needs, for example by moving towards the electronic submission of assignments and evidence. The larger scale, systemic impacts on teachers and schools were characterised in terms of enhancing teacher professionalism through building a culture of collaborative enquiry. This was said to have had significant impacts on students' self-esteem, with '*teachers valuing themselves as knowledge creators*'.

Summary of messages to TDA

- There is considerable uncertainty among providers about MTL and its impact on PPD provision
- TDA funding for PPD covered course fees but not supply cover costs, which made it difficult to extend school-based provision beyond the teachers in the participating school.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

University of Bath’s telephone interview responses

Interviews with 8 participants at the University of Bath produced a variety of motivations for studying at M level including: improving subject knowledge (3), career development (2) and improving practice (1). Other motivations included personal/professional development (6) and being funded (2).

There were a number of areas in which participants hoped to improve/learn including personal/professional development (5), improving subject knowledge (2) and improving practice (1). Others were discussion with other professionals (1) and to become more critical (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

University of Bath’s telephone interview responses

All of the participants interviewed received some kind of financial support; 4 were fully funded and 4 had some help with funds.

There were many practical ways the school supported the participants’ involvement in PPD. These were study leave/time allowed (4), professional/moral support (2) and rearranged timetables (1). Only 1 participant said they received no support at all.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further

10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

University of Bath's telephone interview responses

There were a number of barriers identified to studying at M level. The main barrier was time to attend sessions and to study (5). Other barriers included lack of funding (1) and travel (1). 2 participants reported no barriers.

1 participant suggested encouraging schools to support study leave as a way of improving accessibility of the course (1). Other suggestions were books being sent to school (1), a clearer expectation of the course (1) and running summer school in holidays (1). 4 participants did not have any suggestions for improvements.

Interviewees discussed aspects of the course they did not enjoy, which included: writing up assignments (1) and time (1), travel (1) and navigating the website (1). 3 participants said there was nothing that they didn't enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% knew of the

course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

University of Bath's telephone interview responses

7 out of the 8 participants from the University of Bath said they had access to enough information about their course. 1 said it was well advertised whilst 1 said it was not. Participants explained that they had found out about their courses from a range of sources including formally via a school or LA (4), informally via a colleague, school or LA (1), choosing from a website (1), responding to an advert/flyer (1) and from a previous course (1).

Participants' ideas of ways of improving the marketing of the course were: direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (6), advertising to PGCE students at the end of the course (1), emphasising the benefits of improving practice (1) and emphasising funding (1). 1 person did not suggest any improvements.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

University of Bath’s telephone interview responses

Out of the 8 participants, 6 said that they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and 7 were involved in coaching. Over half said that tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations (5). The majority of participants said that their course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms (6), 4 said that they made use of observation as part of their course and 4 also said that their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

In terms of the structure and organisation of the courses, the responses referred to: venue – school (1), venue – university (3), after school/evening sessions (5), summer school (3), specific hours/blocks (6), seminars (3), tutorials (4) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (4). 7 participants commented that they thought the level of teaching was good/excellent and 1 commented that some were better than others.

With regard to the different types of assessment used on their courses the majority of participants referred to written essays (7), presentations (1), action research (1) and dissertation (1). 1 participant also said they had experienced 1-1 interviews. 5 said that the method of assessment used for them was effective for their own professional development and 2 said that it was not.

7 out of the 8 participants said that they had good support with writing assignments. Different types of support were available, including submitting drafts for reviews (6), feedback from tutor (7) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (1). 1 reported that they felt they did not have enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)

- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only 1 student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

University of Bath's telephone interview responses

All participants said that they had tried to involve other colleagues. 7 of the 8 said that they had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others by means of shared learning/research with colleagues (5), school colleagues also on the course (3), implementing a policy or project at the school (1) and being involved in an event outside the school (1).

The parts of the course that participants enjoyed the most were research (3), group work/sharing ideas with colleagues (4), learning from experts (1), improving teaching (2), particular lectures/content (2) and summer school (2).

When asked if taking part in the course had influenced their practice all 8 participants said that it had. The specific reasons they gave were: made a difference for professional practice (6), improved leadership (3), improved teaching practice (3), implemented a policy or project

at the school (2). Additional reasons included increased confidence (1) and involvement in an event outside school (1).

7 participants had influenced their colleagues' learning specifying making a difference for professional practice (2), improved teaching practice (2) and action research (1).

5 participants noticed an impact of the course on their pupils' learning, 1 did not and 1 noticed an indirect impact. The impact on the pupils took the form of improved learning (2) and increased engagement (4)

The main benefits of engaging with research were identified as: chance to reflect on practice (3), improved understanding/learning/confidence (5), updating professional knowledge (4) and engaging in academic debate (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';

- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for

learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Bath Spa University

The following report has been compiled from examination of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the provider. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the partnership in January 2009.

Individual and group interviews were held with the CPD Programme Leader (Fiona Maine);

the Head of CPD (Steven Coombs); the Dean of the School of Education (Stephen Ward); five programme tutors; and the CPD QA Project Manager (Zara Johnson). In addition, the researcher attended a PPD session, speaking to students and a local authority partner from Wiltshire who co-led the session, and conducted a telephone interview with the Deputy Headteacher of John Bentley Secondary School which has worked with Bath Spa on school-based projects for the last three years.

Partnership

Bath Spa University's PPD programme is both campus and school-based, working with both local authority and school partners, and founded on a work-based, action enquiry model. Partners include Wiltshire and South Gloucestershire local authorities and local authority officers are involved in planning courses and co-facilitate some of the taught sessions. School-based provision is developed in collaboration with each school and customised to meet their needs. Emphasis is placed in all cases on developing a positive, adult-centred approach and on reducing barriers to learning. The first 90 credits are work-based modules, followed by core modules. This is part of a flexible learning philosophy, founded on basic module structures which can accommodate content tailored to the needs of schools and/or students. As a consequence, modules and courses do not need to be revalidated constantly. Tutors work with affiliated field tutors and partners in delivering modules and there is an open entry and exit system for school-based provision. John Bentley School, for example, left its previous HEI partner for Bath Spa because of its flexible approach to PPD, based on providing support and '*structured opportunities to engage and experiment*'.

The Professional Masters Programme at Bath Spa allows students to choose from a range of career-based accredited Awards which can lead to PG Certificate (60 credits), PG Diploma (120 credits) or Masters Degree (180 credits) qualifications. Students are free to engage in work-based study, independent learning or attend taught modules. Awards within the Professional Masters Programme include:

- Educational Leadership and Management
- Mentoring and Coaching
- Early Childhood Studies
- Educational Practice

Provision is coordinated and quality assured by the CPD QA Project Manager.

Recruitment and participation

939 students were enrolled on the Masters Programme at Bath Spa in 2007-08. Recruitment is open with schools and students able to enrol throughout the year and undertake courses and modules in '*bite-sized chunks*'. Although students are able to exit provision at PgCert and PgDip levels, 'certificates of participation' are also provided for students who choose not to undertake a formal qualification. Students are recruited through local networks, as well as through established contacts and partnerships with schools and local authorities. All interviewees stressed the importance of the programme's flexibility in attracting students and this is evident in the range of teachers' enquiries undertaken recently. This has included, for example:

- is the creation of a highly structured, personalised behaviour and learning system effective in reducing negative behaviours exhibited by a child during a period of instability?;
- how has my leadership helped the development of the department and its climate?;

- diagnostic and analytical study of a work-based team using Belbin's self-perception inventory;
- self-assessment strategies for writing; and
- formal coaching and self-coaching.

Barriers identified by the partnership include:

- timing of provision e.g. after school sessions in twilight;
- lack of career-based recognition performance targets linked to achieving postgraduate Masters and Doctoral level awards;
- low self-esteem of many teachers associated with their perceived academic and time management abilities to cope with M-level professional development activities;
- funding; and
- geographical isolation and small size of many schools which makes release problematic.

The programme's flexible approach and increasing school-based provision are attempts to address these barriers and includes revised modes of assessment, moving from summative approaches to portfolios of assignments and sessions held at times and in locations to suit the needs of students and schools.

Engagement in CPD processes

Bath Spa's provision is based upon an action learning model. Staff interviewed described themselves as '*professional developers*' as well as academics. Provision is co-constructed with schools in a process of consultation, negotiation, mutual approval and agreement. The approach was described as a critical dialogue in which the initial session sets parameters and expectations; after that students are increasingly regarded as part of the learning resource, offering challenge and support to each other. Bath Spa's flexible approach to PPD means that content is developed with school and LA partners on a coaching model in which modules are informed by theory but focus on improving practice. Local authority partners lead sessions alongside university tutors, taking students' experience and knowledge bases as their starting point. Tutors model critical engagement with theory and practice, which allows them to create a '*safe professional learning environment*' in which students develop their research and enquiry skills, starting from their own knowledge base and are eased into presenting and discussing their work with peers. In addition, Bath Spa's VLE offers a blended support system between face to face sessions.

Learning outcomes and impact

Bath Spa collects a variety of data used to analyse the impact and effectiveness of the programme, including:

- evaluative feedback from Partnership schools and LAs ;
- students' needs analysis;
- students' impact evaluation reports completed at the end of each module;
- student assignments;
- module evaluation forms and module reports from CPD Tutors; and
- student-led research seminars.

Impacts identified included the following:

- increased subject knowledge, confidence and self-esteem among teachers;
- better knowledge of action research and the benefits of utilising research in the classroom;
- promotion (e.g. to SLT);
- increased opportunities for children to use creativity in their learning;
- improvements in pupils' attitudes and behaviour;
- increased use of pupil voice, pupil reflection; and
- changes to school policy (e.g. in modern foreign languages).

School-based partners spoke of PPD having '*changed attitudes to research in the school*', based on challenging students to go beyond what they already knew. This included increasing experimentation and empowering students. Feedback from students included the following observations:

Since starting this course, I have a much clearer idea of my inner resources, abilities and limits....This process of self-reflection has helped me to be more self-aware, self-critical and confident.

Throughout the year my class have worked hard to be more collaborative in their working and thinking. Now in class they rarely moan about who they have to work with & have enjoyed the opportunity to work with others – share ideas and improve their personal performance.

This programme has drastically increased my confidence and improved my communication and decision-making skills.

Summary of messages to TDA

- TDA funding assumed that PPD was based on a campus delivery model. However, most projects undertaken by Bath Spa adopted a whole-school approach, often delivered in school in partnership with the school, which is more costly in terms of resources. Consequently, PPD had to be subsidised by the university and local authorities.
- MTL should be costed properly as being located in communities of schools.
- PPD should not exclude Early Years professionals or the wider school workforce, notably Teaching Assistants.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby

- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

Bath Spa University's telephone interview responses

The 11 interviewees reported a range of motivations for participation in PPD. These included: improving subject knowledge (5), improving leadership skills (3), career

development (7) and improving practice (3). Additional reasons included personal/professional development (4) and funding (1).

In terms of what they hoped to learn from the course, the majority of participants at Bath Spa University said that they hoped to further their personal professional development (7). Participants also hoped to improve subject knowledge (4), improve leadership skills (4), career development (4) and improve practice (3).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Bath Spa University’s telephone interview responses

All of the 11 participants interviewed received some financial assistance. 10 were fully funded, 2 also had supply cover and 1 had some help with funds.

10 of the 11 participants received non-financial support from their schools. 4 were given study leave/time and 9 had professional/moral support; 1 had no support at all. 2 students regarded funding as practical support from the schools and 1 mentioned being given a venue.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)

- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Bath Spa University's telephone interview responses

7 out of the 11 interviewees identified time to attend sessions and study as their main barrier to course. Motivation (1) and problems with the website (1) were also identified as barriers to studying. 4 stated that they did not have to overcome any barriers.

The majority of students (9) did not make any suggestions on improving the accessibility of the courses. The remaining participants proposed having existing students acting as a mentor (1) and allowing more time/arranging deadlines around holidays (1).

Six participants identified a part of the course that they didn't enjoy and these included writing up assignments (2), time (3), some of the lecturers/guest speakers (3) and lack of relevance.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of

the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Bath Spa University's telephone interview responses

8 participants said they had access to enough information about the courses, with 5 saying it was well advertised. 1 participant said they did not have access to enough information. Participants explained that they had found out about their courses formally via the school or LA (6), informally via a colleague in a school or LA (2) or already had links with the provider (2).

Some students made suggestions for improving the marketing of the course which included direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (2) and other media (TV, local press, professional publications or the internet) (1). Further suggestions included targeting early years (1) and emphasising action research (1). 7 made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

Bath Spa University’s telephone interview responses

All 11 participants said they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and 6 participants said that coaching was also part of their course. 7 said tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations however this was not applicable to 1 participant. 7 also said the course built in opportunities to experiment with the practice in the classroom whilst this was not applicable to 2 students. 7 participants said that they made use of observation as part of their course with this not applying to 1 participant. When asked if their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons 6 said that it did, 3 said it did not and 1 said it was not applicable to them.

Practitioner’s responses about the structure and organisation of the courses referred to: venue – school (5), venue – university (1), after school/evening (6), whole day (2), specific hours/blocks (8), lectures (4), seminars (4), tutorials (9) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (5). 7 said that the level of teaching was good/excellent and 3 said the teaching was helpful, however one said the lectures were too dry.

There was a variety of forms of assessment used on the courses including written essays (8), presentations (4), action research (3) and dissertation (1). 4 agreed that this was an effective method of assessment for their professional development.

The type of support participants said they received ranged from submitting drafts for review (6), feedback from their tutor (6) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (1). The majority (9) said that they had received good support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)

- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only 1 student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Bath Spa University's telephone interview responses

All but 2 of the participants had tried to involve other colleagues in their M level school work. 10 said that they had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others: 7 achieved this by shared learning/research with colleagues, 1 had implemented a policy/project at school, 1 had been involved in an event outside school and 1 had made a newsletter.

There were a number of aspects of the course that the participants enjoyed; mainly group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (8). 5 enjoyed research, 1 enjoyed particular lectures/content, 1 enjoyed writing academically and 4 enjoyed applying research/implementing change at school.

9 participants said the course had influenced their practice in a variety of ways including making a difference for professional practice (6), improved leadership (4), improved teaching practice (2) and increased reflectiveness. 2 felt it was too early to say.

8 participants believed that they had influenced their colleagues' learning by either making a difference for professional practice (5), through INSET (1) improved teaching practice (1) or a newsletter. 2 felt it was too early to say.

4 participants said that they had noticed an impact of the course on their pupils' learning and 4 said there was an indirect impact. Improved learning (2), increased engagement (3) and increased confidence (1) were all recognised as impacts on students' learning. 1 felt it was too early to say.

The overall benefits from engagement with research were the chance to reflect on practice (7), improved understanding, learning or confidence (5) and updating professional knowledge. 1 felt it was too early to say.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';

- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for

learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Bishop Grosseteste University College PPD 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 during the site visit from course tutors, partnership administrator, LA representative and a focus group of students.

The partnership

Bishop Grosseteste College (BGC), Lincoln, works with a range of organisations to provide PPD to teachers. In 2005 the key partners were anticipated to be:

- partnership schools in north and north-east Lincolnshire, Doncaster, Rotherham and South Yorkshire who work with BG on school-based training;
- EM Direct, who in partnership with BG run a 'Return to Teaching' course which provides PPD opportunities for returning teachers in the east of England including Ipswich, Barnsley, Hartlepool and Guildford; and
- the board of education in the diocese of Lincoln – BG works with many church schools and colleges in and beyond the east midlands to ensure specialised PPD opportunities for church school teachers.

By 2008 the main partners for this work were the first two of these. The church schools are embedded into the schools partnership and not currently services as a separate clientele.

Both BG and EM Direct contribute to planning and leading sessions for returning teachers, according to an agreed pedagogical approach that responds to the experience of the returners. A Departmental Committee meets three times a year to review and develop courses, and includes representatives from local authorities, schools and the student body.

Partnership schools have been particularly interested in researching their work as mentors, coaches and school-based tutors. As a consequence, BG has developed mentoring modules in ways that respond to national initiatives to raise the profile of coaching and mentoring in schools. Other main areas of interest are learning and teaching and leading educational change.

The Masters programme is tiered into three levels, each comprising two 30-credit modules. The first two modules (60 Credits) enable participants to gain a Postgraduate Certificate of Professional Studies in Education (PG Cert). Continuing with two further modules (120 credits) enable participants to gain a Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Studies in Education (PG Dip). The final double module (to make 180 credits) enables participants to gain the full Masters Degree. The modules are also aligned to the GTC's TLA core dimensions.

An MA may be completed in six weekends over one year plus additional study or spread over three years or longer. Completion routes are via school-based and/or college-based learning. Should they move schools mid-programme, teachers are able to transfer to the BG-based MA route. BG also recognises up to 90 credits from recent, relevant M-level programmes from other HEIs.

Schools are encouraged to approach BG individually or in clusters, to enable their staff to gain accreditation for CPD work they have planned to undertake in response to their own identified needs, such as mentoring/coaching, whole school policy development, or teaching innovation. If there is a sufficient number of staff involved (a minimum of 6 is required) a tutor goes to the school on a regular basis to support and guide the study to enable accreditation to be gained through this ongoing in-house CPD. The CPD element may be delivered by BG staff, by LA or other agencies, or may be provided in-house. Normally the BG tutor guidance is in addition to the CPD inputs and is specifically focused upon guiding research study.

Partnership funding is used predominately to enable meetings that are concerned with tailoring provision to reflect the needs of individual schools and groups. The types of meetings include:

- dissemination meetings designed to initiate discussion of models for individual institutions;
- meetings with senior leadership teams to develop plans that respond to school improvement plans, strengths and staff interests; and
- meetings with whole staff groups to present and discuss the projected programme and routes to the award.

Funding is also used to enable meetings between the PPD team and interested groups such as CPD leaders in different LAs and cooperative partners, such as LA personnel and independent providers of CPD.

The partner agencies work with the university college to shape demand, planning, development and delivery of provision through direct contact with schools, representation on the programme committee and through direct contact from the agencies whilst regular teacher feedback enables a culture of collaboration in course development. Conversations with participating teachers indicated that the role of school leadership in promoting and supporting participation on PPD was a key factor for sustaining engagement.

Recruitment and participation

PPD is directly marketed once a year, but most recruitment occurs through word of mouth as a result of working with training schools and through local CPD conferences. In addition, the LAs, aware of the needs within schools and aware of what BG offers, promote the accredited CPD offered by BG. Take up to some extent depends on whether a key person in a school takes part in the programme as they are then in a position to help colleagues find time to participate. Participation is gradually increasing, with 45 registered in 05-06, 62 registered in 06-07 and 90 registered in 07-08.

A number of approaches are used to reduce identified barriers to participation, including:

- personal tutor support;
- MA weekends at the end of each half-term;
- clear levels of flexibility for completion of work;
- reviewing tasks to ensure that they are pertinent, powerful and achievable;
- negotiating module content;
- use of electronic communication to overcome geographical isolation;
- electronic access to journals held by the university college library;
- use of VLE discussion rooms and other e-learning strategies to facilitate effective communication and reflection on ideas; and
- the provision of academic writing days and critical friend meetings, held at half terms, Easter and the summer holidays. These provide support for teachers not used to the genre with an opportunity to work together and with a tutor.

In the school-based route, key taught course sessions and tutorials happen in the school setting, which particularly helps to reduce barriers to participation for schools in isolated areas. Tutors carry out a preparatory visit to one or more prospective school to meet the

CPD coordinator and staff. The CPD coordinator is expected to identify school priorities and issues, including contextual factors that might reduce or inhibit participation. A semi formal question and answer session with staff is used to identify reservations and allay fears about PPD, such as time and workload.

The benefits of the school-based PPD provision are viewed as:

- staff do not need to travel for the study programme as it is based locally in one of the schools involved;
- it can be timed to fit into school development days, to avoid cover costs, but twilight and/or weekend sessions are also options;
- staff work in a collaborative learning communities, gaining support from colleagues working in similar ways, often on similar projects;
- the CPD aspects being explored are priorities identified by the individuals themselves, for the benefit of their own teaching; and
- often, such are the gains for the schools involved that they will contribute to the fees for their staff.

The partnership co-ordinator mentioned that school-based PPD provision also presented its own issues which it was important to bear in mind and ensure that the programme addresses. These included potential isolation of participants, access to resources human and physical, and other school priorities taking over.

Engagement in CPD processes

Teachers are made gradually familiar with a range of research methodologies through exposure to them in all modules. As part of the module teaching, they experience and are required to apply problem-solving approaches, including role-play, brainstorming and SWOT analysis. The modules on mentoring include the use of a journal of critical incidents.

Tutors present summaries of research findings in taught sessions, for example, through shared scrutiny of a printed text or PowerPoint/whiteboard presentations, accessing websites such as the Standards site and discussing approaches to pedagogy. Teachers are then required to relate their own practice to the findings of research. Workshops on critical use of sources and development of an argument are offered regularly and supported through activities on blackboard.

The major assessed tasks fall into two categories: issues modules require a scrutiny of key areas using reading, observation and reflection; impact modules require a report on a project from inception to evaluation and dissemination. Both types of modules also require the teacher to consider both their own learning through researching and the impact the work has had and will have on pupils' learning.

Teachers are expected to use 'critical friends', for example, through making presentations to school or cluster colleagues, as a way of refining their ideas while also disseminating them. As part of their tasks, they write an action plan showing their proposed developments and agree them with colleagues. Teachers working with others in school clusters are expected to share perspectives on, for example, strategies for dealing with challenging behaviour, under-performance or teachers' reservations about spirituality/values. They are encouraged to work across classrooms, phases and schools as appropriate to the problem, in order to trial solutions.

Teachers are expected to make critical, systematic reference to journals, regional and national test/examination data, national reports, subject association conferences etc in order to build a relevant, focused case for interventions. They are also expected to relate their own practice to the findings of research.

Learning outcomes and impact

BG collects a variety of impact review data:

- written module assignments which provide a clear report on intended and unintended gains;
- a review of impact provided with, and as part of, written assignments, identifying the impact on the participants;
- participant reviews after each course, which provides an aspirational review of intended application and impact. Comments are used to inform course design
- national student survey which indicates participants' satisfaction with the course design and delivery; and
- semi structured group interviews with participants.

Participants have variously identified a number of personal gains from the PPD provision in their written assignments, end of module reports and during the focus group discussion, including increased:

- reflectiveness;
- research awareness;
- specific knowledge;
- communication skills;
- role development;
- a transformed view of professional development; and
- greater awareness of individual strengths and weaknesses as well as an increased ability to address personal weaknesses.

For example:

I carried out a study of accelerated learning at KS3 and compared that group with a control group. We expected children at the bottom end not to do so well, but they did. It was children at the top end who struggled. We focused on developing cognitive skills and the SATS outcomes at Year 9 were a lot better.

I was successful with my AST application and my studies formed an integral part of my evidence.

The gains identified for pupils are often reported in the form of anticipated improvement. For example, one newly qualified teacher wrote of her increased understanding of her subject with a new age and ability – “I now feel confident that I better understand the learning needs of the group of pupils I studied ... being better informed means I will be able to set ability appropriate work”.

QA procedures consist of internal and external scrutiny of assignment specifications, double marking, blind double marking of all dissertations, student progress updates, participant evaluations, partnership review and annual reporting. Course reviews, collated by the school-based CPD coordinator and tutor together with partner agents such as EM Direct,

have an impact on the development of the programme and are reported to relevant partners. Module reviews, collated by the module leader have an impact on the next edition of the module and are reported to the programme committee and Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee of the Academic Board for approval. The external examiner's annual report is also represented in the annual review and followed up in the action plan.

Summary of messages to TDA

Teachers, their pupils and their schools have benefited enormously from participation in PPD. Successful completion of an award is often a transformational experience. Teachers gain in confidence, insight and effectiveness as they develop from reflective practitioners to practitioner researchers. Flexibility of provision, including both school-based and institutional sessions, is an important asset to teachers in different circumstances.

Our key messages are therefore that PPD does make an impact and that this is enhanced by a programme at BG that is both supportive and flexible in meeting individual and group needs. Or, in words taken from module reviews:

- “Excellent support and just the right amount of challenge to make me think and develop my research”;
- “The opportunity to choose a relevant area of research made the work both meaningful and enjoyable”; and
- “It has changed by practice - and I have been asked to share findings with others locally and nationally”.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England

- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

Bishop Grosseteste University College’s telephone interview responses

Of the 6 participants interviewed from Bishop Grosseteste University College, 5 attributed their motivation to become involved in PPD as furthering their own personal/professional development, 3 wanted to improve their practice, 1 wanted to improve their subject knowledge. 1 respondent said that it was because involvement in PPD was fully funded and 1 because the course was delivered at their own school.

When asked what they hoped to learn, all six participants said they wanted to improve practice and 1 wanted to improve subject knowledge.

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Bishop Grosseteste University College's telephone interview responses

All 6 participants received some form of financial support. Half had their fees fully funded and the other half had some help with funds.

All participants also received non-financial support for example study leave/time allowed (1), professional/moral support (5), funding (3) and having a venue (1).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Bishop Grosseteste University College's telephone interview responses

The three barriers participants had to overcome to take part in their courses were time to attend sessions (5), insufficient funding (1) and travel (2).

Participants were asked to make suggestions to improve the accessibility of the courses. 1 suggested making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible, 1 suggested improvements in the library such as better access, improving resources and library induction, 1 suggested more providers closer to home and 3 could think of no improvements.

Aspects of the course practitioners did not enjoy were some of the lecturers/guest speakers (2) and the lack of relevance (1). Practitioners also said that they did not enjoy background reading (1) and weekend meetings (2). 2 said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Bishop Grosseteste University College's telephone interview responses

5 of the 6 participants said they had access to enough information about the course and 3 regarded it to be well advertised. The means by which they found out about the course was formally via the school or LA (2), already having links with the provider (3) and the TDA (1).

2 suggestions were made about ways of improving the marketing of the course: direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (1) and emphasising the benefits of improved practice (1). 4 participants couldn't think of anything.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

Bishop Grosseteste University College’s telephone interview responses

All 6 participants said they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and 4 said the course included coaching. 5 said tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations. 4 said the course had built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom. 3 made use of observation as part of the course, 3 did not and this was not applicable to 1 participant. 4 of the 6 participants said that the course had built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

Regarding structure and organisation of the course the participants mentioned: venue – school (1), venue – university (2), after school/evening (2), weekend meeting (2), whole day (1), specific hours/blocks (1), distance learning (1), lectures (1), tutorials (2) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (1). 3 practitioners also said that the teaching was good/excellent, 1 said it was helpful and another said it could be better.

The majority of participants (5) were assessed by means of written essays within their course. Other types of assessment used were action research (1), dissertation (1) and portfolio (1). 2 found the forms of assessment effective for their professional development; 1 did not.

All participants said that they had received good support with writing assessments. Support came via submitting drafts for review (5), feedback from tutor (5) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (3).

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only 1 student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Bishop Grosseteste University College's telephone interview responses

When asked if they had tried to involve other colleagues all said they had and only 1 said that they had not been encouraged to share what they had found out with others. This was achieved largely through shared learning/research with colleagues (4) and by the school colleague also being on the course (2). 2 participants enjoyed every aspect of the course. Specific aspects of the course others enjoyed included research (2), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (2), writing academically (1) and time to reflect (1).

Participants were asked if taking part in the course had influenced their practice and 5 said that it had: 6 said it had made a difference for professional practice, 4 said it had improved their leadership skills, 2 said it had improved teaching practice and 3 said it had made them more reflective. 2 felt it was too early to say.

4 participants had influenced their colleagues' learning 1 had not as it was too early to say. When asked about the impact of their course on their pupils 5 said there was a clear impact. The areas where the impact was noticeable included improved learning (2), more engagement (2) and the participant having implemented a project or policy (2).

The main benefits of engaging with research the participants identified were the chance to reflect on practice (3), improved understanding, learning or confidence (4), updating professional knowledge (6) and 1 thought it was too early to say.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Brighton

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February 2009, and interviews with the Programme Coordinator, the head of the School of Education, a Principal Lecturer, two tutors, a CPD manager in a school partnership and a local authority (LA) representative. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The University of Brighton is the lead organisation in a partnership which includes the LAs Brighton and Hove, East Sussex and West Sussex and six schools with one more coming on board in September. There are links with schools in other ways too. For example, East Sussex Advisory Service has a group of teachers, from a range of schools, involved in PPD. The partnership has been running for four years. The partnership continues to evolve, drawing in more schools and other organizations, such as the Bexhill Consortium of Schools and Colleges. Direct links with the LAs have enabled the University to develop a sustained and productive relationship with advisors and CPD personnel. The University is also involved in meetings with other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), including the universities of Chichester and Sussex which are also part of the large 'coastal strip' area of southern England, with the aim of using the strengths of each institution to enhance PPD provision in the region.

The partnership is managed by a steering group made up of representatives from the partner organisations, including participants and head teachers. The steering group meets three times a year but increasingly functions more as a network than through meetings, which the partnership leaders believe are apt to become over-bureaucratic. A range of sources provide feedback on the programme which the steering group uses to plan future provision, including:

- participants;
- schools' self-reviews;
- CPD coordinators and head teachers;
- outcomes from Ofsted reports and LA annual reviews; and
- LA personnel.

There is also an annual School of Education MA Education research conference to which students, CPD leaders and members of the PPD Steering Group are invited. Participants present and discuss their work at the conference and have the opportunity to discuss their work with partners.

The programme has been designed to be as flexible as possible in order to be able to respond to LA priorities, and to enable local schools and clusters of schools to plan provision which meets the needs of school improvement plans as well as teachers' professional learning needs. The PPD programme at Brighton is characterised by "...a desire to advance teachers' professional knowledge through a combination of critical reflection, work-based learning and intellectual engagement with practice" (Programme Coordinator). The partnership is continually developing its work with the LAs and both parties are keen for the University to accredit and support what teachers are already doing in their everyday working lives in school.

The University offers flexible routes through the certificate, diploma and Master's levels of the provision. Students can exit with a certificate or diploma or can undertake further modules including a 60-credit research project based in the participants' schools to complete the M level. Students who complete the full MA can continue to the Professional Doctorate in Education.

The main areas covered by taught modules include:

- management and leadership;
- equality and diversity;
- special educational needs;
- improving professional practice and learning;
- financial management;
- health and safety;
- 14-19 curriculum; and
- workforce remodelling.

The structure of the programme is based on a combination of compulsory and optional modules. Compulsory units serve to provide an introduction to M level study, give students a background in current policy and practice in education and begin the development of students' practice-based research skills. Optional modules constitute a bespoke pathway and enable students to take up practice-based study in line with their own and their schools' interests. As an illustration of the responsiveness of the programme to schools' needs, certificate level students designed a module for teachers supporting children with autism. This is now running in a special school in Hastings and is an accredited module.

Recruitment and participation

After a dip in 2005-06 the PPD programme benefited from an increase in numbers in 2006-07 when 106 teachers enrolled. Provision is marketed through:

- existing networks between the University and schools, in particular with teachers already involved in ITE who are offered the opportunity to take a module on mentoring;
- events, conferences and exhibitions at which students are encouraged to share good practice;
- existing networks between the University and LAs e.g. details of the PPD available at Brighton are included in the LA's CPD handbooks;
- leaflet drops to schools;
- tracking ITE students who now work in local schools;

- the University of Brighton, School of Education website; and
- word of mouth.

Identifying the needs and interests of teachers who enrol is carried out in the introductory module. All participants conduct a self-audit to establish where they are in terms of their knowledge, understanding and skills. The self-audit is analysed during discussions with senior leaders and CPD managers to ensure that programmes are meeting the needs identified by schools. The outcome of the audit informs individual participants' routes through the programme.

Teachers enrolling on the courses identified a number of concerns about studying at M-level including the timing and location of the provision, the pressure of home and school commitments and their own lack of confidence. Brighton has tried to address these concerns by:

- arranging for students to be supported in-school by CPD coordinators;
- providing a comprehensive virtual support system known as Studentcentral;
- creating action-learning sets, facilitated by tutors, in schools and clusters of schools;
- fitting the programme around teachers' needs by offering varying methods of delivery, in-school and University locations and flexible times for sessions;
- providing access to libraries including access to electronic journals and resources;
- providing financial support for teachers' fees; and
- enabling teachers to suspend or extend their period of study for up to four years to complete a PG Cert award, and up to six years to complete a full MA award.

Engagement in CPD

Brighton delivers programmes through weekly twilight sessions lasting for two hours. Depending on whether the module is a taught one or is school enquiry-based, these take place either at the University or in a local school. All modules are taught by University of Brighton tutors, with the exception of modules undertaken by the specialist autism and dyslexia students, for whom the modules are delivered jointly by a specialist teacher and a University tutor. Each programme lasts for ten weeks. Saturday morning sessions are also used, twice monthly, mainly for the Research Methods module. In addition, students are supported online through a virtual learning environment known as Studentcentral. Students have access to the evidence base through journal articles, access to the library and access to online journals, books and materials. They are supported in interrogating the evidence to develop their existing knowledge and skills and make links between the research and their current practice. For example, a geography module is taught in a large secondary school with students being supported by the school's CPD coordinator who encourages peer collaboration and uses the school's MOODLE intranet to communicate with students.

Learning activities students engage in include:

- working with tutors to identify learning goals and research questions which link to classroom practice;
- working with school CPD coordinators to identify the ways of linking their professional learning to school improvement plans and performance management targets; and
- collaborating with students from their own and other schools in action learning sets which offer students the opportunity to share their thinking and practice.

Support from tutors is typically provided through tutorials once every half-term, email and telephone. Embedding learning in schools is supported by CPD coordinators who review the teachers' action planning as recorded in their learning journals and portfolios. School CPD coordinators may also give students advice about academic writing, reinforce deadlines and generally keep students on track.

Assessment involves students writing assignments and reporting on school-based action research projects. This assessment is supplemented by evidence students build up in their reflective journals and learning portfolios.

The University has an extensive pool of associate tutors, many of whom have themselves completed MAs at Brighton, recruited from schools and LAs, which provides considerable scope for matching tutors to individual students.

Learning outcomes and impact

The PPD Steering Group is monitoring the impact of PPD programmes in a variety of ways, including:

- reviewing students' written assignments and research projects;
- evaluations by programme participants and tutors;
- feedback from head teachers and LAs;
- impact evaluations by CPD coordinators;
- monitoring attendance and completion rates;
- external examination reports; and
- internal University monitoring and evaluating procedures, such as the bi-annual review group meetings.

The partnership found evidence that their programme was linked to improvements for pupils including:

- a greater emphasis on personalised learning approaches;
- more effective responses to pupils with SEN;
- more creative learning activities; and
- improved achievement.

The partnership found evidence of a number of benefits for teachers including helping to:

- improve teachers' confidence;
- provide teachers with a better understanding of the links between their practice and policy;
- improve teachers' skills in analysing and interpreting data;
- foster collaboration and the development of shared professional learning skills and dialogue;
- increase their pedagogical understanding;
- increase teachers' skills of reflection;
- lead teachers to challenge assumptions about pupils' learning; and
- provide a start point for further professional thinking.

Summary of messages to TDA

The partnership identified a number of benefits arising from PPD supported by TDA funding, including:

- increased range of topics covered by the M-level programmes;
- flexibility in the structure of courses, the routes available to students and the types of assessment used; and
- increased opportunities to align students' learning with school improvement.

Representatives of the partnership also identified two important issues for the TDA:

- could the present funding model be matched by similar funding to the schools concerned in order to improve resources for innovation?; and
- could the funding be extended to others such as TAs who are also engaged in pupils' learning but who are ineligible for TDA funding as they are non-QTS? In this respect, the partnership believes that the evolution of the Every Child Matters agenda is widening the circle of professionals involved in education, which is being reflected in the range of people interested in PPD courses.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?

2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Brighton’s telephone interview responses

The 9 participants at the University of Brighton had a number of motivations for becoming involved in PPD including improving subject knowledge (4), career development (5) and improving practice (2).

When signing up for the course they hoped to further their personal/professional development (6), improve subject knowledge (5) and improve practice (7).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen

students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Brighton's telephone interview responses

8 out of the 9 participants received some kind of financial support: 5 were fully funded, 3 had some help with funds, 1 had supply cover and 1 had no support at all.

Support from schools included professional/moral support (3), providing a venue (1) and funding (6). 1 participant said that this was not applicable to them.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Brighton's telephone interview responses

Barriers that participants had to overcome to study at M level were time to attend sessions and to study (5), personal commitments (1), lack of funding (1) and travel (1). 1 participant said there were no barriers.

Suggestions were made for making the course more accessible for other teachers and for the participants themselves. These included: encouraging schools to support study leave (2), making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1), provide/improve online learning and distance learning opportunities (1), a clearer expectation of the course (1) and more providers closer to home (3). 2 participants didn't suggest any improvements.

There was a variety of features of the course that participants did not find enjoyable. These were: writing up assignments (2), unclear structure/expectations (1), poor admin (1), time (1), some of the lectures/guest speakers (3) and lack of relevance (1). 3 could think of nothing that they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Brighton's telephone interview responses

6 of the 9 participants said they had access to enough information about their course. 1 thought it was well advertised; 2 did not. Most found out about their course formally via the school of LA (6), 2 found out informally via a colleague in the school or LA and one had responded to an advert/flyer.

6 participants did not suggest any ways of improving the marketing of the course; 2 suggested direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools; and 1 suggested advertising to PGCE students at the end of the course.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry”.

The University of Brighton’s telephone interview responses

1 interviewee said that the tutors did not encourage them to work collaboratively with other teachers. 3 said the course included coaching. 1 said tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 7 said they did not; and 1 said this was not applicable to them. 6 said the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom; 1 said it did not; and one said this was not applicable to them. 5 participants made use of observation as part of the course; 3 did not; and this was not applicable to 1. 4 of the participants found that the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons; 3 did not; and this was not applicable to 2.

When discussing the structure and organisation of the course participants identified: venue – school (1), venue- university (3), venue – LA site (1), after school/evening (4), weekend meeting (2), whole day (3), specific hours/blocks (2), lectures (3), seminars (3), tutorials (2) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3). 4 gave positive feedback about the teaching including: the teaching to be at a good/excellent level (1) and finding the teaching to be helpful (3).

Most of the participants were assessed by written essays (7). Other forms of assessment included presentations (4), dissertation (3) and portfolios (4). 4 found them to be effective for their own professional development.

Support participants received for writing essays included: submitting drafts for review (1), feedback from tutor (3), module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (1) and managing

portfolios (2). 4 participants said the support was good while 4 said there was not enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only 1 student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional

knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Brighton's telephone interview responses

Out of the 9 interviews conducted, 5 of the participants said they had tried to involve other colleagues. 8 had said that the course had encouraged them to share what they had found out with others by: shared learning/research with colleagues (6), school colleagues also being on the course (2) and by implementing a policy or project at their school (2).

We asked what parts of the course they enjoyed the most and their responses included research (1), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (5), learning from experts (1), time to reflect (1), applying research/implementing change at school (1) and 1 participant said they enjoyed all of the course.

Taking part in the course had influenced 8 participants' practice by either making a difference for professional practice (4), improved teaching practice (4), implementing a policy or project at school (2), increasing confidence (1) or involvement in an event outside school (1). 2 felt it was too early to say.

7 participants had influenced their colleagues' learning by making a difference for professional practice (6), improved teaching practice (2) and implementing a project or policy (1). 2 felt it was too early to say.

2 participants had noticed a direct impact on their pupils; 1 had noticed an indirect impact; and 4 had not noticed an impact on their pupils. Those that had noticed an impact had seen improved learning (1) and more engagement (2). Those that had not noticed an impact felt it was too early to say (4).

The parts of the course participants enjoyed the most were the chance to reflect on practice (4), improved understanding/learning/confidence (8), updated professional knowledge (5), impact on children's learning (1) and the participant's own fulfilment (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and

- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Bristol

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February 2009, and interviews with the Course Director, Partnership Coordinator, Postgraduate Programmes Manager, Director of Administration, two tutors, two science faculty partners and a partner from the Science Learning Centre South West. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The University of Bristol is the lead member of a local PPD partnership which includes the Science Learning Centre South West, Bristol City local authority (LA) and partners in local schools. A unique feature of the partnership is that it also includes an internal partner, namely the science faculty at the university. The partnership is advised by the Programme Advisory Group which comprises representatives from students, schools and LAs.

The partnership continually updates the PPD programme it offers by collecting information from a range of sources including:

- feedback from past and present students and tutors;
- comments and observations by school personnel, including heads of science departments;
- feedback from Science Learning Centre South West;
- an annual review by the Programme Advisory Group; and
- meetings with LA staff.

Ten modules are available to students and participants can choose up to six to create a route to the MSc SURE (Science Understanding, Research and Education) qualification. Among the key areas of study are:

- science teaching, learning and assessment;
- current research in science or research methods in science education;
- developing and evaluating science teaching resources; and
- updating science knowledge through looking at contemporary science.

Core aims of the programme are the development of students' knowledge, particularly in science education, and their ability to apply it in the classroom. Specific modules such as 'Research in Science' and 'Science Update' directly address this aim. Opportunities to develop and trial science resources and techniques are integral to the course offered. Participants can engage in research in science in the Science Faculty's laboratories which are recognised to be of very high quality. Students are supported in applying this new learning in their own schools by staff of the Centre for Excellence in the Teaching and Learning of Chemistry, which has a full-time teacher in residence. Optional modules provide students with the opportunity to further develop the programme towards ethics, ICT or mentoring in science education. The course is taught by tutors from the Graduate School of Education and the Science Faculty. Students progress at their own pace, taking between one and three modules per year and overall three up to five years to complete the MSc.

Students can opt to leave the course with a Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma, depending on whether they have 60 or 120 credits.

Recruitment and participation

The number of students eligible for TDA funding registered on the MSc SURE programme in 2007-08 (its second year of running) was 19, slightly up on 14 in the first year 2006-07. These numbers are below capacity (although there are further home students who do not qualify for TDA funding as well as overseas students on the course) but the University is pursuing a vigorous marketing policy and hopes to improve the numbers over time.

The provision is marketed through:

- visits to schools and network meetings;
- word of mouth;
- mail shots;
- flyers and advertising cards;
- emails to schools;
- Science Learning Centre South West website and network;
- existing links between the University and the LA and science advisors who have good links with school science departments;
- existing networks between the University and schools, in particular schools involved in initial teacher education; and
- the University website.

The partnership is keen to ensure that they address the needs of students enrolling on the MSc SURE course. Tutors respond to the interests students identify in their applications. The partnership coordinator and other programme leaders act as a source of advice and support to students considering applying for the course. The Course Director and individual module tutors carry out needs analyses with students. For the 'Science Update' module, for example, students receive one-hour presentations on a range of current science issues, including genetics, climate and nanotechnology, before making a choice of interest area. They are then mentored by a specialist from that subject area. The partnership coordinator also meets with heads of science and other school leaders to ensure that the programme content is relevant to the needs of schools and to the individual students. The partnership believes working more closely with LAs will help it to identify an increased number of opportunities for PPD science courses.

Teachers enrolling on the courses expressed concerns mainly about timings of sessions, costs and location. The programme leaders have tried to address these concerns by offering flexible timings of sessions and subsidising costs to the extent of 50%. They are also exploring the possibility of using a range of locations for delivery across the south-west. In addition all students have a personal tutor with whom they have one-to-one tutorials.

Engagement in CPD

The course is delivered using a combination of approaches including personal tutorials, group and whole class teaching. There are also workshops and laboratory work. Students have access to the evidence base through journal articles provided to them by tutors, access to the library and access to online journals and materials. There is also the opportunity for wider net-working and sharing with other professionals through the Science Learning Centre South West web portal.

The programme is designed to be as flexible as possible in terms of timing. Sessions, which take place at the University, are run in the holidays, in the evenings (five per term) and at weekends. If there is sufficient demand a module can be run as an intensive 2.5 day course.

Students are supported to use new knowledge, to develop their existing knowledge and skills and to make links between the research and their current practice. Many sessions contain an element of student ownership with individuals making presentations which are then followed up by contributions from others.

Learning activities include:

- working with tutors to identify learning goals and research topics which link to issues of science learning in schools;
- discussing with tutors and school leaders ways to link their professional learning to school targets;
- group discussion about how to use research evidence in classroom teaching and learning; and
- sharing practice by reviewing data collected from action research and enquiry with other students and tutors.

Assessments differ from module to module but they are all centred on the classroom. They include students writing assignments and reporting on school-based enquiry or action research projects, and submitting planning for creating science resources. Some assignments assess science education resources created by students. In the case of science research modules, students are required to submit their research in the form of a fully-fledged science research report.

Learning outcomes and impact

The University monitors the impact of the SURE programme in a number of ways, including through analysis of:

- school-based data;
- students' written assignments and research projects;
- evaluations by programme participants and tutors, at the ends of modules and on exit from the course;

- feedback from other teachers, heads of department and the LA;
- presentations by students;
- monitoring attendance and completion rates; and
- external examiners comments.

This analysis is set alongside:

- an annual review by the Programme Advisory Group; and
- internal university scrutiny by the Faculty Quality Audit and Department Review teams.

The partnership recognises the difficulties of assessing the impact of PPD for teachers on their pupils but has evidence that pupils have benefited in a number of ways, including:

- experiencing new and up-to-date resources in their lessons;
- experiencing new practical techniques;
- engaging in different approaches to learning, such as independent learning; and
- being able to take an in-depth look at science topics such as nanotechnology, astrophysics and genetics, where research is moving quickly.

Most students saw the impact of PPD as firstly on themselves with impact on pupils further down the line. One teacher commented:

It has provided me with the confidence to research in my own institution and share best practice to enhance the experiences of our students.

Teachers reported a range of ways in which they felt they had benefited personally, including:

- improvements in subject knowledge, particularly in newer areas of science;
- better understanding of science teaching and learning, including assessment for learning;
- improved skills of reflection and collaboration;
- having opportunities to use coaching and mentoring in science; and
- improved career opportunities leading to promotion.

Some teachers commented on gaining experience in research techniques:

Use of action research has led to changes in how I assess students.

It has made me research more into any changes I make in my teaching before I undertake that change.

Summary of messages to TDA

The partnership finds TDA funding helpful in a number of ways, including:

- subsidising the costs of the course for students;
- supporting the employment of the Partnership Coordinator; and
- helping to meet the costs of local promotion and advertising.

In addition the partnership would also like to see development in a number of areas, including:

- a greater promotion of M level courses through the auspices of the TDA;
- extensive promotion of the choice of subject specific specialised programmes like SURE; and
- a closer alignment of practice based and perceived usefulness with accreditation.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Bristol’s telephone interview responses

Key motivating factors for the 9 participants on Bristol’s courses have been: improving subject knowledge (4), career development (2), improving practice (2), personal/professional development (6) and having funding (1).

What participants hoped to learn were personal/professional development (4), improved subject knowledge (5), career development (1), improved practice (6) and to become more reflective (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Bristol’s telephone interview responses

All 9 participants interviewed had received funding. 4 said fees were fully funded and 5 had some help with funds.

Forms of support given by the school included study leave/time (1), professional/moral support (5) and funding (7).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Bristol's telephone interview responses

All participants said that they had to overcome barriers to take part in PPD. Barriers were: time to attend sessions and to study (7), lack of funding (1), travel (4), timing of meetings (2), lack of/access to resources (2), timings of deadlines (1) and tutors often being away (1).

4 suggestions were made for improving the accessibility of Bristol's courses including encouraging schools to support study leave (1), making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1), provide/improve online and distance learning opportunities (1), allowing more time/arranging deadlines around holidays (1) and more funding/fund supply cover (1). 3 did not suggest any improvements.

2 participants said there was no part of the course that they did not enjoy, whilst the remaining participants did not enjoy writing up assignments (4), time required (3), some of the lectures/guest speakers (1), lack of relevance (1), poor teaching in parts (1) and part of the content (1).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. Thirteen percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Bristol's telephone interview responses

The vast majority of participants (7) said they had access to enough information about the course; 1 said they did not. 3 said the course was well advertised while 2 said it was not. They cited a range of ways in which they had found out about the course including: found out informally via a colleague in school or LA (2), choosing the programme from the website (2), already having links with the provider (1), responding to an advert/flyer (5), from a previous course (1) and a science festival (1).

There were a variety of specific suggestions participants made for improving the marketing of the course. Suggestions were: direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (4), visiting schools (1), using ex-students to promote the course (1), tasters in holidays (1) and targeting one day PPD courses (1). 3 participants made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation

- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were 'too dry.'

The University of Bristol's telephone interview responses

7 practitioners said that tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers. 6 said the course included coaching. 3 said tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations while this was not applicable to 1 practitioner. 8 said that the course built in opportunities to both experiment with new practice in the classroom and for planning and reviewing lessons while these were not applicable to 1 participant. 6 made use of observation as part of the course and this was not applicable to 1 practitioner.

The participants' responses regarding the organisation of the courses and the teaching at Bristol referred to: venue – university (9), after school/evening (9), specific hours/blocks (8), lectures (4), seminars (3), tutorials (3) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (2). 5 described the teaching itself as at a good/excellent level, 4 described the teaching as helpful, 1 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable, however 2 said some were better than others.

All 9 participants were assessed by written essays. Alternative forms of assessment included presentations (2), action research (5) and dissertation (4). 4 out of the 9 found this effective for their own professional development; 2 did not.

Support received for writing essays included submitting drafts for review (2) and feedback from the tutor (5). The support was referred to as good by 5 participants while 3 said there was not enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only 1 student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Bristol's telephone interview responses

7 participants had tried to involve other colleagues and 6 had been encouraged to share what they have learnt with others by shared learning/research with colleagues (3) and discussion online (1).

Parts of the course enjoyed by participants were: research (3), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (6), applying research/implementing change at school (2) and Science Update (3).

All participants stated that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. The ways participants felt their practice had been influenced were making a difference for professional practice (6), improved teaching practice (7) and becoming reflective (2).

8 of the participants felt they had influenced their colleagues' learning by: making a difference for professional practice (2), improved teaching practice (3), implementing a project or policy (2) and informally (2).

6 participants had noticed an impact of their pupils; 1 had noticed an indirect impact; and 2 had not noticed any impact. The impact noticed included: improved learning (2), more engagement (5) and where practitioners had implemented a project or policy (2).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and

- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for

learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report University of Derby

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 2009, and interviews with the programme leader, Head of MA Education programme, Head of Initial Teacher Education, three module leaders, PPD administrator and two representatives of the partner schools (Noel Baker School and Chilwell School).

Partnership

The University of Derby is the lead organisation in a partnership that work together to develop the range of PPD programmes on offer. The organisations involved include local authorities (LAs), particularly Derby LA and Derbyshire LA; subject associations like the National Association for Teachers of English (NATE) and the Association of Science Education (ASE); and five local schools. Partner organisations are constantly involved in planning, development and monitoring of the provision through attending the PPD Steering Group meetings, Programme committees and meetings with individual partners. The University of Derby has developed a number of models that support the engagement of its partners in the development of the PPD provision and ensure that the needs and priorities of each partner organisation and individual teachers within it are addressed.

Working with local authorities often involves providing academic support and opportunity for assessment and accreditation to the participants attending the training and development courses run by LAs. Partner schools can opt for either delivering the programme alongside the academic staff as associate tutors or having it delivered by the University lecturers at their school's venue. Some teachers and groups of teachers from the same school elect to attend the sessions at the University to benefit from networking with colleagues from other schools and sectors. Irrespective of who delivers the programme, or where it is delivered, the University of Derby works closely with its partner schools to link the students' learning and development to school's needs and priorities as they are identified, for example, in the school improvement plan. Recently, the University of Derby has been successful in developing new partnerships with subject associations. The provision developed in partnership with subject associations such as NATE and ASE is generally distance learning based. Another distinctive feature of the learning process is the requirement for participants to attend and run sessions at subject association conferences. The University also extensively involves subject specialists from respective associations in the delivery of the programme in order to bring high quality expertise and cutting edge knowledge to the MA provision.

The full MA in Education consists of four taught modules (30 credits each) plus an independent studies module (dissertation) which is worth 60 credits. Students may exit at Stage 1 with 60 credits and be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate, or at Stage 2 with 120 credits and be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma. In recent years the retention between stages has significantly improved and the majority of students enrol with the intention of engaging deeply in learning at Masters level and completing the full programme. After completing a Masters award students can choose to extend their learning by continuing onto a Doctoral programme.

When studying for the MA Education qualification, students are required to undertake the Evidence Based Practice (research methods) core module and can choose three other modules from a wide range available, for example:

- Advanced Professional Practice;
- Learning Theories in Action;
- SEN: Current issues and concerns;
- Essentials of Early Literacy;

- Principles of Management; and
- Monitoring, Assessing, Recording and Reporting Achievement, etc.

There are a number of specialist pathways within MA Education that allow participants to select their preferred modules from a set developed specifically for a particular award. Some of the specialist awards offered by the University of Derby are Curriculum Management, SEN, Early Years, ICT and Learning and Teaching, etc.

Participants usually undertake two modules per year and are encouraged to allow themselves time for their own research and reflection; they are not required to submit their assignments during the same term as attending the sessions.

Recruitment and participation

Over 200 students are currently enrolled on the programme. In recent years the University of Derby noted an increase in the numbers of NQTs and teachers in early stages of their career taking up the programme. The provider sees improved retention between stages and increased numbers of students gaining the full masters award as the main indicator of success of its PPD provision. The University works on further developing its virtual and online learning resources and programmes and establishing strong partnerships with subject associations as two possible ways of attracting new participants.

The provision is marketed through number of approaches, including:

- University website;
- existing networks, including schools, Las and East Midlands PPD consortium, etc.;
- traditional marketing materials and publications; and
- events, conferences and exhibitions, particularly those run by partner subject associations, etc.

The University of Derby recognises the importance of considering students' potential barriers to enrolling on and successfully completing a PPD programme. The partners have identified 4 types of potential barriers: financial, location, physical and educational. To address these barriers and make the PPD provision more accessible to teachers the University of Derby:

- passes most of the TDA PPD funding to the students;
- offers a choice of venues to participants (e.g. university campus, participants' own school or any other mutually convenient venue);
- gives participants an opportunity to select their preferred timing for the sessions which could be run as twilights or in the evenings, during holidays and weekends, etc.;
- offers a number of modules and awards online supported by e-mail and phone tuition; and
- uses a range of assignments and assessment techniques which are rooted in teachers' every day work and commitments at school.

Students discuss their needs before enrolling on a programme; these are annually reassessed and reviewed with course tutors and the Programme Leader. Participants are

encouraged to seek advice from their tutors as and when a problem arises to ensure any issues are tackled early and do not have any negative impact on their learning.

Engagement in CPD processes

The University of Derby prides itself in how flexible its PPD provision is in order to meet the needs and requirements of the students. A 'typical' delivery model entails three-hour sessions run for 8 weeks on the same evening of the week at the University campus. Some of the variations of this model include a mixture of evening and Saturday sessions, intensive courses during half term breaks, a whole day session run in agreement with a partner school or extension of the delivery period to e.g. 12 weeks. In one instance, a module was delivered in a school during a whole year to support the school in addressing its priorities and ensure the changes in school culture and staff development are established and sustainable.

Some of the teaching and learning strategies adopted by the provider include:

- lectures, seminars and tutorials;
- directed study tasks, including readings from journals, downloadable materials, etc.;
- action studies for the collection and analysis of data;
- preparation of learning resources; and
- presentations including the use of PowerPoint.

E-learning is viewed by the University of Derby as an important means of addressing teachers' needs and demands and making PPD provision even more flexible and accessible. Over recent years e-learning has been extensively developed; a number of modules are now available in online mode and one of the Masters pathways is offered entirely by e-learning. Around 30 participants are currently undertaking their courses via e-learning, distance learning and blended learning.

Module tutors contact the participants who opt for distance learning immediately after their enrolment to guide them through online study materials and assessment procedures. As with all Derby PPD provision, models are assessed through small scale research reports based on the students' practice. Participants are regularly contacted and supported and their progress monitored. They particularly appreciate, for example, an opportunity to discuss their draft assignments and get advice from their tutors before submission.

All students (face-to-face and e-learners) share virtual learning materials accessible to them on the Blackboard Platform. The University of Derby is constantly developing new and innovative ways of meeting the needs of its students and enhancing their learning through online resources such as:

- tutors' voice-overs and scripts added to e-learning materials;
- virtual classrooms;
- podcasts; and
- discussion forums.

Partners recognise the importance of collaboration and networking for teacher development. These are extensively encouraged by the University, which is reflected by the fact that some participants opt for campus based delivery model, despite there being Derby

PPD provision in their own school, in order to make the most of the networking opportunities that it provides. To further aid collaboration and networking between its students, particularly those studying by distance learning, the provider, for example, organised a voluntary support group, which does not necessarily involve tutors but gives participants a chance to exchange e-mails with each other and thus not feel isolated in their learning.

Specialist expertise is recognised as a valuable part of the provision; this is reflected through, for example, inviting guest speakers and practitioners who are recognised for their expertise in a particular area to co-deliver sessions. To support them to draw on the extensive evidence base in their study, the participants are provided with the access to the University library, online recourses and VLE.

Assessments for each module reflect the importance of work-based learning which is at the heart of the Derby PPD programme and are usually action research or case study based, focusing on participants' teaching practice and aiming at improvement of children and young people's learning and development. Apart from written assignments (research reports where they describe their development activity), methods of assessment include academic posters and presentations.

Learning outcomes and impact

The University of Derby collects a variety of data to analyse the impact and the effectiveness of the programme, including:

- feedback from participants (module evaluation questionnaires completed by all students at the end of each module, surveys and interviews);
- evidence from and analysis of assignments (research reports, action plans and evaluations, completed within a term of the end of each module);
- feedback from partners collected during stakeholders' meetings, e.g. Steering group and partnership meetings, and through surveys and questionnaires completed by school CPD leaders or senior management team;
- external Examiner's reports; and
- internal monitoring reports such as module reports and programme reports.

The partnership found evidence that the PPD programmes had an significant impact on students' knowledge and understanding, their individual performance and their motivation, commitment and self-confidence. Examples of impact in students' own words include the following:

My studies have brought about sound reflective practice that has enabled me to increase my knowledge and abilities. They have caused me to approach my work with renewed enthusiasm.

It has given me self esteem academically and professionally.

I'm a lot more confident with data analysis.

Students' action research projects focusing on, for example, using schools' assessment data to improve pupils' performance, using intervention strategies or creative approaches to teaching and learning, are indicative of the impact the PPD provision has had on their pupils. Specific examples of impact on pupils identified by the participants include enhanced

performance and achievement and dramatic improvement in engagement and interest in lessons.

The University of Derby works very closely with its partner schools; this often intensifies the effect of individual teachers' professional learning. For example, one of the partner schools highlighted that since the beginning of the PPD programme in school their pupils had achieved the highest results in all Key Stages in the history of the school. In a different school, a member of SLT highlighted that even though only some teachers were formally enrolled on the PPD programme; it positively affected all the staff and brought significant changes to whole school culture, making it a community of learners. The data collected by the University suggests that even though it is not possible to establish a single causal link between the PPD programme and the impact outlined above, there is a strong perception by the teachers and members of the school SLTs that PPD has been a major factor in it.

The PPD programme is subject to the usual University of Derby quality assurance procedures. Partners are also extensively involved in monitoring and evaluation of the quality of provision through surveys, questionnaires, interviews and impact evaluations. Furthermore, external examination is seen as an important instrument for evaluating the quality of the provision.

Summary of messages for TDA

The messages to the TDA included:

- PPD is a strong and successful model, providing a good balance between the practical and theoretical aspects of teachers' Masters level study;
- there should be more emphasis on creating a climate and culture that acknowledges the importance and value of Masters level work, including convincing established teachers and school senior management of the benefits of continued learning for teachers and their performance. Linking PPD to teachers' salaries and career perspectives could be helpful;
- there is a need to extend the notion of PPD beyond pedagogy into subject knowledge, allowing teachers to work on specific curriculum areas and for universities to offer PPD funded Masters programmes in subject areas. This could help improve recruitment and retention of teaching staff as well as fill in the gaps of knowledge and expertise in schools;
- the existing funding arrangements make PPD a possibility for a large number of teachers and schools. Should the funding decrease, PPD will become inaccessible to many of them; and
- the current (three year) funding model does not provide the participants with the certainty that the programme and funding will be there if they opt for extending their learning at Masters level over five or six years.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College

- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Derby's telephone interview responses

The motivation of the 9 participants interviewed from Derby included improving subject knowledge (2), career development (6), improving practice (1), personal/professional development (5) and having funding (4).

When asked what they hoped to learn, the majority of the participants said improving subject knowledge (6) and improving practice (7). Other responses included personal/professional development (4), career development (2), to become more reflective (1) and to develop student voice (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Derby's telephone interview responses

All of the participants interviewed received some financial assistance; 4 were fully funded and 4 were partly funded.

Support from schools included the following: 3 were given study leave/time, 3 were given professional/moral support, 6 received funding and 1 said they were given a venue.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)

- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Derby's telephone interview responses

2 out of the 9 participants interviewed said there were no barriers to overcome to take part in the PPD course. The 7 other participants said the barriers they had to overcome was time to attend sessions and study. 1 participant also said motivation was a barrier.

6 participants did not suggest any ways of improving the accessibility of the course. 1 suggested providing/improving online and distance learning opportunities and 1 suggested more providers closer to home.

8 participants identified an aspect of the course they did not enjoy. The responses were varied: writing up assignments (2), poor admin (2), time (1), some of the lectures/guest speakers (2), part of the content (1) and doing presentations (1).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Derby's telephone interview responses

8 of the 9 participants interviewed at Derby said that they had access to enough information about their course. 3 said it was well advertised while 2 said it was not. The participants had found out about the courses from a range of sources including: formally via school or LA (2), informally via a colleague in school or LA (1), chose the programme from the website (1), already had links with the provider (3), responded to an advert/flyer (1) and from a previous course (1).

There were a number of ideas suggested for improving the marketing of the courses including: direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (3), other media (TV, local press, professional publications and press) (1), emphasising the benefits of improved practice (1), emphasising funding (1), visiting schools (1) and using ex-students to promote the courses (3). 2 participants did not make suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry”.

The University of Derby’s telephone interview responses

6 participants said they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers. 3 said the course included coaching and 2 said tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations. 6 participants said the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms; this was not applicable to 1 person. 5 said they made use of observation as part of their course and 5 said their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

In terms of structure and organisation of the courses the responses referred to: venue – school (2), venue – university (6), after school/evening (8), specific hour/blocks (8), distance learning (1), VLE/E-learning (1), lectures (6), seminars (4), tutorials (7) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (7). When asked about the teaching itself the responses were: a good/excellent level of teaching (3), the teaching was helpful (3) and the lecturers/tutors were knowledgeable (2). 2 participants said that some were better than others.

Written essays were used as a form of assessment for all 9 participants on the M level course. Other forms of assessment included presentations (4) and dissertation (2). 5 participants found this form of assessment effective for their own professional learning; 1 said they did not.

The support received for writing essays included the opportunity to submit drafts for review (4), feedback from the tutor (5) and a module/seminar/booklet on essay writing (2). 8 of the 9 participants said the support was good.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)

- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Derby's telephone interview responses

Out of the 9 interviews conducted, 8 said they had involved other colleagues. 7 said they had been encouraged to share what they had found out: 1 participant achieved this by implementing a project/policy at school.

The parts of the course participants found most enjoyable were: research (3), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (2), learning from experts (2), particular lectures/content (2), writing academically (1) and independent study (1).

Taking part in the course had influenced all of the participants practice by: making a difference for professional practice (3), improving leadership (1), improving teaching practice (6), implementing a project or policy at the school (3) and helping them to become more reflective (1).

6 participants said they had influenced their colleagues learning; 2 said they had not. The impact on colleagues was mainly making a difference for professional practice (5) but participants had also noticed improved teaching practice (1) and had implemented a project or policy in school (1).

7 participants thought the course had had an impact on their pupils. Participants had noticed improved learning (3), more engagement (4), had implemented a project or policy (1) and improved exclusion figures (1). 1 felt that it was too early to say.

The participants said the main benefits of engaging in research were the chance to reflect on practice (5), improved understanding/learning/confidence (7) and updating professional knowledge (2).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and

- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning,

thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Exeter

The following report has been compiled from examination 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 information gathered by the researcher who visited the University in February 2009. Group and individual interviews were held with the Head of Taught Programmes (Wendy Robinson); Deputy Head of School (Keith Postlethwaite); the Programme Director for the Part Time

Masters in Education (Sue Chedzoy); the Partnerships Director; the Postgraduate Taught Programmes Manager; two programme tutors; two former students; and the Director of the Learning Institute, a training provider based in the South West which is one of the University's partners.

Partnership

PPD provision at the University of Exeter essentially takes three forms:

- Campus-based programmes which build on existing, well-managed partnerships with schools for initial teacher education;
- School-based provision where programmes have been developed and delivered in close partnership with schools. Corfe Hills School in Dorset was highlighted as a particularly successful example of this ; and
- Programmes delivered in partnership with other organisations and local authorities (notably the Learning Institute and Devon local authority) and validated by the University.

Provision is coordinated by the Postgraduate Taught Programmes Manager and overseen by the Head of Taught Programmes. From September 2008, Exeter has moved to a 'new model' of PPD provision which has a very flexible structure and is designed to run alongside the new Masters in Teaching and Learning. It is targeted at newly and recently qualified teachers. At the same time, existing students continue to study on the 'old model' which offered modules in areas such as Special Educational Needs; Leadership and Management; Mathematics Education; and Professional Studies. This report will outline both models of PPD, although the discussion of impact will necessarily focus on the old model.

In both models, students undertake a range of modules which focus on the study of their practice in the first year. They are able to exit at this point with a Postgraduate Certificate (60 credits) or with a Postgraduate Diploma after another year of study (120 credits). The new model focuses on Teaching and Learning: Theory and Practice. Although students can participate entirely online if they wish, the programme is centred around four days on campus. Day 1: Creating Learning Classrooms takes place in June for PGCE students and is repeated in October for other students. Day 2: Becoming Critical takes place in November. Day 3: Learning to Learn follows in February and Day 4: Communicating Research is held in May. Between these sessions, students are inducted into a critical reading network which offers a combination of peer and tutor support and undertake independent study. They are required to submit a portfolio of assignments in August.

The partnership with the Learning Institute offers an exclusively school-based continuum of PPD with enquiry placed at the centre. Working with the Learning Institute extended the University's reach into Cornwall, helping to overcome access barriers for potential students located there. The focus of the partnership was said to be on 'demystifying' research and exploring professional beliefs in collaboration with colleagues through a mixture of CPD processes, in-school coaching and external support. Exeter's role is primarily to validate and accredit this provision at PG Cert level, providing 'academic rigour' but also contributing to the development of resources. After this, students can progress further through Exeter's other modules on the part time M. Ed.

Recruitment and participation

On the old PPD model, Exeter and its partners had attempted to meet the recruitment challenge through building on their established 'captive audience' of NQTs. The new model,

on which there are currently 290 students enrolled, appears to be an extension of this approach, although the question was raised of how also to overcome the difficulty of attracting mid-career teachers into PPD. Students who had been involved in school-based provision at Corfe Hills emphasised the flexible and personalised nature of the programme which offered “complete autonomy over the content of what we studied”. They had also been attracted by the fact that the programme was part-funded by their school and offered a “proper qualification”, going so far as to describe it as a “perfect learning experience”. So far 12 students have completed the PG Cert at Corfe Hills, 8 have completed the PG Dip and a further 6 have completed the MA. One additional student has gone on to doctoral study at Exeter.

Areas selected for study at Exeter have included the following:

- an investigation and critical reflection on the conditions necessary for making effective starts to lessons in a secondary environment;
- can raising the status of the collaboration between the school-based Principal Subject Tutor and Mentor improve the quality of mentoring for the student teachers on the PGCE?;
- exploring ways to provide for the most able pupils;
- improving the variety of sentences used by Year 7 students;
- what strategies are most successful in ensuring continued participation; and commitment to the Virtual Mentoring process when working in an Educational Context?

Barriers to participation in the programme were said to include the following:

- perceived inflexibility of Masters level provision and distance from practice;
- timing of sessions; and
- teachers’ concerns about returning to academic study.

The new model of PPD refines Exeter’s approach to addressing and reducing these barriers through strategies such as increasing the flexibility of the content and structure of provision and assessment and offering bespoke programmes for schools.

Engagement in CPD processes

Like other providers, Exeter emphasised that the challenge in delivering effective PPD lay in supporting teachers to develop research-informed and theoretical perspectives on practice. Within the teaching and learning module, for example, students can select a focus for their problem based inquiry which is aligned to their own or their school’s development needs. As the content of programmes is increasingly negotiated, rather than prescribed, CPD processes had to be similarly flexible. Interviewees spoke of developing a “nurturing approach” aimed at changing practice and culture in schools.

The new PPD model is moving towards more flexible, portfolio-based assessment, with the critical reading networks offering students opportunities to evaluate each other’s work. It also builds on Exeter’s blended learning approach in which the virtual learning environment is intended to function as both a “repository for content” and a “space for conversation”. Ten tutors work with students on the new model.

Learning outcomes and impact

Exeter collects a range of data to analyse the impact and effectiveness of the programme, including:

- student questionnaires;
- evidence from formative and summative assessments;
- institutional review processes;
- feedback from student-staff liaison committees and programme meetings; and
- external examiners' reports.

The partnership found evidence of:

- increased confidence and critical reflection among teachers;
- more collaboration;
- more focused and pupil-centred teaching;
- greater engagement by pupils e.g. when involved in designing their own tasks;
- more empowered pupils; and
- new whole-school policies following students' research e.g. behaviour management strategy.

The external examiner's report from February 2009 indicated that the research undertaken by students on the PPD programme was coherent, worthwhile and methodologically strong.

One of the tutors involved on the old PPD model spoke of the evolution in students over three years of participation from developing a reflective, questioning approach to implementing action research principles and practice in the classroom. She described impact on students in a range of areas, including increased knowledge and academic confidence. Students' research had led to whole school change in a range of areas, such as school observation policy; student voice; and mentoring (through the close analysis of mentoring conversations in one case). Others spoke of school redesign through the introduction of a vertical tutoring system and a student contributing to SEAL training both in school and for the local authority. In general, improvements had been noted in teachers' self-motivation which had renewed their enthusiasm for teaching and was felt to have had knock-on effects on pupils through making them see the "importance of making kids feel they can achieve" or even involving them in the research process.

Summary of messages to TDA

- Interviewees emphasised the importance of providing PPD for experienced teachers, alongside CPD for NQTs via MTL. They have models for doing this but stressed that in the context of uncertainty about PPD funding it is difficult to raise the profile of PPD in schools and to get them to commit to working in partnership.
- They felt that it is important to negotiate the *content* of PPD with schools and students, while working towards clearly defined masters level outcomes.
- The process of supporting teacher learning is complex, as is the assessment of impact on pupils.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Exeter’s telephone interview responses

Interviews with 8 participants at Exeter produced a variety of motivations for studying at M level. These included: improving subject knowledge (1), career development (3), improving practice (2), personal/professional development (7), being funded (3) and the course having been recommended (1).

Through the M level course, participants hoped develop personally/professionally (4), improve subject knowledge (1), improve practice (5) and to research/implement change (3).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Exeter’s telephone interview responses

6 out of the 8 participants interviewed had received some funding; 3 were fully funded and 3 were partly funded. 1 said they had no financial support.

Support was given by schools in the form of study leave/time (3), professional/moral support (4), funding (3) and transport costs (1). 1 received no support from their school.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course

sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Exeter's telephone interview responses

The majority of participants identified barriers they had to overcome in order to participate in PPD (5). Practitioners identified time to attend sessions and study (3), personal commitments (2) and insufficient funding (2) as the main barriers they faced. 3 practitioners said they encountered no problems.

1 participant suggested making sure the venue was accessible/time flexible as a way of making the course more accessible. 4 did not suggest improvements.

4 of the participants said that there were no features of the course that they did not enjoy. Those who identified a feature of the course they did not like referred to: unclear structure (1), time (1), some of the lectures/guest speakers (1) and online exchange (1).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Exeter's telephone interview responses

The majority of the participants interviewed had access to enough information about their course (6) while 2 said they did not. 1 participant said that they thought the course was well advertised while 2 did not. Interviewees found out about their courses formally via school or LA (2), choosing from the website (3), responding to an advert/flyer (1) and from a previous course (3).

4 participants made the suggestion of direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools as a way of improving the marketing of the course. The 4 other participants made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The University of Exeter’s telephone interview responses

7 participants said that tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers and that the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom; 1 participant said it did not. 2 participants said their course involved coaching, 1 participant said their tutor modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations, 6 said the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons and all 8 said they made use of observation as part of the course.

The participants’ responses regarding the structure and organisation of the course were varied. Participants cited: venue – school (1), venue- university (3), after school/evening (2), weekend meeting (4), whole day (4), specific hours/blocks (1), VLE/e-learning (4), lectures (6), seminars (6), tutorials (4) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (2).

The responses regarding the teaching on the course were: a good/excellent level of teaching (6), the teaching was helpful (5) and the lecturers/tutors were knowledgeable (2).

The main form of assessment used on the PPD course at Exeter is written essays (6). The courses also make use of presentations (1), portfolios (2) and reviews (2). 5 found these methods useful for their own professional development while 2 said they did not. Support given specifically for writing assessments included submitting drafts for review (3), feedback from tutor (3) and a module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (1). 4 felt this support was good however 3 said there was not enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)

- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Exeter's telephone interview responses

Participants were asked questions about the impact of the course. 7 participants said they had tried to involve other colleagues. 5 had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others via shared learning/research with colleagues (4), implementing a policy/project at the school (1) and discussion online (1).

4 participants found all aspects of the course enjoyable while others gave specific aspects including research (1), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (2), time to reflect (1) and a particular tutor (1).

5 of the 8 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practice. The changes noticed were: made a difference for professional practice (2), improved teaching practice (3), participants had implemented a policy or project at school (3), become more reflective (1) and become more confident (1). 1 felt it was too early to say.

1 participant did not feel they had influenced their colleagues' learning; 6 felt they had. There were a number of ways participants said they had achieved this: making a difference for professional practice (3), through INSET (1), improved teaching practice (3), participants had implemented a project or policy (1) and informally (1). 1 participant thought it was too early to say.

With regard to impact on pupils' learning, 6 participants had noticed either: improved learning (3), more engagement (4) and impact through an implemented project or policy (1). 1 participant felt it was too early to say.

The majority of participants specified improved understanding/learning/confidence as a benefit of engaging with research (7). Chance to reflect on practice (4), updating professional knowledge (3) and thinking outside of the context of the school (1) were also identified as benefits of the PPD course.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;

- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students

sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development

Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Greenwich

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 2009, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, Head of department of Education Leadership and Development and a local authority (LA) partner. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The partnership consists of the following schools and local authorities in the South East: The Thomas Aveling School, Dartford Grammar, Leigh City Academy, Hugh Christie School, Essex LA, Greenwich LA, Bromley LA and Medway LA. Several of these partnerships are long standing and have been in place for up to the last 10 years. Each school or local authority in the partnership is an Outreach Centre for delivery of Masters programmes to cross phase groups.

The University of Greenwich post graduate professional development (PPD) programmes include an MA in Education and MSc in Education Management which take from two to five years to complete on a part-time basis. There is also an MA in Education for International Students which is full-time and takes one year to complete. The MA in Education is awarded following completion of 180 credits and consists of a 90 credit core comprising of Research Methods (30 credits) and the final Research Project (60 credits). There are a variety of courses for students to choose from, which are each worth 30 credits and are delivered over a 12 week period. There is flexibility to apply for a specific endorsement as long as the mandatory courses designated to that endorsement are completed and that any claim for Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) or Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) reflects the endorsement. Endorsements in MA in Education include SEN, ICT, Early Years, Post Compulsory Education and Training (PCET), Lifelong Learning and eLearning.

The MSc in Education Management is awarded following the completion of 180 credits and consists of the same mandatory core as the MA. In addition students must also complete the Strategic Management course, Leadership and Change in Education course and the Managing People course.

Although some teaching takes place at the University, the majority of the PPD is delivered in outreach centres. The delivery is by university tutors with occasional contributions from local authority partners. For example, Essex LA advisers have led taught sessions on monitoring pupils' performance and analysing pupil data as part of the 'School Effectiveness and Improvement' course.

The programme leader from the University of Greenwich works with their partners to tailor programmes to meet the needs of the students, schools and local authorities. The approach and capacity of Greenwich to respond to stakeholders' needs is highlighted in evaluations from partners and is viewed as a real strength. An example of this collaborative development is the Early Years Masters with Medway LA. In each outreach centre, whether it is a local authority or a specific school, there is a co-ordinator who links with the students and the university tutor. The co-ordinator is key in terms of identifying the needs of the students, schools and local authorities and negotiating the content and delivery of the programme. The co-ordinators also monitor students' progress and end-of-course evaluations. They examine the impact of provision on personal and professional development and the impact on practice and its contribution to school improvement. These findings are then fed back and reviewed with the Masters programme leader. This detailed information forms the basis of the internal programme committee meetings and the end of

year programme report to the Learning and Quality Committee (School of Education and Training) at the end of each year.

There is a strong emphasis on linking with European Networks in the PPD programme. The Programme leader is a British Council Consultant and this has led to an invitation to six secondary phase schools from the Dartford West cluster to become involved in a British Council Project: Challenges in Schools. Students have also attended European Conferences.

Upon completion of their Masters, students are encouraged to progress to a Doctorate in Education (EdD). On average, each year, 5 TDA students from the Masters programme choose to continue studying and undertake the EdD programme.

Recruitment and Participation

Greenwich recruits through links with local authorities, partnership stakeholders and through their ITT involvement. Several of the partnerships have been in place for up to ten years. Previous students and word of mouth have proved effective in recruitment to the Masters and Doctoral programme. Greenwich has developed M level provision for newly qualified teachers: MA in Education (Early Career Route) which was validated in September 2007. Training has taken place re: M 'levelness' to prepare Colchester SCITT and primary and secondary students and colleagues involved in the PGCE for M level course and for transition to the MA in Education (Early Career Route).

Greenwich also seeks to develop existing partnerships and enlist new partners by becoming involved in projects beyond the immediate provision of PPD programmes. The aim is to raise the profile of the School of Education and Training of the University of Greenwich to recruit more staff to PPD programmes. An example of such a project is Leigh City Academy where the PPD team are investigating a year-long project focusing on how to teach effectively in very large teaching spaces. Teachers involved in this project could use their involvement in the project to contribute to APEL and progress onto a Masters award.

Barriers to participation have been identified as funding, time, lack of confidence and concern over lack of support by their school. However, teachers are motivated to take part as they recognise the value of a Masters, both as a qualification and for continuation onto a Doctorate, and in contributing to their career development and progression. Greenwich is particularly committed to overcoming barriers and the timing of sessions is tailored to each cohort. Sessions take place after school, usually 4.30-6.30pm in the outreach centre, on alternate weeks. Doctoral students attend fortnightly sessions from 5.00 to 8.00 in addition to two weekend sessions each year. Schools and local authorities fund half the Masters programmes for teachers. Accreditation agreements are in place with local authorities to allow teachers to import Prior Learning and Prior Experiential Learning, including the Leadership and Management programmes provided by the NCSL. The programme leader and tutors aim to develop students' confidence through ongoing tutorial support covering topics such as writing for academic purposes, using online journals and databases, and academic time management. Tutors are responsive to individual needs and provide individual tutorials when required.

Measures to overcome barriers are obviously effective as evidenced in the increasing numbers of students on the programmes (200 on the Masters and 50 on the EdD) and 90% retention and completion rate. Non-completion has usually involved a student moving away from the area but taking their Masters credits with them to another provider.

Engagement in CPD Processes

Both the Masters and Doctorate are underpinned by the models of the 'Teacher as a Reflective Practitioner' and the 'Teacher as a Researcher'. Implicit in both these are technical and process skills which are taught at induction and modelled throughout the provision. There is a strong emphasis by the programme leader on ethics in research and students are expected to address this issue explicitly in their assignments and research projects. Library and study skills sessions provide additional support in developing writing skills. Drafts are commented on by tutors prior to submission for marking. All assignments are then second marked by university tutors.

Increasingly within the Masters, and mandatory within the taught Doctorate, teachers are encouraged to disseminate their findings both internally within their school and externally to wider audiences through publication. Collaborative funding has enabled the annual publication of the Journal of Partnership and Professional Development (ISSN 1751-8237) through which students on PPD programmes disseminate their research.

Cohorts at outreach centres develop strong group identities through the regular fortnightly interactive meetings led by university tutors. Peers support each other through collaboration on homework assignments, through study-buddy relationships and through forums (students have set up three this year). Peers share resources and tutors tailor resources to specific group and individual needs as required. Headteachers have provided additional support and encouragement to teachers in their schools. There is support for students through the university VLE in terms of online course information, materials and reference lists.

Learning Outcomes and Impact

The partnership monitors impact on personal and professional practice using a variety of sources, including:

- end of course meetings with students, co-ordinator and link tutor;
- electronic questionnaires;
- focus group interviews;
- 1:1 interviews with students;
- consultation with heads;
- PPD needs questionnaire;
- representation at annual partnership meetings; and
- scrutiny of final research projects and sample of assignments carried out by students.

Evaluation of provision is supported externally by university mechanisms that serve to assure the quality of provision. These include scrutiny at course and programme level and include external examiners reports and formal review of the Masters and Doctorate level award provision every three years. This is part of the 'Learning and Quality' process with a panel consisting of external HEI representatives, the School of Education and Training Quality officer, members of staff and a partner.

There is an expectation to relate theory to school-based practice in researching 'real' issues emerging from the schools' self-evaluation form or inspection reports where recommendations are made for improved practice. Students on the Masters programme reported personal impact in the following areas:

- increased personal and professional confidence;
- increased engagement in critical evaluation;
- use of electronic databases to search for research based evidence;
- proactive contribution to school;
- changes in jobs or responsibility;
- a more interconnected and strategic understanding of the school; and
- reappraisal of career development and increased self confidence leading to seeking out and achieving middle and senior management promotion.

In terms of impact on pupils, students have articulated a common theme: that through their own increased learning and understanding they have been able to improve the quality of learning experiences for the pupils themselves. Masters students describe how process skills and research skills they learn are brought to the curriculum and pedagogy of the classroom, so that pupils carry through these same processes to research topics such as homework, being healthy and issues such as bullying, so fostering the concept of the 'pupil as a researcher and a creator of knowledge'. Students have recognised that these skills and experiences make an important contribution to 'student voice'. One teacher commented:

I have been able to take children I've worked with into new areas of learning. Created a number of different opportunities for children proving to fellow professionals and adults that children are able to take responsibility and be trusted to conduct their roles efficiently and professionally.

Messages to TDA

The programme leader commented that the TDA need to consider what happens to PPD programmes in the light of MTL. She is also concerned that the M 'levelness' of the MLT will be compromised if there is to be no dissertation; and, whether funding will be available to support teachers engaged in Doctoral study.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire

- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Greenwich's telephone interview responses

The majority of the 8 participants from the University of Greenwich said that their motivation to take part in M level study was personal/professional development (7). Other responses included improving leadership skills (2), career development (3), improving practice (1) and the course being at their own school (1).

The key element participants were interested in learning was personal/professional development (7). Other qualities included: improving subject knowledge (1), improving

leadership skills (2), career development (3), improving practice (2) and to become more reflective (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Greenwich’s telephone interview responses

4 of the 8 participants interviewed from the University of Greenwich received some financial assistance: 1 said fees were fully funded and 3 said fees were partly funded. 4 were self funded.

Schools supported participants’ involvement in PPD through providing study leave/time (2), professional/moral support (4), a venue (1) and funding (3). 2 of the participants received no other practical support and 1 said this was not applicable to them.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Greenwich's telephone interview responses

All 8 of the participants interviewed had to overcome barriers to participate in M level study. Barriers included: time to attend sessions and study (4), personal commitments (2), insufficient funding (2), level of challenge offered by the course (1) and poor admin (1).

Some participants made suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course including: encouraging schools to support study leave (1), making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1), providing/improving online and distance learning opportunities (1) and more funding/fund supply cover (1). 3 students suggested improving the library services such as better access, better resources, library cards and a library induction. 4 interviewees made no suggestions.

6 practitioners said there were aspects of the course they did not enjoy. Aspects identified were writing up assignments (1), unclear structure/expectations (1), time (1), part of the content (2) and timings of the lectures (1). 2 participants said there was nothing they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of

the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Greenwich's telephone interview responses

7 of the 8 participants had access to enough information about their course however 2 said it was not well advertised. Most of the students found out about the course informally via a colleague in school or LA (4); others found out about the course formally via school or LA (2) or responded to an advert/flyer (2).

Participants were asked to make suggestions to improve the marketing of the course. 3 suggested direct advertising to CPS coordinators in schools, 1 suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the internet), 1 said by emphasising funding and 1 said by using ex-students to promote the course. 2 made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The University of Greenwich’s telephone interview responses

We asked the participants questions about the CPD processes associated with the courses. 7 participants said that tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers and 2 said the course involved coaching. 1 said the tutor modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 4 said the tutor did not; and 3 said this did not apply to them. 7 participants said the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom; 1 said this did not apply to them. 5 said they made use of observation as part of the course; 2 did not; and 1 said this did not apply to them. 3 said the course did not build in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons while this was not applicable to 5 participants.

In terms of the structure and organisation on the courses, the responses referred to: venue – school (2), venue- university (3), after school/evening (3), weekend meeting (1), whole day (1), specific hours/blocks (4), lectures (1), seminars (3), tutorials (6) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (4).

Most of the participants gave positive feedback about the teaching itself describing it as a good/excellent level of teaching (7), the teaching helpful (6) and the lecturers/tutors knowledgeable (1). 1 participant said it could be better.

Written essays were used as a form of assessment for all of the participants (8) with other forms of assessment including presentations (4), dissertation (1) and portfolio (4). 6 participants said these were effective for their own professional development.

All 8 participants had feedback from the tutor to support them with writing assessments; 3 were able to submit drafts for review; 6 said they had good support; while 1 said there was not enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Greenwich's telephone interview responses

Of the 8 participants interviewed, 7 had both tried to involve other colleagues and were encouraged to share what they had learnt with others by either shared learning/research with colleagues (6) and school colleagues also being on the course (3).

Aspects of the course participants had enjoyed the most were: research (1), time to reflect (1), applying research/implementing change at school (1), independent study (1), a particular tutor (4) and 1 participant enjoyed all parts of the course.

All 8 participants said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice in some way and all 8 said that this had made a difference to their professional practice. Participants also noted improved leadership (1), improved teaching practice (3), a change in role/promotion (1) and increased confidence (3).

All participants also felt they had influenced their colleagues' learning by either making a difference to professional practice (6) or informally (2).

4 participants had noticed an impact of the course on their pupils; 3 had not; and 1 had noticed an indirect impact. Those who had noticed an impact had observed improved learning (2) and more engagement (4).

Participants discussed the benefits of engaging with research and the main benefits identified were the chance to reflect on practice (4), improved understanding/learning/confidence (6) and updating professional knowledge (4).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;

- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Hertfordshire

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 principal research manager who visited the site during February 2009, and had interviews with: the Partnership Manager, programme tutors, a representative from Brent Local Authority (LA), and students. In addition the partnership provided video recordings of interviews with participants and CPD leaders as they reflected on a module to develop skills in mathematics teaching among primary teachers. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

While the initial partnership included the University of Hertfordshire School of Education, the London Boroughs of Barnet, Brent, and Harrow, as well as Luton LA and Hertfordshire Children, Schools and Families services, some LAs, such as Brent and Hertfordshire have a more active role than others. In addition the partnership is seeing increasingly active participation by individual schools.

The University of Hertfordshire leads the programme and collaborates with schools and local authorities to develop programmes that are responsive to local needs as well as national policy developments. Along with ongoing informal communication between members of the partnership, the School of Education also holds Professional Advisory Group meetings at which partners can discuss issues such as the introduction and development of courses and how they align with school and LA priorities.

Schools are playing an increasing role in the design and implementation of programmes. One way this is facilitated is through the network of current and former students on the School of Education's programmes who progress to a leading CPD role in their school. Programme design is also informed by student feedback in the form of impact audits at the end of each module, along with inspection. For example, in response to inspectors' suggestion that students see evidence of high standards achieved by deaf children, the pathway leader engaged Oxfordshire hearing impaired support service to run a session on this for students on the programme.

Uniquely, University staff are also able to draw on their role as commissioning partner for Teachers TV, evaluating new resources for CPD leaders, to inform course design and practice.

The partnership has structured its offer into five pathways:

- Education
- Leading Learning
- Early Years
- Professional Learning
- Education of Deaf Children

Students can work towards Certificate (60 credits), Postgraduate Diploma (120 credits), or an MA Education (180 credits). Students working towards accreditation are required to complete core modules specific to their pathway (e.g. *Developing Young Children as Creative Learners* for Early Years), and may also choose from other modules. Each module carries 30 credits and is assessed through course work. Modules are also designed to align with the GTC's TLA framework, enabling the opportunity for teachers to seek accreditation by that route. Students attending individual modules for specific CPD purposes, spoke of the masters level accreditation either as 'an added bonus', or as an important way for teachers to have their CPD recognised. One student also felt that the flexibility of the offer catered for a range of demands, from dipping into particular CPD to taking a full 2-year 'hard core' MA.

The University's approach to assessment design is varied and innovative. In particular students on the *Developing Young Children as Creative Learners* module are required to complete a creativity journal in which they can develop their ideas and reflect on their professional learning using images and metaphor.

Underlying the design of the partnership's programmes is that each one supports students' understanding of the principles underlying teaching and learning practice, encourages learner voice, and supports the development of learning communities.

A focus group discussion during the site visit highlighted the potential of the programme to grow CPD leadership. A student who had formerly attended an LA led module was now designing and delivering modules within her school. The discussion also illustrated the ability of schools to draw on the partnership's support to tailor programmes specific to their development needs, thereby complementing modules comprising the structured University offer with flexible, ad hoc modules. School CPD leaders also spoke of the value of collaborating with the University on CPD programmes, particularly in terms of the University providing a benchmark of quality in CPD provision by which they could calibrate their own practice.

The partnership believes that the bursaries to cover course fees that it is able to offer as a result of participating in PPD means that more people attend than would otherwise be the case, especially in a climate where in a lot of cases schools and LAs have ceased to fund study at this level.

Recruitment and participation

The partnership has established several routes for encouraging practitioners to engage on PPD programmes. It does this via:

- recruitment from undergraduate and PGCE programmes;
- the provision of specialist postgraduate programmes for students from different professional contexts (Deaf Education and Early Years); and
- marketing PPD provision during seminars and the annual Education, Policy and CPD conference which are open to all teachers, and which have included high profile, external speakers.

A recent innovation to raise awareness of CPD provision is the video recording of participants discussing their CPD and its impact. The University has uploaded these video case studies onto YouTube to be accessed by current students, stakeholders and other

institutions. The facility also allows for comments on the content of the videos, creating the potential for discussion forums.

On basis of two years' evidence, registration on the programme appears to be stable, from 201 students in 2006/07 to 207 students in 2007/08. The student cohort is made up predominantly by females (the male:female ratio in 2007/08 was approximately 85:15). The University believes this is mainly due to the fact that recruitment is significantly greater in the early years and primary sectors.

Time was mentioned by several students and members of staff as a big barrier to overcome in terms of participation. Module delivery has been designed to address this issue, and takes place both on the University campus and in schools. Mentoring modules, for example, are often delivered in schools, while the Education of Deaf Children programme includes eight weeks of teaching experience for each student in two locations. Where delivery takes place at the University, programmes offer flexible options for attendance including weekends and evenings, and are sometimes taught as a block, such as a 10-day mathematics teaching course for primary teachers.

Engagement in CPD processes

Evidence collected during the visit indicated a range of activities that students engage in to develop their learning and practice. Students spoke of the collaboration which takes place as they introduce new practice, and that this is a particular feature of in-school modules. One pair who were working on their teaching of mathematics tried out a part of a lesson in a staff meeting to stimulate discussion on the approach, so they could draw on the skills of staff who they felt to be more experienced. The research project, which took place across two schools, was used to draw up a school policy for teaching calculation.

In addition to encouraging collaboration between students as a regular approach to CPD, the partnership also has a formal mentoring and coaching module which introduces students to the principles and practice of coaching and mentoring. The course builds on what mentors know and can do already and through an investigation of research evidence helps them reflect on their developing practice, with a particular focus on how their learning links with broader improvements within their school.

The University also develops resources in a variety of media to frame student learning and provide models of practice. As the higher education commissioning partner for Teachers TV, the University is well-positioned to broker access to good quality resources for its students, as well as to showcase its own work. This provides its students with the opportunity to disseminate the outcomes of their own learning to a wider audience.

A further resource is a series of posters which illustrate the learning cycle, i.e. a systematic process by which teachers can develop their practice through observation of children's learning and adaptation. The posters provide examples of approaches to data collection, interpretation, planning and practice and reveal a sophisticated understanding of the importance of linking professional learning to pupil learning.

There is an emphasis on practitioner enquiry in each module, where students are required to engage in gathering evidence of the impact of their learning and to reflect on this in their assignments. The partnership places a particular emphasis on students sharing their learning with each other and developing their thinking through dissemination in various formats, including presentations, video, writing and other artefacts.

Learning outcomes and impact

Teacher evidence provided by the University (video and written feedback) reflected students' appreciation that the course had helped them to become more confident practitioners. One student who wanted to move from teaching Reception age children, to teaching at KS2, commented:

My subject knowledge having taught reception for seven years was lacking and so I felt if I'm going to be that age group of children I need to know the staff and I seem to be doing all right ... staff in my school view me now almost as an expert teacher.

Students also felt that the course had enabled them to develop skills in adapting resources and approaches to teaching so that they benefited pupils in their context. In several instances they felt the course had introduced them to and helped them develop creativity and engaging activities for their teaching and learning.

There were also several instances of participation on the modules being in preparation for or leading to promotion or moves into specialist roles, such as CPD leader or subject co-ordinator. A common theme referred to by the students was the fact that attending the modules had opened their minds to different approaches and had increased their appetite for continued professional learning. One LA adviser spoke of teachers who had participated on the programme learning to look at their practice within the context of whole school development and being able to appreciate the wider picture.

Teachers and LA advisers referred to the impact of the mathematics programme on pupils. In their experience teachers who had participated in the module had developed skills in collecting pupil evidence, including inviting feedback on teaching sessions (pupil perception surveys), and collecting photographic evidence. They had found examples of pupils:

- taking on a teaching role;
- communicating their ideas more confidently;
- finding lessons more enjoyable; and
- having a more positive attitude to mathematics.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire

- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Hertfordshire's telephone interview responses

A range of motivations were identified by the 9 interviewees for becoming involved in PPD. Participants said that their motivation was wanting to: improve subject knowledge (4), improved leadership skills (1), further their career development (4), improve practice (5) and further their personal professional development (4).

When asked what they hoped to learn specifically, responses were: personal professional development (4) improving subject knowledge (8), improving leadership skills (1), career development (1), improving practice (6) and research/implement change (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Hertfordshire’s telephone interview responses

7 of the 9 participants at the University of Hertfordshire received some financial assistance: 5 had their fees fully funded and 2 had their fees partly funded, including supply cover (1). 2 received no support with funds.

Schools supported the participants by providing study leave/time (5), professional/moral support (5) and funding (4). 1 participant said that they did not receive any practical support from their school.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Hertfordshire's telephone interview responses

When asked what barriers they had to overcome in order to take part in PPD, 5 participants said they faced a range of barriers including: time to attend sessions and study (2), personal commitments (1), lack of funding (1), level of challenge offered by the course (1), travel (1) timing of meetings (1) and lack of confidence (1). 4 participants experienced no barriers.

2 participants suggested making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible to improve the accessibility of the courses. 6 participants did not make suggestions.

The least popular aspect of the course was part of the content (4), while other parts of the course participants didn't enjoy were writing up assignments (1), unclear structure/expectations (1) and poor admin (1). 3 participants said there was nothing they didn't enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to

colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Hertfordshire's telephone interview responses

All participants interviewed said they had access to enough information about their course and 4 said it was well advertised. Interviewees found out about their course formally via school or LA (2), informally via a colleague in school or LA (1), chose the programme from the website (2), responded to an advert/flyer (1) and from a previous course (3).

5 of the participants made suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course. 4 suggested direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools, 1 suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and press) and 1 suggested targeting particular teachers.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The University of Hertfordshire’s telephone interview responses

8 of the 9 participants said: tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers, the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom and the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons. 6 participants said the course included coaching. 4 said the tutor modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations. 7 said they made use of observation as part of their course.

In terms of the structure and organisation of the courses, the responses referred to: venue-university (9), after school/evening (6), weekend meeting (4), whole day (6), specific hours/blocks (8), VLE/e-learning (2), lectures (4), seminars (2), tutorials (3) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3). 6 said the teaching itself was at a good/excellent level, 6 said it was helpful and 5 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable. 3 participants said some were better than others.

All participants were assessed in the form of essays (9) and most were assessed by presentations (7). 5 were assessed through journals, 3 through posters, 2 through creating a DVD and 1 through action research. 8 found the methods of assessment effective for their own professional development.

8 of the 9 participants said they received good support with writing essays: 5 were able to submit drafts for review, 6 had feedback from their tutor and 3 had a module/seminar/booklet on writing skills.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)

- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Hertfordshire's telephone interview responses

5 participants had tried to involve other colleagues and all 9 participants had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others. This had largely been achieved via shared learning/research with colleagues (9), but also by school colleagues being on the course (1), implementing a policy/project at school (1) and involvement in an event outside school (1).

We asked what parts of the course participants enjoyed the most. Responses were: research (1), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (5), particular lectures/content (3) and 3 participants had enjoyed all parts of the course.

All 9 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practice. They said it had: made a difference for professional practice (6), improved their teaching practice (7), helped them implement a policy or project at school (2), helped them become more reflective (2) and more confident (1).

All 9 participants said they had also influenced their colleagues learning. They said they had: made a difference for professional practice (6), influenced learning through INSET (3) and improved teaching practice (6).

8 participants had noticed an impact of the course on their pupils'. They had noticed improved learning (6) and more engagement (6).

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by interviewees were: the chance to reflect on practice (4) improved understanding/learning/confidence (9), and updating professional knowledge (4).

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by the participants were: chance to reflect on practice (1), improved understanding/learning/confidence (4), updating professional knowledge (1) and the specific benefits to their school (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;

- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Liverpool Hope 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 chief executive and a research manager who visited the site during February 2009, and had interviews with the Partnership Manager, Professor of Education Faculty and programme tutors. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

Liverpool Hope University has links with local authorities including Sefton LA (Postgraduate Cert for Leading CPD), Knowsley LA (MA Practitioner Inquiry modules), Halton LA (new Postgraduate Certificate for e-learning and VLEs) and Liverpool LA (Postgraduate Cert for Leading CPD and Learning Networks Initiative). Liverpool Hope links with other universities such as Liverpool John Moores University (JMU) and Liverpool University. Collaboration is particularly strong with JMU involving planning complementary and harmonised provision with Liverpool LA and in the region generally. Liverpool Hope has partnership links with Networked Learning Communities (MADCOS and JANUS in Sefton LEA, accredited teacher research and Practitioner Inquiry and Research) and Teacher Learning Academy (GTCE).

Liverpool Hope University has to be responsive to individual school needs, for example it needs and worked closely with the headteacher at Wade Deacon High School to deliver a specially adapted module in the school. This has strengthened the partnership with the school, which is a Teacher Learning Centre. The school is keen to explore the opportunity to write and deliver a Masters in Leadership and also for the opportunity for staff to undertake PhDs through the university.

The MA Education course has recruited 45 British teachers in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) through three partners: British School Al Khubarait, Nord Anglia and Star Education. The students are a mix of aspiring leaders from the primary and secondary phase, teachers as well as advisors, including six former Liverpool Hope University students.

Liverpool Hope offers a MA in Education consisting of 4 taught modules each with a value of 30 credits and a 15,000-20,000 word dissertation of 60 credits. Dissertation involves 2 compulsory sections 'Impact on Practice' and 'Recommendations for Improvement'. The initial two modules, Practitioner Inquiry and Research 1 and 2, are compulsory and are taught by the Programme Manager. Modules are delivered in pairs to make use of the same literature base. Students usually complete the course on a part-time basis over two to three years. Students completing the MA Education (UAE) complete the same Practitioner Inquiry Research modules 1 and 2; Coaching, Co-Coaching in Education modules 1 and 2; as well as a dissertation. The students on this course experience a mix of face-to-face teaching, use of VLE and paper-based materials.

Funding is used in a variety of ways such as employing a MA administrator, payment of a virtual learning environment (VLE) manager to create intranet access to materials and resources, visits to schools and other institutions to liaise with staff on accreditation of professional courses and to discuss potential partnership activities.

Liverpool Hope involves its partners in the planning and development of its programme. The NW HE forum, which is also attended by headteachers, allows the opportunity for partners

to express their views to Liverpool Hope. The University presently draws upon the views, experience and expertise of this forum with whom future partnerships and collaborative ventures are being planned and delivered. Two local authority advisors specifically act as critical friends for the programme. Students provide feedback about the range of modules and make suggestions for course organisers to consider.

Recruitment and participation

Liverpool Hope University recruits students through links with local authorities, partnership stakeholders and through their ITT links. They currently have 149 students enrolled on PPD courses. A 20% reduction in fees is offered to former university students to encourage recruitment. Local Authority members invite Liverpool Hope to attend meetings in teachers' centres to promote the MA. The university offers to teach the programme in school if six or more teachers sign up. If there are less than six teachers, they apply directly as individuals. M level modules have been introduced into the PGCE programme and a 30 credit module 'Critical evaluation of the NQT year' is offered to students to create a post graduate certificate. This can be added to their MA portfolio.

Occasionally, recruitment activities involve the partnership, for example a recent event was held at Everton Football Club, where universities promoted postgraduate professional development to a wider range of schools. Some schools have groups of teachers enrolled onto the MA. These schools are highly regarded and influence others in the area, so word of mouth is another recruitment method.

Liverpool Hope accredits both Leading from the Middle and NPQH and has 'open' modules such as 'Evaluation of CPD' which are already validated to enable accreditation of prior learning (APL) or accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL).

A postgraduate certificate in CPD targets CPD co-ordinators. This jointly accredited programme with the University of Liverpool focuses on improving school-based CPD. In particular, the strategy is to increase capacity and improve understanding of how coaching, peer review and critical friendship can be developed in schools, LEAs and in the region. Liverpool Hope is keen to develop collaborative professional learning communities. Each CPD co-ordinator is a member of an email conversation group to which a member of the programme delivery team has been allocated.

The MA Education (UAE) students are taught two modules in each academic year. This is delivered on Fridays and Saturdays with tutorials taking place on Sundays. A recent announcement by the Abu Dhabi Education Council that teachers in all school in the Emirate should be actively engaged in school-based research offers Liverpool Hope University considerable opportunities to further target this group and expand the PPD programme.

Engagement in CPD processes

Liverpool Hope staff are aware of barriers facing teachers, such as transport, timing, location and access. They are also aware of the potential barrier of teacher perceptions of CPD, i.e. seeing it in a traditional way consisting only of workshops and courses. To overcome these barriers modules are delivered in schools or professional development centres, where possible, and usually consist of six evening sessions running from 6-8.30pm and a Saturday. Modules are delivered by university tutors. Electronic access to research and literature and school-based action research helps to address teachers' perceptions of traditional delivery of CPD. The VLE (Moodle) provides distance support and includes access to materials used in taught modules, reading materials, some podcasts and forums. Tasks are set between

sessions, for example, students are initially given a Journal relevant to their interests to critique. This activity is diagnostic as well as developmental.

There are high retention and completion rates which are attributed to emphasis on relationship building within the programme. Students start out with a sense of the programme as a social context. For example, there are picnic lunches, social events and sharing of resources. Previous students are invited to talk to new students to share their research and experience of the programme. As the programme leader teaches the two introductory modules and the preparation for dissertation module, she gets to know the students very well. Considerable effort is made to match students to tutors who can support them and provide highly individualised tutorials. The programme manager draws widely on expertise within the university to match tutors to the research interests of students.

Students are supported in developing their research skills and are provided with reading materials for the taught elements. As the modules are paired, for example, Language Acquisition 1 and 2, students build their knowledge through the same literature base. University staffs feel that this benefits students as they learn to engage with the evidence and scrutinise it at a deeper level.

Students are encouraged to disseminate their research and this is facilitated early in the programme through the sharing of their research with colleagues on the course and in their schools. This helps build their confidence in their research and presentation skills. In addition, students present their dissertation proposals to university staff and are encouraged to consider the complexity of their research topic and are supported with suggestions of how to do this. This is highlighted as a strength of the programme by external examiners, who comment that 'students are not afraid to tackle difficult issues of concern in school'. A writing frame is provided for their dissertations and compulsory taught preparation sessions are also delivered to students. They disseminate their final research through seminars and a summary paper to managers of their schools and research community. Some present their research at local authority level.

University staff are keen to support teachers to explore possibilities and opportunities such as practitioner and action research, coaching, peer mentoring, joint planning and peer observation and review. Peer support is more easily facilitated where groups of teachers from the same school are studying together. These groups of teachers establish a collaborative 'tone' and model the approach in the joint sessions.

Learning outcomes and impact

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

- interviews with students;
- course evaluation forms from students;
- analysis of assignments and dissertation titles and contents;
- external examiners comments; and
- discussions with stakeholders.

Tutors who teach MA Education modules, in the postgraduate provision, consider pupils' learning as a high priority. Pupil learning experiences have been addressed through the development of teachers' learning in subject-focused modules and in research modules and

projects. The main objective is the improvement of pupils' performance through the embedded improvement of teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice. The following aspects are undertaken in modules and research projects:

- planning pupil learning;
- reviewing and evaluating participants' professional learning as a result of investigations undertaken;
- focusing on the SEN of children;
- using and interrogating performance data from schools and national agencies;
- using and critiquing government strategies and data; and
- searching out literature and research about the improvement of pupil learning and the impact of teaching to support enquiry.

Some recent dissertations involved using the '*pupils' voice*' as a means of collecting data. Teachers made comments such as:

the children have gained in two ways: by improving their learning and by taking part in the research

children have been given a voice to express what bothers them

Teachers gain confidence through interaction with scholarly activity and are given the research skills and techniques to support changes to their work practice through academic research. Students on the course discuss their progress and through evaluation at every stage of the course, it is apparent, that embarking on MA Education increases reflection and improves knowledge and understanding of theories in their chosen area. They are more likely to offer opinions in the staff room based on their research findings and to suggest ways to develop children's learning.

One teacher commented:

I am proud of my achievements, and the move into research in HE, and have decided to continue with academic pursuits

Summary of messages to TDA

Liverpool Hope University has already considered MTL in aspects of their programme so that M level is maintained but staff are concerned about the timelines.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter

- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about "becoming more critical" and "engaging in discussion with other professionals."

Liverpool Hope University's telephone interview responses

The majority of the 8 participants interviewed from Liverpool Hope University told us their motivation to study at M level was career development (7) or personal professional

development (6). Other motivating factors included improving subject knowledge (1), improving leadership skills (1) and improving practice (3).

When asked what they hoped to learn, participants' responses were: personal/professional development (2), improving subject knowledge (2), improving practice (2), becoming more reflective (1) and to carry out research/implement change (4).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Liverpool Hope University's telephone interview responses

5 participants had financial support. 1 participant's fees were fully funded and 4 participants received some financial support. 3 had no support at all.

Schools supports the participants in the following ways: study leave/time (1), professional/moral support (2) and funding (2). 3 said they receive no other practical support at all and 2 said this was not applicable to them.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)

- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Liverpool Hope University's telephone interview responses

The majority of participants said they had to overcome barriers in order to participate in PPD (6). Practitioners identified time to attend sessions and study (5), personal commitments (2), insufficient funding (1) and lack of/access to resources (1). 2 participants said they encountered no problems.

3 suggestions were made to improve the accessibility of the courses. These included: encouraging schools to support study leave (1), improving the library service (1) and more funding/fund supply cover (1).

Aspects of the course participants said they enjoyed the least were: writing up assignments (2), time (2), some of the lectures/guest speakers (2), lack of relevance (1) and parts of the content (3). 3 participants said there was nothing they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through

CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Liverpool Hope University's telephone interview responses

The vast majority of participants had access to enough information about their course (7). 4 said it was well advertised whilst 2 said it was not. The participants found out about their courses from a range of sources including, informally via a colleague in school or LA (1), chose the programme from the website (2), responded to an advert/flyer (3) and from a previous course (4).

Interviewees made suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses. These included: direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (4), advertising to PGCE students at the end of their course (2), school visits (1) and using ex-students to promote the course (1). 2 participants did not suggest any improvements.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

Liverpool Hope University’s telephone interview responses

7 participants said tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers. 1 participant said the course included coaching. 2 said that tutors modelled new skills and practice in real classroom situations and they made use of observation as part of the course. 6 said the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom and 3 said the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

In terms of the structure and organisation of the courses, the responses referred to: venue-university (8), after school/evening (7), weekend meeting (2), whole day (1), specific hours/blocks (8), VLE/e-learning (1), lectures (2), seminars (1), tutorials (1) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (4). 6 said the teaching itself was at a good/excellent level, 3 said it was helpful and 4 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable.

All 8 participants were assessed by written essays. Other forms of assessment used on the M level courses were: presentations (2), action research (4) and dissertation (4). The majority found this effective for their own professional development (7).

All 8 participants said that the support they received with writing essays was good. The type of support received included submitting drafts for review (2), feedback from the tutor (4) and a module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (2).

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Liverpool Hope University's telephone interview responses

5 of the 8 participants said that they had tried to involve other colleagues. 7 said that they had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others by means of shared learning/research with colleagues (6), implementing a policy/project at the school (1) and being involved in an event outside the school (1).

When asked what aspects of the course that participants enjoyed the most, responses included: research (3), group work/sharing ideas with colleagues (4) and a particular tutor (2). 2 participants had enjoyed the entire course.

When asked if taking part in the course had influenced their practice 7 participants said that it had. The specific reasons they gave were: made a difference for professional practice (5), improved teaching practice (2) and increased confidence (1).

3 participants had influenced their colleagues' learning by making a difference for professional practice (1) and improved teaching practice (2). 3 participants said they had not influenced their colleagues learning and 1 said it was too early to say.

5 participants noticed an impact of the course on their pupils' learning. The impact on the pupils included improved learning (3) and increased engagement (3). 2 participants said it was too early to say.

The main benefits of engaging with research were identified as: the chance to reflect on practice (1), improved understanding/learning/confidence (7), updating professional knowledge (2) and impact on children's learning (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning,

thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU)

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 2009, and interviews with: the Partnership Manager, programme tutors and local

authority (LA) partners. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

MMU is the lead organisation in a large partnership in the north-west. It works with approximately 1000 partnership schools established for Initial Teacher Training (ITT) and Continuing Professional Development (CPD). It also works with the Science Education Centre Northwest and the Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning in partnership with a wide range of Local Authorities (LA) and other organisations. The partnership consists of 12 local education authorities including Bolton, Bury, Cheshire, Cumbria, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Stoke On Trent, Tameside and Trafford. The partnership also includes a range of organisations such as The Centre for Educational Leadership (regional NCSL centre), Teacher Learning Academy, National Autistic Society and Boys and Girls Welfare Society, National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth, British Dyslexia Association and Waterloo Lodge Group of Schools. In addition a growing number of schools are becoming involved as school-based centres of delivery.

MMU describe their programme as a Professional Development Programme which offers post graduate certificates, postgraduate diplomas, an MSc in Education Leadership and Management, an MA in Urban Education and an MA in Education. The structure of the programme is very flexible and comprises courses provided centrally and in local schools and LAs. There is a wide range of modules which are taught at MMU sites at Crewe or Didsbury. Each module of study is worth 20 units. 3 units lead to a postgraduate certificate. 6 units lead to a postgraduate diploma. Completion of a dissertation leads to a Masters. There are two mandatory modules: Practitioner research and Professional Development.

In addition to their main post-graduate programmes, MMU work in partnership with a variety of organisations to offer bespoke modules and accreditation at M level. An example of this is a cluster of 16 secondary school teachers who worked with MMU to tailor a module focusing on developing maths pedagogy. Another example is the partnership between MMU and the Bridge School which is a fully inclusive specialist school. Twenty teachers at the Bridge are now engaged at M level. The course is delivered at the school which in turn is becoming a base for partnership with other schools in the area. MMU are also currently working with a 6th form college to explore accreditation for the mentoring work they provide for NQTs so they can offer this across their LA. There are a growing number of schools that work in partnership with MMU, offering school-based delivery of modules. The school-based delivery of modules for the MSc in Education Leadership and Management is either co-delivered with MMU tutors or delivered by school staff who have been accredited to deliver. In all cases there is extensive guidance from MMU to local providers in order to establish that the quality of the courses is appropriate for M level.

MMU has also collaborated with a number of regional local authorities to co-author, deliver and accredit courses on behaviour, special educational needs and creativity. The modules are designed with LA partners to respond to needs and to complement the day courses already provided by advisers in local authorities, to provide an academic dimension and university accreditation to LA provision and to strengthen partnerships. MMU has also worked closely with a special school to offer an MA in Special Educational Needs which has involved staff from another special school and secondary school and is seen as having an impact in the community.

TDA PPD funding enables MMU to offer its course without charging fees and to offer a Postgraduate Certificate free to NQTs.

In addition to the joint development of modules and co-delivery with partners, MMU seek views of stakeholders through informal and formal means. Teachers, schools, LAs and other stakeholders are involved in planning and developing the programme in a number of ways including twice yearly Stakeholder meetings, termly board meetings, and a Secondary Partnership Steering Group which is chaired by headteachers. A recent request from headteachers at the partnership board meeting for greater access to senior researchers has led to an increase in events to engage schools in research. A secondary schools partnership conference offered the opportunity for both researchers and schools to present research. MMU issue an annual PDP Needs Questionnaire to over 400 schools in their ITT partnerships which has led to the development of existing units and the establishment of new units such as citizenship and creativity.

Recruitment and Participation

In response to feedback from schools, MMU have adapted their promotional literature and its timing to facilitate schools' CPD planning. MMU recruit through links with local authorities, partnership stakeholders and through their ITT links. MMU increased the visibility of PPD for PGCE students whose motivation to complete PGCE assignments to a master accreditation standard has been enhanced by the prospect of continued 'joined-up' study during their NQT year. During 2008 over 400 students were recruited from the ITT cohorts. There are 1000 students studying with MMU 2008-2009. MMU encourage participation from the wider school workforce. There are business managers completing the MA in Urban Education. There are examples of support staff, subject leaders and governors taking part in school-based study. Middle managers are the target audience for one partner local authority collaborating with MMU in delivery of the Postgraduate Certificate in Education Leadership and Management. This course already has a waiting list for next year. The MA in Education is particularly flexible and has a wide choice of units with practical relevance to teachers. There are also a wide range of subject specific units appealing to secondary teachers. MMU aim to be responsive to student needs and will facilitate transfer from one Masters programme to another where possible. There is also the option of a group consultancy project to be undertaken by a group of teachers in one school addressing an area of school improvement. This is considered as a double unit.

The Institute of Education became a faculty in its own right at MMU last year. Staff are keen for all ITT courses and CPD to be intrinsically linked and for links to be maintained in a multi-professional manner between departments such as Youth and Community, Early Years and departments outside the faculty such as Social Work and Psychology. This strategy and the provision of a full-time member of staff to manage the partnership mean MMU are confident about continuing to increase their recruitment to their PDP programme.

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 a 'constant state' of professional development. This is apparent in the distinction tutors make about pedagogy not just being research informed but being research-led. Tutors model this by demonstrating how they too are learning alongside their students.

Evaluation has highlighted that attendance on campus presented barriers to participation for some schools and teachers. MMU have responded through the provision of more 'outreach'

and LA-based provision and more units of study which involve online and blended learning. Opportunities to undertake independent study have also been enhanced.

Students are encouraged to support each other in study and MMU facilitates this through tutorials, peer collaboration, and weekend events such as workshops and conferences. These weekend events have allowed students from different years of study to share research and experiences. There are termly course group meetings. Strength of relationships vary in cohorts depending on the balance of individual and group choice of study. There is a diverse range of units available which is a positive in meeting students' needs but tends to be a barrier in developing relationships. There is a strong group identity evident in school-based programmes. Teachers offer mutual support through shared reading, discussions and peer collaboration.

Coaching and mentoring support offered by MMU to students is in the early days of development. MMU recognise the need to quality assure this area of support offered to students in schools. Web support in terms of forums is also under development. However, there is support for students through the university web in terms of course information, materials and reference lists being available. There is considerable support with writing through library and study skills sessions. Drafts of assignments are reviewed.

Learning Outcomes and Impact

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

- interviews with students;
- course evaluation forms from students;
- consultation with heads, deputy heads;
- PDP needs questionnaire;
- discussions with school leaders at formal meetings such as secondary partnership meeting;
- analysis of assignments and dissertation titles and contents; and
- discussions with PDP stakeholders.

Students report a range of positive impacts both direct and indirect on pupils' performance. Students model learning as a lifelong development to pupils. They are encouraged to disseminate their research to other staff so skills and knowledge benefit the whole school. Students report gains in understanding, knowledge, in use of research and confidence in discussing issues in school. Students completing SEN units are able to recognise dyslexia early and provide more appropriate assessment and support earlier to pupils. They also report being more effective in multidisciplinary teams in the meeting of needs of pupils with communication difficulties. Teachers said, for example:

When discussing SEN issues in school, I feel confident to discuss practices I have studied on this course.

When working with SEN issues in school, I feel more able to anticipate obstacles and provide solutions.

I am more confident in addressing students' issues in my classroom due to having a greater understanding of their needs.

MMU have a variety of quality assurance processes which ensure a high standard of delivery. University based tutors cross-moderate across programme areas and share staff development days. There is a process of close collaboration with documentation including templates to support the writing of new units with partners. Partners who seek accreditation to deliver units are given a rigorous induction process whereby any adaptation of materials is written with MMU staff, a period of co-delivery takes place and assignments are all second marked by MMU staff.

Messages to TDA

- The TDA need to recognise how late MTL is coming on stream.
- There should have been more effort to build on existing practitioner-led research at Masters level.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)

6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

Manchester Metropolitan University’s telephone interview responses

Key motivating factors for the 6 interviewees on Manchester Metropolitan University’s courses were: career development (2), personal/professional development (4) and having funding (4).

The participants gave a number of suggestions when asked what they hoped to learn through the PPD course including: personal professional development (1) improving subject knowledge (3), improving leadership skills (1), career development (1), improving practice (3) and carrying out research/implementing change (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Manchester Metropolitan University's telephone interview responses

All practitioners at Manchester Metropolitan University received help with funding. 3 were fully funded and 3 had some help with funds.

Schools offered practitioners support in the following ways: providing a venue (1), professional/moral support (3) and funding (1). 1 said this was not applicable to them and 1 said that they received no support from their school at all.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Manchester Metropolitan University's telephone interview responses

All participants had to overcome barriers in order to take part in PPD. The barriers participants faced included: time to attend sessions and study (3), level of challenge offered by the course (1), travel (1) and dyslexia (1).

Suggestions for making the course more accessible for other teachers were making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (2) and improving library services (1). 3 participants could not provide any suggestions.

All participants identified an area of the course that they did not enjoy: writing up assignments (2), unclear structure/expectations (1), poor admin (1), time (1), background reading (1) and the long waiting time for marks (4).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Manchester Metropolitan University's telephone interview responses

3 said they thought the course was well advertised; 3 did not. 4 said they had access to enough information about their course; 2 said they did not. Interviewees found out about their course formally via school or LA (2), informally via a colleague in school or LA (1), chose the programme from the website (2) and from a previous course (1).

3 participants suggested that the course could be better marketed by direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (3), school visits (1) and targeting particular teachers (1).

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review

- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

Manchester Metropolitan University’s telephone interview responses

Participants were asked about the CPD processes associated with their courses. 3 of the 6 participants said: the course included coaching, the tutor modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations, the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom and they made use of observation as part of their course. All participants were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and 4 participants said the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons.

The participants’ responses regarding the organisation and structure of the courses referred to: venue – school (2), venue- university (4), after school/evening (6), weekend meeting (2), residential (1), specific hours/blocks (4), lectures (3), seminars (1), tutorials (1) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3). Some participants said that there was a good/excellent level of teaching (3) and some said the lecturers/tutors were knowledgeable (2).

The forms of assessment used on the courses at MMU were written essays (5) and presentations (1).

The support received for writing essays was submitting drafts for review (1), feedback from the tutor (1) and a module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (3). 2 participants said the support was good, while 3 participants said the feedback was slow.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)

- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Manchester Metropolitan University's telephone interview responses

4 participants had tried to involve other colleagues and had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others by either shared learning/research with colleagues (3), school colleagues being on the course (1) and involvement in an event outside school (1).

Group work and sharing ideas with other colleagues was the most popular part of the course for all interviewees. 1 interviewee also enjoyed a particular tutor and 2 enjoyed a field trip.

3 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practices. Participants said it had: made a difference for professional practice (1), improved teaching practice (3) and they had implemented a policy or project at school (1). 3 felt it was too early to say.

2 participants felt they had influenced their colleagues' learning; 1 felt they had not. Of those that did, they had: made a difference for professional practice (1) and improved teaching practice (1). 3 participants felt it was too early to say.

With regard to impact on pupils' learning, 3 participants had noticed either: improved learning (2) or more engagement (3). 3 participants felt it was too early to say.

Nearly all of the participants specified improved understanding/learning/confidence as a benefit of engaging with research (7). The chance to reflect on practice (4), updating professional knowledge (3) and thinking outside of the context of the school (1) were also identified as benefits of the PPD course.

Interviewees identified the main benefits of engaging with research as: chance to reflect on practice (2) improved understanding/learning/confidence (4), and updating professional knowledge (2).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;

- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of Portsmouth School of Education and Continuing Studies

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February 2009, and interviews with the Head of School, Course Leader, unit leader for teaching English as an additional language (and HCC partner), a tutor (who has also conducted some market research with schools) and a secondary school assistant head teacher/CPD coordinator from Portsmouth. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The School of Education and Continuing Studies (SECS) at Portsmouth University works with Hampshire County Council Ethnic Minority Achievement service, Portsmouth City Council School Improvement and Ethnic Minority Achievement Services and with individual schools predominantly from Portsmouth and Hampshire authorities. The School of Education and Continuing Studies is also an active member of the Southern Partnership for Professional Development (SPPD) involving all higher education institutions and local authorities across Hampshire, Sussex and the Isle of Wight.

The SECS leads the PPD programme. Partners plan and develop specific units that are eligible for the award of Postgraduate Certificate (PgCert equivalent to 60 credits at M level) within the SECS Masters degree programme. Each PgCert comprises two units each of 30 credits: one specialist and the other reflective practice. The specialist unit combines practical application in the classroom with appropriate theoretical background. Specialist units are available in teaching English as an Additional Language (EAL), working with autism and climate for learning. The proposed units in mathematics, inclusive practice and modern foreign languages (MFL) units have not run due to lack of support from PCC and lack of recruitment respectively. The reflective practice unit is an independent enquiry focused on the potential for subject enhancement. Tutorial support is provided by tutors spanning a range of appropriate methodologies, including school visits and observations, one-to-one mentoring and group based support.

Teachers gain a PgCert (the minimum qualification) by successfully completing one specialist unit plus the reflective practice units (usually within a calendar year). They can then choose to continue their studies to obtain a Postgraduate Diploma (PgDip – 120 credits at M level) or a full Masters degree (180 credits). The Postgraduate Diploma requires the successful completion of a further subject-based unit chosen from a number of options and a compulsory research methods unit (30 credits each). To proceed to the full masters' degree, teachers need to complete a dissertation (60 credits). Teachers normally complete a part-time Masters degree within two calendar years, but it is possible to apply for an extension. Teachers can also apply for academic credit in respect of previous learning equivalent to Masters level.

All stakeholders are involved in programme development via reviews and evaluations that form part of the normal quality assurance procedures of the university. Teachers formally evaluate each unit and are represented on School Committees and the Board of Studies. Regular meetings are held for each of the key areas (EAL, autism and climate for learning) to develop and review provision, each consisting of representative groups (such as heads of departments, ASTs and advisers). Feedback is also elicited from stakeholders via

questionnaires and discussions with departments during school visits, direct contact with teachers through assessment, tutorials and written evaluations, continuing liaison with local authorities, headteachers, heads of department and teachers, discussion in curriculum enhancement groups attended by course tutors and discussion within the SPPD. Part of the partnership funding was used to appoint a researcher whose role is to coordinate and report on the various sources of feedback and evaluation of the provision.

SECS have invested a lot of time and effort to get this PPD provision off the ground, developing units and establishing contact with schools, especially since the SECS did not previously have a long history of M level delivery for schools staff.

Portsmouth helped run a very successful SPPD conference which used previous M level students to talk about their experience of PPD and this has enhanced the partnership.

The partnership is viewed as working well by university staff and partners interviewed. The SECS has brought in individuals and specialists as and when needed. The HCC EAL tutor interviewed was extremely positive about the partnership model; specialist EAL staff deliver the learning while the SECS take care of systems and quality assurance. The manager of the Hampshire County Council Ethnic Minority Achievement Service has invested a lot of staff time in the partnership as she sees the PPD provision as a successful method of delivering to teachers across the region.

There are signs of growing partnership with individual local schools. As an example the assistant head teacher interviewed explained that her school is already in discussion with SCES about PPD support for her staff next year.

Recruitment and participation

The PPD provision started later than hoped in the first year due to changes in units. Numbers have grown steadily though they remain relatively low (27 enrolled on M level study during the third year of PPD provision) and SECS has a challenge to establish PPD as something teachers choose to do.

SECS recruited the recently retired head of Education Psychology from Portsmouth City Council for 30 days, to visit schools and discuss what type of PPD provision would be popular. This research established that finance is not a major issue for schools, rather the provision of the most appropriate modules and the willingness of teachers to commit the time to PPD. Despite leaflets being sent to all local schools the research demonstrated a general lack of awareness of PPD provision at the university and therefore a need for alternative marketing. Direct marketing to teachers is one strategy under consideration as CPD coordinators receive so much varying marketing material. SECS could market provision directly at NQT induction days.

Selecting the right modules to suit schools has been a challenge as schools have varying priorities which themselves can change quite rapidly. The QA processes within HE preclude accredited short courses being developed as quickly as some schools would like, though the development of the 'climate for learning' module came out of this market research phase and there are 6 participants on its first run, demonstrating that PPD can respond quickly if there is a common local need.

A strategy worth pursuing would be a review of school development plans to pick out common areas of development needed so that additional units could be designed in time to be delivered as and when local schools require them.

SECS uses a number of formal and informal mechanisms for gathering and evaluating information concerning barriers to participation. Principally, these have involved discussions with schools, participants and providers. Feedback from teachers and schools confirm that the main barriers are: provision of cover during the school day, feeling guilty at being away from classes, sessions running late in the evening, time to disseminate at school, access to resources and provision located some distance away from school or home.

In terms of motivation to participate, the assistant head teacher indicated that of 6 teachers undertaking PPD, 4 were middle managers wanting to enhance their CVs and 2 were NQTs. Of these 6, only 1 was proposing to complete the Masters. The school would be happy to continue funding teachers on PPD if their focus fits with the school development plan.

To address these barriers, SECS' taught sessions generally start during mid-afternoon (3.30 pm) and run to early evening. This minimises cover required in school, yet allows teachers to travel home in good time. As a contrast the English as an Additional Language unit draws on teachers from a large catchment area and has chosen to run three full taught days delivered in different locations. Taught sessions generally take place in a local school or at the Hampshire EMAS base. The three years of the EAL unit have attracted 11, 7 and 16 teachers respectively and most of these come from EMAS staff promoting the course during school visits or targeting schools with recently increased numbers of pupils with EAL. One interviewee recommended PPD provision concentrates teaching time more during the summer term, when schools are quieter and teacher workload is reduced.

As a larger number of teachers (up to 27 in a cohort) attend the reflective practice unit, the unit is offered only at the University of Portsmouth over fixed 3 hour afternoon sessions. An e-learning environment has been set up to give teachers ready access to educational tools to facilitate learning, communication and collaboration.

It is recommended that wherever possible visits are made to head teachers prior to their staff beginning PPD, to clarify expectations and more particularly to try to ensure that head teacher support and buy in is confirmed at an early stage.

Engagement in CPD processes

Each PgCert has both taught sessions and a tutor-supported personal investigation. This helps teachers consider the relationship between theory and practice and develop techniques of research and critical evaluation in order to develop practice. Experienced practitioners (e.g. from the Ethnic Minority Achievement service) plan and deliver the subject-based units. They focus on identified areas of weakness in practice and pedagogy and take account of current policy and guidance.

The EAL course provides the theoretical underpinning for bilingualism and factors that contribute to raising achievement, including alignment with national strategies. There is a mix of experiential learning, presentation and peer coaching and after each day there is a voluntary homework task, in the form of 'Frequently Asked Questions', for teachers to answer in preparation for queries back in school. A pre-course self assessment questionnaire helps students to identify an area of development which is covered in the 2500 word assignment.

There are 20-25 taught hours on each unit. Students are required to maintain a journal, illustrative examples and reflections. Tutorials serve to develop the journal and essays. The form of tutorials varies, including for example an in-school visit to a student to assist in reflection on practice, or more focussed assistance with action research and assignment writing. There is a good deal of email contact between tutors and students.

In the reflective practice unit, teachers undertake an investigation into a specific area of their own practice (a 'critical incident analysis') informed by research and theory. Students are encouraged to drill down into their response, consult colleagues and reflect on and question their practice. In the process, they develop a strategy and action plan that aims to improve pupil understanding and achievement.

Within their investigations and research, teachers are expected to draw upon and engage with a number of processes and methods. These have included: reviewing schemes of work that ensure progression; production of teaching and learning inclusion resource packs with opportunities for differentiation; group work and self supported study; and dissemination of good practice within school and local authorities' Children's Services. Teachers also have the opportunity to record and share good practice with colleagues by making their documents available on the university's e-learning environment.

Learning outcomes and impact

Evidence about impact is gathered from discussions with teachers, teachers' assignments, journals, and unit evaluations. These have revealed evidence of wide ranging impact on teachers' professional learning, in particular including:

- changes in knowledge base;
- implementing new practice (e.g. new assessment tools for EAL learners);
- improved capacity to reflect on practice, ability to change minds and attitudes within the workplace following discussion and research about particular issues (e.g. withdrawal);
- increased confidence from wider reading about a subject (the ability to draw on research to back up a point of view and therefore convince others with a reasoned and research-based rationale). There are several examples of teachers having confidence to go into school and argue for a change in policy/practice;
- increased ability to recognise personal strengths and opportunities to drive change in the workplace;
- ability to disseminate to colleagues; and
- the opportunity to learn from others and share practice and concerns.

A key feature of the PPD is influencing the practice of others 'back in school' and this is written into the learning outcomes. The first cohort who did the EAL unit were partly responsible for the publication of a book on isolated bilingual learners, called '*Counting Them In*'. The book used several extracts from the journals of the teachers who participated on the PPD.

The assistant headteacher interviewed who had herself completed the Masters at Portsmouth, said: "It's completely changed the way I teach – completely turned around thoughts and practices – especially the 'climate for learning' module."

Evidence about impact on pupil learning is gathered from teachers' journals and course evaluations. Areas of impact include greater collaboration between pupils, improvements in pupil confidence and self-esteem, improved motivation, raised achievement, and more inclusive learning environments. One of the learning outcomes requires each student to demonstrate having moved a pupil issue forward during the PPD. The marking scheme for the journals also looks specifically for impact on pupils.

University quality assurance procedures are the principal means of assuring the quality of the PPD provision. Other sources drawn upon include: monitoring and evaluations at LA level, school and department self-review and evaluation, tutor evaluations, curriculum and steering group meetings, evaluations completed by teachers, head teachers and heads of department. There is also an external specialist examiner for the whole programme. The external examiner reports on academic achievements and the quality of the course. Other sources drawn upon include school Ofsted reports, schools improvement plans and teachers' reflective journals.

It was acknowledged during interviews that re-visits to schools some time after completion of PPD would be a useful way of identifying impact if resources could be found, for example to interview the headteachers to reflect on school wide impact.

Summary of messages to TDA

The University of Portsmouth SECS reported being highly committed to PPD for teachers and believes its approach is now working well and paying dividends. The SECS is extremely keen for future funding to be made available to continue the partnership and local needs-led approach to PPD.

More than one interviewee stressed the importance of providing access to PPD for staff without QTS. Several unqualified staff have wanted to enrol, some of whom were put off by the full fee which they had to find.

There was support for increased investment in e-learning, especially as Portsmouth is providing some units which are not being run in other areas (e.g. EAL and climate for learning) and in order to support teachers in more rural and remote areas.

The partnership approach to PPD was supported as being the best way to ensure quality and breadth of provision.

The school represented at site visit interviews was very keen to be made aware of future offers of PPD support from the TDA, especially as they are looking toward achieving gold IIP status and specialist hub status for training.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton

- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

The 3 interviewees reported a range of motivations for participation in PPD. These included: improving subject knowledge (1), career development (1), improving practice (2) and personal/professional development (2).

Interviewees hoped to learn: improved subject knowledge (2), improved practice (1) and how to research/implement change (4).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

2 participants' fees were fully funded; 1 participant received no support with fees.

Support received from participants' schools was study leave/time (1) and funding (2). 1 participant said they had received no support from their school.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

The barriers participants had to overcome to take part in their courses were time to attend sessions and study (1), timing of meetings (1), finding cover in school (1) and lack of/access to resources (1). 1 said there were no barriers.

Participants suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses were: encouraging schools to support study leave (1), making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1) and providing/improving online and distance learning opportunities (1).

All 3 participants at the University of Portsmouth said that there was nothing on the course that they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of

their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

The participants had found out about their course either informally via a colleague in school or LA (2) or they already had links with the provider (1).

1 participant said they had access to enough information about their course. 1 participant suggested direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools as a way of improving the marketing of the course.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were "too dry."

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

2 participants said that tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers and that their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons. 1 participant said coaching was part of their course and that they made use of observation as part of their course. All participants said tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations and all 3 said that the course built in opportunities to experiment with the practice in the classroom.

Practitioners' responses about the structure and organisation of the courses referred to: venue – school (1), venue – university (2), after school/evening (1), whole day (1), lectures (1), seminars (2), tutorials (1) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (1).

All participants were assessed by written essays and 1 participant was also assessed in the form of a journal. 1 participant said that the forms of assessment were effective for their own professional learning.

All 3 participants said that support received for writing essays was good. The type of support received included: submitting drafts for review (1), feedback from tutor (1) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (2).

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of Portsmouth's telephone interview responses

1 participant said that they had tried to involve other colleagues. All 3 said that they had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others by means of shared learning/research with colleagues (2), school colleagues were also on the course (1) and implementing a policy or project at the school (1).

1 participant said that they had enjoyed all aspects of the course, 1 participant said that the aspect of the course they had enjoyed the most was particular lectures/content and 1 said that it was having the time to reflect.

All 3 participants said that the course had influenced their own practice. The course had made a difference for professional practice (1), helped them to implement a policy/project (1) or made them more reflective (1).

All participants said that they had also influenced their colleagues leaning. This was achieved through INSET (2) or by improving teaching practice (1).

All participants had noticed an impact of the course on their pupils. They identified that it had improved their learning (1) and that pupils had become more engaged (3).

When asked what participants thought were the benefits of engaging with research 1 participant identified the chance to reflect on practice, 2 identified improved understanding/learning/confidence and 1 identified updating their professional knowledge.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and

- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

St Mary's University College

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February 2009, and interviews with the Academic Director, partnership Manager and two part-time lecturers (one of whom has responsibility for quality assurance of the PPD provision). Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios. This report refers to the MA in Education (Leading Innovation and Change), run by St Mary's University College, Twickenham. The College also runs the Catholic School Leadership MA, but information about this PPD is NOT included in this report.

Partnership

The partnership for the MA in Education: Leadership of Innovation and Change is predominantly between St Mary's and their local schools, with some contact with local authorities. Schools are represented from the boroughs of Hillingdon, Peckham, Richmond and Croydon amongst others.

The partnership with schools already committed to the PPD programme is strong. Regular contact occurs between the Partnership manager and the CPD coordinator (or another member of the senior management team in school) to ensure that participants' needs are being met and that the delivery methods and processes are appropriate. The Partnership manager devotes a good deal of time to individual school links.

Contact with local authorities is also a strength of the partnership, with St Mary's known as a responsive provider of PPD. The borough of Richmond have recently requested that St Mary's provide 60 credits at Masters level study for all of their NQTs, reflecting their confidence in the quality of provision.

The TDA funding goes towards the partnership manager and provision of additional resources and materials.

Recruitment and participation

Teachers are largely recruited from around six local London boroughs, though interest is spreading and provision is now made for some schools from outside London. A lot of

recruitment is achieved through word of mouth, with schools recommending the provision to others. The year on year increase in registrations and the relatively high success rate of visits to schools to sign up teachers onto the provision indicates strong relationships with schools and clusters.

There are around 70 students on the MA in the current year, all in groups of approximately eight, some groups school-based and others drawing students from across a cluster. St Mary's has invested heavily in recruitment onto the course, with the Partnership Manager making visits direct to schools to discuss the provision directly with the head teacher and/or CPD coordinator. This is time consuming but has been effective in recruiting students (approximately 50% of school visits result in sign up to the MA) and ensuring high completion rates as students are well aware of the expectations prior to starting.

One of the key selling points of the MA appears to be that it is delivered on school premises, responding to the needs of the teachers and schools involved and takes place over relatively short but regular twilight sessions.

Engagement in CPD processes

The MA in Education: Leading Innovation and Change is a two year part-time course. Registration lasts longer than two years and there is flexibility to extend. However, St Mary's encourage cohorts to complete the programme as a group if at all possible, to maximise the opportunities for collaborative learning and motivation provided by other colleagues. Learning is delivered on school sites with groups of at least six teachers at each 'hub'.

A key feature of the assessment and dissemination of learning is a focus on presentation by students, in addition to the assignments they complete. This ensures that students are able to summarise their learning and conclusions in a form useful to others (especially colleagues in their own and other schools) and it also provides them with a series of formal opportunities to practice and improve their own presentation skills. One non-assessed and three assessed presentations are key elements of the programme.

The MA is delivered in six modules:

1. distributive leadership and clarification of professional attributes – including a 4,500 word assignment, a pen portrait on student's values, four critical incident reviews / reflections and a non-assessed presentation;
2. research methods for project enquiry – leading to a research proposal and defence of the research methodology. All teacher research proposals use the practitioner action research model;
3. the research proposal in detail – five sections including ethical guidelines, a logo design, analytical framework, scaffolding for the research and pilot research results; plus a non assessed presentation at the Autumn Conference
4. interim evaluation of Research Project – a 5,000 word paper on interim findings, including an introduction, literature review, methods, a log book of research and an assessed presentation;
5. from research to policy – a full 5,000 word research paper , including a policy proposal and strategy which follows from the research and an assessed presentation; and
6. final paper and assessed presentation to conference.

There are 20 fortnightly two-hour twilight sessions for each group each year. St Mary's also offers three key-note lectures on site to which all participating teachers are invited. In the last year key-note lectures have been delivered by Sir John Jones, Professor Ivor Goodson and Marcus Orlovsky, all leading figures in school leadership and practice.

Tutoring is carried out by a group of around eight staff, some of whom are from outside the education system and others are practising teachers. One tutor is a local deputy head teacher who has been seconded for two days per week to tutor four of the MA groups. He reported a very positive experience of working with St Mary's and of being able to work with colleagues on the MA in other schools.

A range of delivery methods are used on the course. There is a balance of tutor led and teacher led seminars, formal debate format is used for some sessions, and other sessions are used as one-to-one time between student and tutor. Published literature is also used to stimulate learning and debate. Role play, semi-structured interview and goldfish bowl (in which a discussion/role play is observed by a small group of non-participants) formats are also used as learning methods.

A virtual learning environment is available to all students to share learning and debate. A key feature of the programme is an annual conference organised by St Mary's, at which students present their learning to other students and interested professionals. This conference is well established and is a good source of dissemination as well as an opportunity for students to be assessed. Students on their first year have the opportunity to get a feel for the level and type of research expected of them in their dissertation in year two.

One school has established its own conference to share and disseminate learning from the course. St Mary's are going to encourage other schools to use this model.

Up to module three students all make use of a large selection of research literature provided for them at the beginning of the programme. After module three students are expected to identify their own reading related to the focus of their research project.

Fees are now £2,400 per person (reduced from previous rate of £3,200).

Learning outcomes and impact

Evidence of impact is captured and available at pupil, teacher and school level. Students are asked to complete a proforma for evaluating impact which asks them to reflect specifically on development of knowledge, improvements in practice, impact on pupil learning and other areas of impact. Examples of key areas of impact are given below.

Foci of action research for dissertation which have led to improved practice based on research include: peer mentoring, 'risky teaching' and encouraging healthy lifestyles.

At pupil level, most of the MA students choose a research topic directly relevant to their pupils' needs. Frequent topics for research include boys' attainment, ICT for learning, active learning, and supporting pupils with SEN. Each school signs a memorandum of agreement to support the participation of each teacher entering the MA and endorses the area of research. Often the head teacher will be directly involved in the discussion about the topic of interest. This ensures that the focus of research is both of interest to the student carrying it

out and relevant to the wider school in which they work. Frequently an area of development identified within the school development plan is chosen.

From one group of six students from a 'failing school' who completed the MA, three went on to complete a doctorate as they were hugely inspired and motivated by the experience of M level PPD.

A further impact is around retention and development of staff. One school supported teachers on the MA when it started seven years ago in order to retain and promote five key staff in school. Seven years on, three of them have moved on to more senior positions in other schools while two have been promoted to management posts in their own school.

Evidence from evaluations and assignments indicates that participating students feel strongly that they become more reflective and innovative practitioners and that they significantly improve their action research skills to improve practice. Many students report that because they are reading more literature and research they have become more reflective about their own practice.

Processes for measuring impact are in the process of being enhanced by St Mary's. One of the part-time tutors has been given specific responsibility to develop the Quality Assurance systems, including measuring impact. Current systems gather feed-back from students, head teachers and other stakeholders. The new systems will improve the rigour and range of these measures.

Summary of messages to TDA

There was consensus that subsidised MAs should be made available to non-qualified teaching staff, several of whom have expressed an interest in the provision.

St Mary's staff also stressed the significance of the TDA subsidy for PPD through this programme and a concern that the number of registrations would drop off if similar support does not continue in the future.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University

- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about "becoming more critical" and "engaging in discussion with other professionals."

St Mary's University College's telephone interview responses

The 5 participants interviewed on St Mary's courses gave a variety of motivating factors. These included: improving subject knowledge (1), improving leadership skills (2), career development (1), improving practice (2), personal professional development (3) and having funding (2). 1 participant was motivated to take part as all the Senior Management Team from his school were taking the course for maximum impact at their school.

Participants reported a range of qualities they hoped to learn whilst taking part in the M level course. These included: personal/professional development (2), improving subject

knowledge (1), improving leadership skills (1), improving practice (1), becoming more reflective (1) and to research/implement change (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

St Mary’s University College’s telephone interview responses

All of the participants interviewed received some financial assistance; 3 were fully funded and 2 were partly funded.

All 5 participants said they received support from their schools including study leave/time (3), professional/moral support (3), funding (5) and also being given a venue (2).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

St Mary's University College's telephone interview responses

The majority of participants (4) said they had to overcome barriers to take part in PPD. The main barriers identified by interviewees were time to attend sessions and study (4) and personal commitments (2). 1 said they had no problems.

2 participants suggested providing/improving online and distance learning opportunities to make the course more accessible; 3 did not make any suggestions.

All 5 participants identified aspects of the course that they did not enjoy. The main aspect was part of the content (3); others were writing up assignments (1), time (1) and background reading (1).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

St Mary's University College's telephone interview responses

All 5 participants had access to enough information about their course and 2 stated that they thought it was also well advertised. Most of the participants found out about their course formally via school or LA (4); 1 responded to an advert/flyer.

The two suggestions made for improving the marketing of the course were visiting schools (1) and using ex-students to promote the courses (1).

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

St Mary’s University College’s telephone interview responses

All 5 participants were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and their tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations. 2 were involved in coaching. 2 also said that the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms while this was not applicable to 1. 3 made use of observation as part of their course and 3 said the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons, again this was not applicable to 1 participant.

The participants responses regarding the structure and organisation of the courses and the teaching at St Mary’s referred to: venue – school (4), venue – university (2), after school/evening (5), specific hour/blocks (5), lectures (4), seminars (1), tutorials (3) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3).

4 participants had positive comments regarding the teaching on the course: 3 said it was a good/excellent level of teaching and 1 said the teaching was helpful. 1 participant said that it could be better.

The forms of assessment used on the course at St Mary's for the 5 participants were written essays (4), presentations (5), portfolios (1) and review (1). The assessment type used was thought by all participants to be effective for their own professional learning.

The particular support received for writing essays included: submitting drafts for review (3), feedback from the tutor (4) and a module/seminar/booklet on essay writing (2). 4 of the 5 participants thought this support was good. 1 said there was not enough support in this area.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

St Mary's University College's telephone interview responses

All 5 participants at St Mary's have both tried to involve other colleagues and been encouraged to share what they had learnt with other colleagues. This was achieved through shared learning/research with colleagues (3), school colleagues also on the course (2), implementing a project or policy at school (2) and involvement in an event outside school (2).

When asked what parts of the course they enjoyed, participants stated research (2), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (1) and applying research/implementing change at school (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to

indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

The Slough Partnership

The following report has been compiled from an examination of documentation supplied to the TDA including Submission Documents, Data Returns and Impact Evaluation along with supplementary documentation provided by the provider. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the partnership in January 2009.

Interviews were undertaken with the following people: the PPD/EBITT Manager at Slough Grammar School (Zelda Marais); two school-based tutors; four students from the programme's first cohort (all current teachers at Slough Grammar School); the Programme Leader (from Sheffield Hallam University); and Slough local authority's School Workforce Adviser.

Partnership

PPD provision at The Slough Partnership is based at Slough Grammar school, working with Sheffield Hallam University and LA partners. As a former training school, the partnership was able to integrate the PPD programme into an established culture of staff development. The programme takes an enquiry-based approach, based on giving students opportunities to enquire into their own practice in school. Apart from the foundational 'Enquiring Practitioner' module (taught in two blocks of three and a half days), the HEI partner's role is largely to validate, accredit and quality assure content originated by the school, as well as offering pastoral support to students and tutors. Assessment is shared with six school-based tutors. Ownership of the curriculum was felt to be crucial and had prompted the partnership with Sheffield Hallam, after an earlier HEI partner had proved to be insufficiently flexible.

The programme is based on a two year model:

Year 1

- Enquiring Practitioner (30 credit module)
- Professional Learning in the Workplace (60 credits)

Year 2

- Reflecting on Professional Learning (30 credits)
- Extended Professional Project (60 credits)

The programme is flexible in terms of both entry and exit, with students able to complete at PgCert (60 credits) or PgDip (120 credits) levels, as well as at full Master's level. Students have up to six years to complete. Sheffield Hallam offers online support throughout the programme, with the Programme Leader acting as a consistent link for students and tutors, but the school-based tutors work with the students after the first module, mainly through twilight sessions.

The partnership was described as open and transparent. Schools and students were able to enquire into their own practice; and Sheffield Hallam gained "the opportunity to work in a different way and extend the boundaries of what a professional Masters degree might offer". Although the majority of students so far have been teachers at Slough Grammar

School, the programme is open to teachers from other schools and Slough local authority welcomes this outward-facing orientation and developing culture of CPD, especially as it does not have the capacity to provide training itself. The programme is coordinated by the school's EBITT (Employment-based Initial Teacher Training) manager.

Recruitment and participation

So far there have been two cohorts of 10 students recruited from Slough Grammar School, along with 6 students from other local schools. Recruitment is shared between the school and the local authority which has developed a network of interested schools in the area. No students have dropped out of the programme to date. Students and tutors interviewed felt that the location of the programme in the school and the ability to focus on areas and issues central to their practice had been significant draws in recruiting them to the programme.

Areas selected for study by the first two cohorts included:

- raising the attainment of children for whom English is an additional language;
- what are the factors that motivate and demotivate teaching staff at Slough Grammar School?; and
- self-efficacy and mentoring.

Barriers to participation in the programme were said to include the following:

- teachers moving away from the area;
- lack of time allocated to teachers' education; and
- teachers not valuing the MA qualification as a career enhancer.

The partnership regarded the flexibility of its programme, its location in school and developing culture of professional development as key factors in addressing these barriers.

Engagement in CPD processes

The Slough Partnership's enquiry approach to PPD encourages students to experiment to move their practice forward. Interviewees spoke of equipping students to articulate and research their areas of interest through supporting them to use evidence and evaluate their practice, developing criticality and robustness. School-based tutors and mentors were said to play a key role in engaging and supporting colleagues through professional dialogue, although it was acknowledged that having to tutor colleagues had inevitably created some tensions. Tutors are responsible for supporting students in their academic work and were praised for their flexibility. Along with the Programme Leader, mentors were felt to play a key role in modelling effective practice to students and connecting their research to the classroom: "facilitating the implementation of the project and acting as a sounding board". Finally, interviewees emphasised the good connections and high levels of trust that had developed between the school and Sheffield Hallam, along with the awareness all partners needed and the political issues that arise, inevitably, from school-based research and enquiry.

Learning outcomes and impact

The Slough Partnership collects a range of data to analyse the impact and effectiveness of the programme, including:

- analysis of assignments;
- participants' evaluations;

- feedback from partners and stakeholders; and
- assessment data.

The partnership found evidence of:

- increased confidence among students;
- more reflection on practice;
- improved motivation among students and greater sense of community; and
- improved retention of staff.

Students spoke of having been able to “refocus on learning”; “think more academically again”; and develop “an understanding broader than [of my] specific subject, not just teaching in the classroom”. They also spoke of becoming more questioning, more aware of educational theories and policies, and, in one case, more empathetic of the difficulties pupils face in learning and expressing their ideas. A PE teacher said that his research into Assessment for Learning had led directly to changes being made to PE provision in the school and had given him a better understanding of pupils’ strengths and weaknesses. Other students spoke of rethinking and revising lessons in ways which they thought had benefited pupils in ways that were not easily measurable.

The Programme Leader was felt to act as a role model in terms of academic support and integrity, and establishing ways of working with adult learners on vocational projects. However, it was felt that they could be more systematic in their approach to evaluating impact. School-based tutors also stated that they had become more confident through their involvement in the programme which was described as a ‘*collective learning enterprise*’, while acknowledging the challenges involved in managing and coordinating 20 different school improvement projects simultaneously.

Summary of messages to TDA

- The bidding and evaluation processes for PPD should be more flexible and less onerous on providers.
- There is a need for greater clarity about future funding, especially as Slough, and other providers, have already recruited students to begin the programme in September 2009.
- PPD’s importance has been understated. It has been very highly valued by participants in terms of their development as teachers and impact on practice in the classroom.
- PPD should be placed at the heart of performance management systems in schools.
- Some concerns were expressed about the ‘disjointedness’ of postgraduate professional development policy and provision nationally.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College

- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The Slough Partnership's telephone interview responses

Key motivating factors for the 9 participants studying on Slough's courses were varied and included: improving subject knowledge (2), improving leadership skills (1), career development (2), improving practice (1), personal professional development (7), being funded (1) and wanting to learn how to carry out research (1).

When asked what they hoped to learn responses were: personal professional development (3) improving subject knowledge (3), improving leadership skills (1), career development (2), improving practice (5) and research/implement change (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The Slough Partnership's telephone interview responses

The majority of participant's fees were fully funded (7). 2 participants received no financial assistance.

Participants' schools provided support in the following ways: study leave/time (5), professional/moral support (4), having a venue (1), rearranged timetables (2) and funding (4).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)

- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The Slough Partnership's telephone interview responses

Most participants encountered barriers to taking part in PPD including time to attend sessions and study (7), personal commitments (1) and lack of/access to resources (1). 1 participant said they encountered no problems.

6 participants suggested ways to improve the accessibility of the courses. These were: encouraging schools to support study leave (4) and making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (2). 3 made no suggestions.

Aspects of the course participants identified they enjoyed the least were: writing up assignments (1), unclear structure/expectations (1), time (2), background reading (1) and poor timing of assignments (1). 3 said there was nothing that they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The Slough Partnership's telephone interview responses

5 participants said that they had access to enough information about the course, 1 said they did not and 4 said the course was well advertised. 7 of the 9 participants had found out about their courses formally via a school or LA and 2 had found out about it informally via a colleague, school or LA.

Direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools and visiting schools were suggested as ways of improving the marketing of the course. 5 participants made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The Slough Partnership’s telephone interview responses

Out of the 9 participants, 7 said that they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and that the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms. 6 said the course included coaching and 3 said they made use of observation as part of their course. 1 participant said that tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 6 said they did not; and 1 said this was not applicable to their course. 5 said the course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons; 1 said it did not; and 1 said this was not applicable to their course.

The practitioners responses about how the courses were structured and organised were: venue – school (6), after school/evening (3), whole day (2), specific hours/blocks (7), lectures (3), tutorials (4) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (4). The participants referred to the teaching as helpful (3) and the lecturers/tutors knowledgeable (1).

The range of assessments used on the participant’s courses included: written essays (6), presentations (4), action research (3) and dissertation (2). 4 found the methods of assessment effective for their own professional development; 1 said they did not.

Most of the participants received good support with writing essays (7). The types of support identified were submitting drafts for review (1) and feedback from the tutor (4).

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The Slough Partnership's telephone interview responses

4 of the participants had tried to involve other colleagues; 2 said they had not. 6 had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others: 6 achieved this by shared learning/research with colleagues, 2 had school colleagues also on the course, 2 had implemented a policy/project at school and 1 had been involved in an event outside school.

1 participant had enjoyed every aspect of the course, 5 participants had particularly enjoyed research and 1 had particularly enjoyed group work and sharing ideas with colleagues.

6 participants said that taking part in the course had influenced their learning. The course had: made a difference for professional practice (1), improved leadership (1), improved teaching practice (5), helped them become more reflective (2) helped them become more confident (1) and helped them become more creative (1).

5 participants felt they had influenced their colleagues learning. 2 said they had done this by making a difference for professional practice.

4 participants had noticed an impact of the course on their pupils and 1 had noticed an indirect impact. Those who had noticed an impact had observed improved learning (4), more engagement (2) and an impact via implementing a policy or project (2). 2 said it was too early to say.

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by the participants were: the chance to reflect on practice (2), improved understanding/learning/confidence (4), updating professional knowledge (4) and the specific benefits to the school (1).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Staffordshire 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 February 2009 and interviews with the programme manager and the Head of Education, both of whom contribute to course design and delivery, and the representatives of the partner organisations (the West Midlands Consortium and Cheadle and Westwood schools).

Partnership

Staffordshire University has a partnership with Stoke city and Staffordshire Local Authorities (LAs), the West Midlands Consortium and several other schools. The University works very closely with its partners to ensure that the PPD programmes are relevant to teachers and responsive to the complex demands of particular educational contexts. Staffordshire University expects their partners to work with them to identify development priorities and issues for the organisation and its staff and discuss the best way of addressing them through the provision of PPD. They believe that the University's role is in building the institution's own capacity rather than providing them with solutions. The partnership, which has been established for only two years and has been successful in securing the input of partner organisations at the operational level, is now looking at involving them more strategically.

The provision offers MA Education awards in several key areas that the University is specialist in and the demand for which is high amongst a range of local teaching professionals and educational establishments:

- community learning;
- learning and assessment;
- educational leadership; and
- negotiated (with partners).

In order to achieve an MA Education award, participants study two 30 credits modules at the certificate stage and two at the diploma stage. At the Masters stage practitioners undertake a module in research methods (15 credits) and complete their dissertation (45 credits). Participants usually undertake two modules per year but there is a possibility to choose an individual rate of progression and extend the time they spend at each stage to 18 months. The students who opt for MA Education (Negotiated) have a choice of the first four modules from, for example:

- Newly Qualified Teachers: Improving Subject learning;
- Mentoring and Coaching in Educational Contexts;
- Leading Learning with Hard to Reach Learners;
- Community Learning;
- Data for Educational Improvement; and
- Interprofessional Working.

PPD at Staffordshire University is offered via either a campus or an off-campus route. Each off-campus site (usually a partner organisation, e.g. a school) has its unique award. For example, having assessed in collaboration with the University their priorities, Cheadle High School and Westwood Business College selected Learning and Assessment and Educational Leadership modules as most relevant for their staff in order to encourage rapid improvement and progression and help one of these schools to come out of special measures. The West Midlands Consortium, involved in ITT, selected the Mentoring and Coaching module to develop the subject mentors in its partner schools. Most of Staffordshire University PPD provision is currently delivered off-campus to suit the needs of individual partners.

Recruitment and participation

Staffordshire University identified a significant increase in the numbers of students recruited to the PPD programmes on offer; almost 140 participants currently enrolled compared to only 15 a few years ago. M level provision at Staffordshire University is not only for school teachers. It is aimed at supporting the development of the whole sector workforce.

Currently 47 school teachers are on PPD programmes with more schools and teachers ready to join in 09-10. The remaining students are drawn from other partner organisations such as FE colleges, the prison service, and Local Authority employees (particularly in relation to community learning).

The increase in numbers over the previous two years has been attributed to:

- the significant modifications to the content and nature of the provision, which made the programme more relevant to teachers and responsive to schools' development needs and priorities;
- building strong relationships with partners; and
- adopting a new marketing strategy aimed at establishing new partnerships and working with partner schools rather than mass market targeting.

Staffordshire University employs two ex-headteachers who are well known and respected in the local area in order to visit schools and discuss the school development priorities and describe the PPD programme offered by the University. This is seen as a first step in building a working relationship with a school that can be subsequently developed further and possibly lead to forming a new partnership.

In addition to this approach, which has been successful not only in increasing recruitment numbers but also improving retention, a number of other methods is used. For example, the provision is promoted through the University or Business faculty marketing activities which include placing advertisements in the national press followed by open evenings and describing the programme on the University website, etc. School and University networks provide additional channels for communication that spread information about the courses.

Staffordshire University staff ensure they consider the needs of the students who wish to enrol on PPD courses carefully. Tutors and course leaders pay particular attention to the skills and needs students identify in their applications and supporting statements and discuss these during an interview with the individual teachers and groups of practitioners, as well as providing all the necessary guidance and support, prior to the start of the course. The students also receive advice about accrediting their prior learning and work.

The University recognises the importance of considering students' potential barriers to enrolling on and successfully completing a PPD programme. The key obstacles identified by the partnership are lack of time, pressure of teachers' workload and anxiety about academic work. Staffordshire University works closely with its partners to tackle these by:

- carefully timing the sessions and assignments so that they fit around teachers work commitments;
- introducing an assessment framework that is largely action research based, which allows teachers to try their ideas in practice as part of their work;
- running courses locally, i.e. in schools (off-campus model); and

- providing guidance and support (personal tutorials) to students, ensuring they are aware of the workload demands and understand what is involved in completing the course from the beginning.

Staffordshire University staff note and value the amount of support and encouragement that partner schools offer to their teachers in order to facilitate their involvement in PPD.

Engagement in CPD processes

The basic structure of the provision entails sessions delivered by the course tutors every three weeks and inter-sessional support through email correspondence, telephone and one-to-one tutorials at the university or in school. Teaching and learning methods include: interactive lectures, seminars, workshops, tutorials, problem-based learning and independent investigation.

The representatives from partner organisations highlighted that the quality of teaching on the course was so high that the participants viewed the sessions as models of teaching and learning processes in terms of planning and preparation, using assessment for learning, engaging all learners through the use of enquiry, problem solving and active teaching approaches.

Students enrolling on the Staffordshire University PPD courses are expected to:

- engage in reading a variety of specialist, cutting edge evidence sources to gain a deep knowledge and understanding in their chosen area;
- participate in discussions and case-study activities helping them to establish connections between the issues raised by the course and their own practice;
- receive (and provide) critical feedback from their peers and tutors;
- work collaboratively with their peers (particularly for the school-based model);
- undertake their own enquiry or action research projects; and
- actively use ICT and VLE to enrich their own and their pupils' learning.

Specialist expertise is recognised as a valuable part of the provision; this is reflected through, for example, inviting guest speakers and practitioners who are recognised for their expertise in a particular area to co-deliver sessions. To support them to draw on extensive evidence base in their study, the participants are provided with the access to the university library, on-line resources and VLE.

VLE is further used to promote networking and collaboration between the participants. All masters level students share the same area of VLE; they post a little vignette about themselves once they have enrolled on a course to help them start networking, share their experiences and resources, etc. Another example of an opportunity for collaboration and networking is Saturday schools. They are held at the University and are intended to pull together students across all awards and stages and help them disseminate their findings, participate in workshops and generally celebrate their professional learning and ambition to improve themselves and their teaching practice.

A requirement to disseminate the findings of their research projects in participants' own schools intensifies the impact of PPD. For example, in one school three participants from the same department were engaged on the programme. They reported raised standards

(attainment and behaviour) in their department which might be causally linked to their undertaking CPD.

Assessment mainly involves students' written assignments where they report on their school-based research projects, occasional literature reviews and a dissertation. An example of an alternative method of assessment is a portfolio of evidence in for the Mentoring and Coaching module, which includes examples of activities performed during the module, such as meeting and observation notes, target setting records, etc., supported by a reflective diary/journal.

Learning outcomes and impact

The partnership collects data about impact through a range of internal and external mechanisms. Participant and tutor post-module evaluations, assignments and partner organisations' feedback are a key source of information. All the data is collected and analysed by the PPD manager and then presented in the Annual Monitoring report. The Annual Monitoring report is peer reviewed and examined by the External Examiner.

Teacher perceptions included in post-module evaluations indicate that being involved in PPD courses has:

- increased their knowledge and skills in relation to educational leadership;
- improved their pedagogic practice (planning, assessment, use of resources and technologies); and
- enhanced their self-esteem and professional confidence.

Tutors encouraged participants to collect data about the impact of their learning on their pupils. The evidence highlighted that the PPD provision had also had a positive impact on pupils' attainment and performance.

Summary of messages for TDA

Staffordshire University identified several key messages for the TDA:

- PPD is extremely valuable because it conveys the message that there is a priority on post early professional development;
- whatever programme (for example MTL) follows PPD it shouldn't be monolithic. There ought to be plenty of room for the multiplicity of providers in each region. Schools and individuals need to be able and encouraged to move around to find the best kind of provision there is for their particular need and priority;
- there should be more professional collaboration between different PPD providers in order to offer the best opportunities for professional learning to schools and individual teachers;
- every practitioner working with learners of any age (early years, 14-19, FE, etc.), irrespective of having a QTS, needs PPD to help them grow as professionals and improve learning processes and outcomes, and thus should have access to PPD funding. Effective collaboration between agencies such as the TDA and LLUK (Lifelong Learning UK) could provide better support and ensure more continuity between various programmes aimed at different kinds of practitioners;
- with relation to the wider educational workforce, there is a need to offer PPD funding to school practitioners without QTS; the range of such practitioners varies from

members of school leadership teams (with e.g. financial responsibilities) to teaching assistants, particularly if they work mainly with SEN (special education needs) children;

- it would be helpful to clear the confusion amongst schools about CPD, PPD and other programmes and opportunities and where they fit in relation to early career development, NCSL (National College for School Leadership) programmes, etc.;
- there are many competing initiatives out there that try to offer schools the answers rather than equip them with the capability to solve their problems themselves;
- fees are not a problem for teachers who want to be involved in PPD; had there been more funding available it would not necessarily lead to increased numbers of teachers on PPD programmes; and
- it would be helpful if connections were made between early and mature professional development and their outcomes were linked to the standards and articulated as progression.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?

4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

Staffordshire University’s telephone interview responses

The motivations of the 6 participants at Staffordshire University for becoming involved in PPD were: improving leadership skills (2), career development (3), improving practice (1) and personal professional development (4).

Participant hoped to improve/learn: personal professional development (1), subject knowledge (4), leadership skills (3), career development (2) and practice (3).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Staffordshire University's telephone interview responses

5 participants received some financial support and 1 participant received no support at all.

Participants' schools supported their staff by providing funding (5), supplying a venue (1) and offering professional/moral support (5).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Staffordshire University's telephone interview responses

All participants said they had to overcome barriers to study at M level. The main barriers identified by interviewees were: time to attend sessions and study (5), personal commitments (2), insufficient funding (3) and lack of/access to resources (1).

Some participants made suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course. These were: making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1), providing a mobile library (1) and more funding (1). 3 interviewees made no suggestions.

Participants identified aspects of the course they did not enjoy, they referred to: writing up assignments (2), unclear structure/expectations (1), time (2), some of the lectures/guest speakers (2) and background reading (1).

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Staffordshire University's telephone interview responses

4 interviewees told us they had access to enough information about the course whilst 1 said they did not. 2 said it was well advertised. Interviewees had found out about their course formally via their school or LA (3), choosing the programme from the website (1) and by responding to an advert/flyer (1).

Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses were direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools (2) and visiting schools (1). 3 participants made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review

- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were "too dry."

Staffordshire University's telephone interview responses

All 6 participants said that they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers, 1 said the course included coaching, 4 said their course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms and 5 said they made use of observation as part of their course. 4 participants said tutors modelled new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 2 said this was not applicable to their course. 1 said that their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons; 1 said it did not; and 1 said this was not applicable to their course.

In terms of the structure and organisation of the courses, the responses referred to: venue-school (3), venue- university (2), after school/evening (1), weekend meeting (3), whole day (3), specific hours/blocks (1), lectures (3), seminars (1), tutorials (4) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3). 4 said the teaching itself was at a good/excellent level, 3 said it was helpful and 1 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable.

Forms of assessment use on the course included written essays (5) and dissertation (1). 4 said the assessments used were effective for their own professional development and 1 said it was not.

Support given specifically for writing essays included: submitting drafts for review (2), feedback from tutor (4) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (4). 5 participants said the support given was good.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)

- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Staffordshire University's telephone interview responses

4 participants had tried to involve other colleagues. All 6 had been encouraged to share what they had found out. This was mainly achieved through sharing learning/research with colleagues (4) and by school colleagues also being on the course (2).

Features of the course participants enjoyed the most were: research (1), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (3), particular lectures/content (1) and 1 participant had enjoyed all parts of the course.

When asked if the course had influenced their practice, participants identified that the course had: made a difference for professional practice (1), improved leadership (2),

improved teaching practice (3), helped them become more reflective (1) and more critical (1).

Participants said they had influenced their colleagues' learning through INSET (1) and informally (2). 1 said it was too early to say.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);

- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The

studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Report

The Learning Institute (TLI - formerly Networked Learning Partnership)

The following report is based on an interrogation of documentation supplied to the TDA by TLI, including submission documents, data returns and impact evaluation, along with the findings of an external evaluation carried out by Peter Seabourne on behalf of TDA and published in December 2008. References to interviews in this report are drawn from this external evaluation.

Partnership

The principal partners are The Learning Institute (lead body), the University of Exeter, which provides guidance and accreditation, and the Institute of Education (London), which provides accreditation and support for candidates.

The core of the PPD programmes are the teacher research centres (TRCs), each staffed by qualified academic staff who provide masters level tutoring, and who broker specialist input from the teaching profession and other stakeholders. The TRCs are modelled on the International Learning and Research Centre in Bristol.

Other partners include:

- the London Centre for Leadership and Learning (LCLL);
- Holland Park School, London, which provides the London-based TRC;
- WebBased Ltd, which provides the virtual infrastructure for the partnership;
- Somerset LA; and
- school networks, such as Community Learning Partnerships in Somerset.

The partnership offers a 60-credit practitioner enquiry module at M-level which is designed to be completed over two terms with additional time for writing up final assignments, and is accredited by the partner universities. In addition, the universities offer a pathway for participants to complete a full Masters qualification, and one of them accredits successful completion of the 60-credit module with a PG Cert qualification. In particular, the partnership targets teachers who have not previously regarded study at Masters level as possible or even desirable.

An important advantage of the partnership approach highlighted in the evaluation is the fact that as the provision is school-based, there are minimal premises costs. Main costs are for tutors' time and expenses, largely covered by TDA funding, which means the first 60-credit module can be offered for free. Among benefits for partner schools is the potential for staff participation in PPD modules to contribute to achieving the aims of the school improvement plan.

Close working between the partners has also led to developing additional programmes and pathways since the partnership has been in operation. For example, the Institute of Education has incorporated the school-based module developed by LCLL, partnership schools and TLI into a full Masters programme.

Recruitment and participation

The Institute's recruitment data show the profile of participants to be mostly in line with national statistics for white/non-white teachers. Participants are more likely to be female than male, and much more likely to teach in secondary schools. The Institute reports recruiting teachers from across 1-24 years in service and that recruitment among NQTs and teachers with 30+ years in service is poor.

Interviews carried out as part of the evaluation showed that for these teachers the main attractions of the TLI PPD programme are the fact that it offers postgraduate study within their schools and that their day to day work is the focus of the study. Family, school and other commitments mean that for many, study at a HEI was not a viable option. There were differences in motivation for participating in the programme according to age. One in three interviewees were keen to gain credit towards a Masters degree. This was especially the case among younger teachers, who saw the need for Masters accreditation as necessary for moving on in their future career. Several of the older teachers were taking part out of interest rather than in order to gain formal qualifications.

Recruitment to the programme involves TLI tutors making presentations to school staff, often supported by senior staff. In interviews, participants spoke about the effectiveness of the presentations in encouraging them to take part in the programme.

Engagement in CPD processes

The design of the TLI PPD programme is based on evidence about effective CPD contained in the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information (EPPI) CPD review. The modules are based on practitioner enquiry, and participants are encouraged to establish collaborative enquiry groups to carry out their school-based research. Participants are supported by Teacher Research Centre leaders to ensure they draw on appropriate external support, assess impact on pupil performance and attainment, and carry out their enquiry with appropriate rigour and professional criticality.

Teachers receive formal input on theory and approaches to practitioner research during 2.5 hour in-school sessions at the end of the school day. TLI tutors draw on their experience, knowledge and skills to:

- encourage and support teachers in working collaboratively;
- negotiate productive themes for enquiry with the schools;
- guide participants in identifying appropriate individual research topics within a common theme; and
- broker access to key articles and literature.

TLI also provided a dedicated librarian to teachers participating on PPD in the South West region.

Another important, if unformalised, feature of the TLI programme identified in the external evaluation is the role of the internal tutor or co-ordinator. Individuals who take on this role facilitate participation in PPD by establishing it as part of the broader development programme in the school, encouraging staff to take part, and maintaining momentum between external tutor visits.

The benefits of carrying out enquiry collaboratively were expressed by teachers during interviews. Many spoke of the importance of being able to share ideas, having someone to support them during difficult stages, and of improvements in the quality and relevance of discussions about the work of the school. Participants also felt that peer-support had kept them on track to complete the module. The value of working collaboratively was also strongly borne out by participant views on the programme contained in the impact evaluation. One commented:

At the beginning of this inquiry a few members of the mathematics department worked collaboratively but sporadically throughout the term. This inquiry forced me to step outside my comfort zone and work with other teachers in the department and in other departments. The teachers involved began to take pleasure in reflecting on their practice, sharing the impact on their lessons with others and not afraid to take risks, at times, in the classroom.

Pupil involvement in the enquiries was also a strong feature of the TLI PPD programmes identified by the evaluation and attested to by participant comments in the survey. The evaluation found TLI guided participants on their obligations and responsibilities to pupils and their parents when undertaking classroom-based research, and concluded:

The transparency of the process seemed generally to have benefited relationships between teacher-researchers and their pupils, who often displayed respect for what the teachers were seeking to achieve.

The evaluation also found that it was important that the over-arching school theme for PPD enquiries engendered cohesion between individual projects. In a small number of cases the overall school theme was so broad there were few points of contact between individual enquiries on which to base common discussions among participants.

A difficult aspect of the learning mentioned by many of the teachers was the process of refining the research topic. TLI tutors had a fine line to tread between being directive and participants feeling confused. One older teacher commented:

I was a bit lost and confused at the start and would have liked more direction but it was right to stimulate our creativity.

Writing up the 9000 words assignment was also cited by many participants as a daunting task, which had a significant and disruptive impact on their personal lives. While some of the teachers were able to follow tutors' advice and write up their work in stages during the course of the module, others found this impossible to achieve. One participant commented, "I do not know that I could give up my holidays again" because she faced each new half term exhausted. Teachers who had been given time by their head teacher expressed appreciation for this, and several said it had been an impetus to find time from their own schedules to work on their enquiry.

Learning outcomes and impact

TLI has several strands of monitoring activity, including:

- a requirement for participants to focus and report in their assignments on impact on pupil learning;
- monitoring and evaluation of programmes by TLI based on intended and actual outcomes;
- feedback from external reports, including Ofsted reports, school improvement plans and LA improvement plans; and
- impact evaluation surveys.

In addition to the TLI's specific monitoring of PPD provision, the programmes are also quality assured through the universities' established QA procedures.

The external evaluation found that the vast majority of teachers interviewed had seen benefits from their participation on the PPD module in changes in their practice and way of thinking about teaching and learning. Teachers highlighted the benefits of being able to understand their practice in relation to underlying theory, of focusing more clearly on the outcomes of teaching, and of being more confident in making decisions and debating with colleagues, because they could base their arguments on evidence.

Teacher interviews also revealed an increased enthusiasm for teaching. Teachers spoke of improved pupil motivation and attitude, of having more empathy with pupils, and of lessons being more enjoyable. While it was difficult for the evaluation to make direct links between participation in PPD and pupil improvements in assessments and examinations, one school reported positive trends from new strategies to improve outcomes in GCSE English and

mathematics. In two other schools, interviews with pupils suggested improvements in the areas of confidence in tackling new work, peer collaboration, questioning and seeking help from teachers.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The Networked Learning Partnership’s (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

The majority of the 8 participants from the University of Greenwich said that their motivation to take part in further study was personal/professional development (6). Other responses included improving subject knowledge (2), improving leadership skills (1), career development (2) and being funded (1).

The key elements participants were interested in learning was personal/professional development (5) and to research/implement change (7). Others included: improving subject knowledge (3), improving leadership skills (1), improving practice (1) and to become more reflective (1).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The Networked Learning Partnership’s (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

All 8 participants received some financial assistance. The majority were fully funded (7) and 1 participant had some help with funds.

Support given by the school for their participation in PPD included study leave/time (6), professional/moral support (6), having a venue (1) and funding (5).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The Networked Learning Partnership's (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

When asked what barriers they had to overcome in order to take part in PPD, participants identified: time to attend sessions and study (7), personal commitments (1) and lack of/access to resources (1).

Participants' suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses were: encouraging schools to support study leave (1), clearer expectation of the course (1) and more funding/supply cover (1). 2 participants did not make any suggestions.

Parts of the course participants said they did not enjoy were unclear structure/expectations (2), poor admin (2) and lack of relevance (1). 1 participant said there was nothing they didn't enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The Networked Learning Partnership's (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

7 participants interviewed said they had access to enough information about their course. 2 said it was well advertised while 1 said it was not. Interviewees found out about their course formally via school or LA (5), informally via a colleague in school or LA (2) and already had links with the provider (1).

5 of the participants made suggestions for improving the accessibility of the course. 3 suggested direct advertising to CPD coordinators in schools, 1 visiting schools and 1 suggested using ex-students to promote the courses.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included:

Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The Networked Learning Partnership’s (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

7 participants said they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers and the course included coaching. 8 participants said the course built in opportunities to experiment with the practice in the classroom but tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations. 5 participants said their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons but they did not make use of observation as part of their course.

The participants’ responses regarding the structure and organisation of the course referred to: venue – school (7), after school/evening (8), residential (1), specific hours/blocks (5), VLE/e-learning (1), lectures (3), seminars (4), tutorials (4) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (5).

The responses regarding the teaching on the course were: a good/excellent level of teaching (4), the teaching was helpful (4) and the lecturers/tutors were knowledgeable (1).

The main form of assessment used on the PPD course at Exeter is portfolios (6). The courses also make use of written essays (3) and presentations (1). 3 found these methods useful for their own professional development. Support given specifically for writing assessments included submitting drafts for review (4) and feedback from tutor (7). 6 participants felt this support was good.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)

- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The Networked Learning Partnership's (The Learning Institute) telephone interview responses

All participants had tried to involve other colleagues and had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others. This had been achieved by shared learning/research with colleagues (4), school colleagues also being on the course (1) and implementing a policy or project at school (1).

The parts of the course participants identified they enjoyed the most were research (5), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (1), time to reflect (1), applying research/implementing change at school (2), a particular tutor (1) and a residential (1). 1 participant had enjoyed all parts of the course.

All 8 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practice. They said the course had: made a difference for professional practice (5), improved leadership (1), improved teaching practice (3), helped them implement a policy/project at school (3), helped them become more reflective (2) and improved their confidence (1).

7 participants said they had influenced their colleagues learning. 1 participant said they had done so by making a difference for professional practice.

6 participants identified that the course had impacted on their pupils. Participants had noticed: improved learning (3), more engagement (4) and noticed an impact through implementing a policy/project (1). 1 said it was too early to say.

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by the participants were the chance to reflect on practice (4), improved understanding/learning/confidence (6), updating professional knowledge (2) and the specific benefits to the school (2).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;

- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

Warwick Institute of Education (WIE)

The following report has been compiled from a combination of an examination 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 February 2009, and interviews with the Director of Teaching and Learning, Business Development Director, Client Manager and three course leaders.

Partnership

The Warwick Institute of Education (WIE) is the lead organisation in a number of partnerships that work together to develop the range of PPD programmes on offer. Some partnerships are longstanding and others are more recently formed and in the process of development. The following organisations illustrate the diversity and quantity of partners that work with the WIE: Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT); Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC); the United Church School Trust and the United Learning Trust; Maths Education Institute (Manchester); Teach First; school networks, clusters and individual schools; and local authorities, etc.

Increasingly, more and more students attend the bespoke courses tailored to the needs and contexts of a particular partner. Developing a new partnership starts with a series of meetings that can take as long as 12-20 months, at which the needs and priorities of a prospective partner organisation and individual practitioners are established, and WIE's role in helping them address these needs is explored. The University staff consider maintaining the dialogue with the partners to be vitally important in order to:

- recognise new and emerging needs;
- gather feedback regarding the content and delivery of the provision and respond accordingly when planning future work; and
- monitor and evaluate the programme's quality, impact and the degree to which it achieves partners' expectations.

The WIE offers a wide range of academic, specialist (such as Maths, Innovation, etc.) and niche (Shakespeare and drama) expertise, which allows it to address the needs of very diverse cohorts of education professionals.

The partnership offers teachers the possibility to progress from PG (Post Graduate) Award (30 credits) or Certificate (60 credits), through to a Master's degree (180 credits), and for those who wish, to a Doctorate. The participants have a choice between full-time and part-time post graduate tuition, leading to MA and MSc degrees by taught modules and a dissertation (or a project), or one of the research degrees such as MA, MPhil, EdD, PhD and New Route PhD, etc.

Two broad pathways are available to Masters level students: generic (flexible) educational studies and specialist (subject specific). The latter includes, for example, MSc in Mathematics Education, MA Drama and Theatre Education, MA in Educational Leadership and Innovation

and MA in Religious Education (by distance learning). Those opting for a specialist pathway typically study a core module of research methods and four specialist modules, completing with a dissertation. Teachers who choose the flexible pathway leading to MA Educational Studies as a way of improving their practice (professional route) are required to complete core modules:

- Leading Professional Enquiry 1 (Design) – 30 credits;
- Leading Professional Enquiry 2 (Implementation) – 30 credits; and
- The Professional Project – 60 credits.

These are complemented by a range of optional modules such as:

- Assessment for learning;
- Contemporary Issues in Further Education;
- Foreign Language Teaching and Methodology;
- Oracy: Developing Speaking and Listening;
- Special Educational Needs: Pedagogy, Policy and Practice; and
- Learning and ICT, etc.

Recruitment and participation

The WIE has seen considerable growth in Masters level postgraduate recruitment, which in the last couple of years has doubled. Currently around 350 participants are enrolled on the PPD programmes with the WIE every year. Compared to a few years ago, when teachers appeared to be interested mainly in short term courses, students increasingly enrol on the PPD programmes with the intention of completing their Masters and many subsequently consider the possibility of doing a PhD.

The WIE communicates information about its provision in a variety of ways which range from adverts in public places or targeting its own PGCE students to attract individuals, to working with existing and developing new partnerships in order to design and offer bespoke courses to groups of practitioners. All the marketing and client relations activities are managed by a designated team which includes, for example, the Business Development Director, CPD client manager and recruitment manager, etc.

Due to having a variety of well-established partners, the WIE shares with them the responsibility of marketing their PPD provision. The University oversees and contributes too many marketing activities undertaken by partner organisations. For example, the University staff attend events and conferences organised by one of their biggest partners, SSAT to talk to potential students and inform them about the opportunities of further study and accreditation based around their courses and work with SSAT.

The provider has identified two major barriers to engaging in PPD: financial and time. The WIE highlighted that financial restraints were particularly significant for schools wishing to commit to long term PPD provision for their staff: whilst creating a vibrant 'research community' with all the accompanying benefits, this could lead to serious financial difficulties for such schools, particularly primary ones. In response to this issue, the WIE has offered staged payments, which in some circumstances has proved helpful. The PPD funding available to the participants with QTS has been invaluable in helping to minimise the cost of the programme for the students and thus removing the financial barrier to participation. The

WIE has also been able to respond creatively to the time restraint factor by offering a variety of delivery models in consultation with each participating cohort.

Engagement in CPD

The provider highlighted that some of the factors that make the courses on offer effective include:

- they have provision relevant to teachers and are practice based;
- they are integrated with the teachers' ongoing work and commitments in terms of the action research design, implementation and expectations;
- they are focused on an innovation in a school setting;
- they are based on participants' needs analysis and personalised accordingly;
- they are contextual but also allowing and encouraging participants to see the bigger picture;
- they blend teachers' personal and professional development;
- they are sustained over time and thus have a more significant impact on the participants and their practice.

Most Warwick PPD courses are bespoke and thus course content and delivery is shaped around the needs and requirements of a particular partner or cohort of participants. Another factor adding to a variety of models of delivery and teaching and learning strategies deployed by the staff is the diversity of awards and modules offered by WIE.

The course delivery for one of the awards, MA Drama and Theatre Education, developed in partnership with the Royal Shakespeare Company, is designed to provide a balance of reflection, practical experiences of theatre and drama and participants' independent learning through, for example extensive reading. The weekly sessions are delivered by programme tutors, invited guests and students themselves.

The *Leading Professional Enquiry* module provides a different model of course delivery. Typically, a mixture of preparation materials is sent to students for their independent learning before they arrive for the first session. This helps them engage in informed discussions with their colleagues during a session, which also includes lead input in smaller breakout groups. At the end of each session students receive a task for the following session. As part of this module students also undertake a small scale research project within their work setting. In order to help the participants to take a reflective and critical view of their practice and context, they are required to keep a research journal with their reflections about the project, details of specific events, and a collection of comments from children and colleagues.

Working collaboratively with colleagues from similar schools, or of similar interests, and setting up networks across a particular area of enquiry is very much encouraged by the tutors. Collaboration is often easier when several colleagues from the same school participate in PPD and engage in a research project based around their school needs and priorities. Working with clusters and networks of schools as well as partners such as SSAT, which have their own extensive networks, allows the provider to offer participants an opportunity not only to learn from their peers but also to disseminate their findings.

Learning outcomes and impact

The WIE monitors the impact of the PPD programmes in a variety of ways which include:

- participants' assignments;
- Needs Analysis Forms and Professional Development Review Questionnaires completed by PPD participants;
- Stakeholder Review Forms;
- consultations with the key players in the programme, the participants, partners, PPD tutors and the internal CPD team about analysing the impact of PPD;
- External Examiners' Reports; and
- existing formal WIE review mechanisms, including Staff Student Liaison Committees.

According to the partnership's impact evaluation documents, teachers believed they had benefited in several ways as a result of studying at M level. The most common impacts related to:

- wider pedagogical and subject knowledge that informed and directed new classroom practices;
- understanding and use of action research techniques to explore and support curricular developments;
- increased confidence and improved working relationships with colleagues;
- ability to reflect on and question current personal professional practice;
- confidence in evaluating classroom practice against various frameworks; and
- more effective use of assessments, targeting and monitoring of pupil performance.

Many participants recorded impact in terms of undertaking new initiatives or planning new developments as a direct result of engagement in the programme.

Some of these improvements are reflected in the following comment from a teacher:

Generally: more knowledgeable questioning with regards to key issues, also keen to find out more about educational issues. I now have the ability to do this in an analytical and evaluative way. Meaning I can audit something and suggest a way forward. Specifically: after doing two action research pieces it has led to changes in the areas of student voice and gifted and talented provision. For example identifying the best model to accelerate G&T students - this has now been adopted. Changes to student voice provision in terms of participation should come on line this year.

The provider recognises that a longer timeframe is required to evaluate the impact of the teachers' PPD on their pupils. Participants felt their involvement on the PPD programme had positive effects on their pupils' performance, motivation and engagement in the classroom:

The co-operative learning is having an extremely positive impact on our students, we have noticed a change in attitude and an increase in their level of motivation and self esteem.

Pupils identified as part of intervention programme have significantly improved attainment profiles.

The pupils reflect, debate and enjoy my lessons and the work rate and grades demonstrate this.

The data collected from various sources undergoes analysis and the findings are reported to the Management and Executive Committees of the WIE. To ensure that the impact is scientifically monitored and fully considered when planning and designing future PPD provision, the WIE has changed its approach to impact evaluation which is now seen as a longitudinal academic research project, run by a team of University staff deploying a range of research methods.

Summary of messages to TDA

WIE identified several key messages for the TDA:

- PPD participants demonstrate significant connection between their Masters level study and their practice; PPD is particularly effective in encouraging and supporting teachers' critical reflection;
- the TDA funding is essential to make Masters level development possible for teachers;
- considering the remit to the wider workforce, PPD funding should be offered to all educational professionals working in children's services, rather than only to the participants with the QTS, to support their professional development at Masters level;
- teachers' professional development is more effective and has better impact on their practice and their pupils when it is continued and sustained over time as opposed to a number of short (even if accredited) CPD opportunities; and
- in our experience of offering PPD and CPD courses, we noticed that teachers who start working at Masters level during their NQT year often encounter significant problems when trying to cope with the pressures of their workload at school and demands of their study; which often leads to them giving up on the latter. The outcomes and experience of Masters level professional development is a lot more positive for teachers who enrol on their PPD course during or after their second year of teaching.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University

- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about "becoming more critical" and "engaging in discussion with other professionals."

Warwick University's telephone interview responses

The 11 participants at Warwick identified a range of key motivations for studying on the M level course: improving subject knowledge (6), improving leadership skills (1), career development (2), improving practice (2), personal professional development (8), being funded (1) and to benefit the school (1).

Participants hoped to learn/improve personal professional development (2), subject knowledge (9), leadership skills (2), practice (6), and to research/implement change (2).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

Warwick University’s telephone interview responses

9 interviewees received some financial support. 4 participants’ fees were fully funded and 5 participants had some help with funds. 2 participants received no financial support.

Schools supported participants in the following ways: allowing study leave/time (4), providing professional/moral support (5) and funding (4). 2 said they receive no support from their school at all and 1 said this was not applicable to them.

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

Warwick University's telephone interview responses

Participants identified barriers to studying their PPD course: time to attend sessions and study (5), insufficient funding (2), level of challenge offered by the course (1), finding cover in school (1) and lack of/access to resources (2). 3 said there were no barriers.

Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses included: making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (1), improving access to the library (1) and more funding/fund supply cover (1). 7 interviewees made no suggestions.

Parts of the course participants enjoyed the least were: writing up assignments (3), some of the lectures/guest speakers (1), background reading (1) and poor timing of assignments (1). 5 said that there was nothing they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

Warwick University's telephone interview responses

6 participants said they had access to enough information about the course; 2 said they did not. 2 said it was well advertised; 1 said it was not. Participants found out about the courses from a range of sources including: formally via school or LA (2), informally via a colleague in school or LA (3), chose the programme from the website (2), responded to an advert/flyer (3) and from a previous course (1).

6 participants made suggestions for improving the marketing of the course to get more people involved. Suggestions included: direct advertising to CPS coordinators in schools (3), suggested other media (TV, local press, professional publications and the internet) (2) and emphasising funding (1). 5 participants made no suggestions.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

Warwick University’s telephone interview responses

6 participants said that tutors encouraged them to work collaboratively with other teachers. 5 said their course included coaching. 8 participants said tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 3 said this was not applicable to their course. 7 said their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons; 2 said it did not; and 2 said this was not applicable to their course. 4 said they made use of observation as part of their course; 6 said they did not; 1 said this was not applicable to their course. 4 said the course built in opportunities to experiment with practice in the classroom; 5 said it did not; and 2 said this was not applicable to their course.

Practitioners’ responses about the structure and organisation of the courses referred to: venue- university (4), after school/evening (2), weekend meeting (2), holiday sessions (2), whole day (1), specific hours/blocks (3), distance learning (6), lectures (1) and tutorials (5). 4 said the teaching itself was at a good/excellent level, 7 said it was helpful and 3 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable.

Practitioners’ responses about the forms of assessment on the courses referred to: written essays (10), dissertation (4) and reviews (1). 9 participants said they found these methods effective for their own professional development.

Support given specifically for writing essays included: submitting drafts for review (2), feedback from tutors (8) and module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (3). 9 participants said this support was good.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)

- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Warwick University's telephone interview responses

9 participants said they had tried to involve other colleagues. 6 said they had been encouraged to share what they had found out with other colleagues. This was largely achieved by sharing learning/research with colleagues (4), implementing a policy or project at school (3) and being involved in an event outside school (1).

Aspects of the course participants enjoyed the most were: research (4), group work and sharing ideas with colleagues (2), particular lectures/content (3) and independent study (1). 3 participants said they enjoyed the entire course.

8 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practice. They said the course had: made a difference for professional practice (2), improved teaching practice (3), helped them become more reflective (3) and helped them become more critical (1). 3 said it was too early to say.

4 participants said they had influenced their colleagues learning; 2 said they had not. Those that had, said they had either made a difference for professional practice (1) or influenced them informally (1). 3 said it was too early to say.

5 participants identified that the course had impacted on their pupils directly and 1 identified an indirect impact. Participants had noticed: improved learning (1), more engagement (5) and increased confidence (1). 2 felt it was too early to say.

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by the participants were the chance to reflect on practice (5), improved understanding/learning/confidence (8) and updating their professional knowledge (4).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and

- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for

learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

University of West of England, Bristol

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during February 2008, and interviews with the Partnership Manager, the

Head of the Secondary Education and Lifelong Learning Department, three tutors, two school partners and a local authority (LA) partner. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The University of West of England (UWE) is the lead member in a partnership which includes the LAs Bristol and South Gloucestershire, and local schools. The PPD partnership has been running for ten years but there has been collaboration between the University and some of the schools for longer than this. The partnership is run through Partnership Strategy Groups which involve LA partners and representatives from primary and secondary schools respectively. Working in partnership with LAs helps the University to identify where and what sort of provision is needed and enables it to extend the range of expertise available to it. An example of this is the MA (Raising Achievement in City Schools – RAICS) which has the specific aim to ‘support and motivate Bristol educators in raising achievement in schools and make an impact on the work of professionals in the workplace’. Module tutors include University staff and LA specialists as well as students who have successfully completed their MA.

The University school partners fall into one of two categories. There are firstly the enhanced partnership schools; students in these schools, which have traditionally close ties to the University and have significant numbers of teachers engaged in school-based and University study are offered free modules. The second level of partnership, known as extended partnership, provides an annual waiver of 40 credits i.e. credit for 2/3 of a 60 credit module for up to six teachers in a secondary school and up to four teachers in a primary school. This category of partner includes any school that takes UWE students as trainee teachers. An example of an enhanced partner school is Patchway Community College where a cohort of 20 students are currently undertaking MA studies and nine teachers have already completed an MA.

The partnership continually develops the PPD programmes it offers by collecting information from a range of sources including:

- feedback from students and school personnel;
- regular meetings the PPD leaders have with LA staff;
- teacher representatives on the School of Education CPD management committee; and
- contacts between tutors and other agencies such as LA strategy groups, head teacher groups, Subject Associations and UCET.

LA representatives and UWE partnership staff meet before Easter each year to discuss the offer they would like to make for the following year. This is based on the LA development plan and currently includes (for Bristol LA):

- 2 behaviour modules – Teaching Behaviour for Learning and Helping Children and Young People Manage Themselves Socially and Emotionally;
- 1 SEN module – The Role of the SENCO in Mainstream Settings; and
- 1 pedagogy module - Teaching for Learning.

The 48 places (12 per module) are all fully funded by the LA. The course presentation is planned jointly between a UWE tutor and an advisory member of the appropriate team from the LA, who teaches 5 of the 10 sessions. For example, the behaviour module receives

significant input from a LA specialist with wide experience of behaviour issues in local schools. Not only does she teach some sessions, she also supports teachers during the module, promotes the course in schools and recruits students to the course. This kind of contribution is highly valued by UWE staff who appreciate the wealth of experience and local knowledge it represents. In a similar vein a SEN module for aspiring SENCOs, which is run jointly by UWE and Bristol LA, includes support from practising SENCOs.

Another key partner is the City Academy, Bristol where the school staff are engaged on creating and nurturing a 'research culture' according to the school's director of research and Associate Tutor for PPD. Recruitment has blossomed from 19 students in the first year to 38 in the current year. The school runs a 'professional reflection day' in July which helps to inform planning for the following year. School-based professional study has replaced traditional INSET.

The partnership offers a variety of Masters degrees within four main programmes:

- MA Education
- MA (Raising Achievement in City Schools – RAICS)
- MA Education (Special Educational Needs)
- MA Education (Early Years)

For all the routes available through these programmes UWE are particularly keen to accredit what teachers are already doing in their schools and classrooms. However, they point out the absolute necessity of ensuring that teachers' portfolios are enhanced by critical reflection, the ability to critically analyse the literature and to show emerging skills in using evidence to tackle problems identified in their schools and classrooms, i.e. the essential '*M-ness*'. Students are allowed five years to complete the MA but this can be extended if they bring a 'letter of currency' to explain the situation the student is in.

The main areas covered by the provision are:

- subject knowledge and subject pedagogy;
- behaviour for learning;
- special educational needs;
- mentoring and coaching; and
- leadership and school improvement.

In addition, independent studies, school improvement through action enquiry and dissertations offer teachers and groups of teachers the opportunity to focus on their particular school and professional needs.

Recruitment and participation

Numbers of students on UWE PPD programmes have remained fairly constant, with a total of 307 enrolling in 2006/7, and a similar number in the following year. Of these the majority enrolled on the MA Education with a smaller but growing number of recruits joining the Raising Achievement in City Schools MA, reflecting the local concern about achievement in Bristol schools which is among the lowest in the country. Increasingly UWE are recruiting NQTs.

The provision is marketed through:

- word of mouth;
- existing networks between UWE and LAs;
- existing networks between the UWE and schools, in particular schools
- involved in ITE;
- an annual conference at which students are encouraged to share good practice;
- through the PG Primary and Secondary Initial Teacher Education Programmes
- links to existing professional development programmes in schools; and
- the UWE, School of Education website.

Needs analysis is a key part of the provision and occurs at the levels of LAs, schools and individual students. For example, programme tutors engage in conversations with head teachers to ensure that programmes are meeting the needs identified by schools. Teachers on the courses, head teachers and LA partners have identified a number of barriers to teachers studying at M-level including the nature, timing and location of the provision, confidence, and anxieties about assessment. The partnership has met these concerns through a combination of measures including:

- offering a variety of locations and times;
- presenting a flexible, modular course that allows students to progress at their own pace and take breaks in study as required;
- offering high levels of negotiation within and between modules;
- putting a number of support methods in place;
- offering financial incentives (see Partnership section above); and
- making a variety of assessment modes available.

UWE provides students with access to a range of research-related activities within the School of Education, such as research seminars. Students also use recent Ofsted reports, research findings and guided reading in module handbooks. Students have access to the evidence base through journal articles provided to them by tutors, the University library and access to online journals, information made available via the VLE, and data that emerge during their own enquiry activities. There is a continuous emphasis on making links between the research and students' current practice.

Engagement in CPD

UWE delivers programmes through weekly sessions lasting between two and three hours. Each programme lasts for ten weeks; approximately half of all modules are taught at the University and half are based in schools. The University sessions involve a mixture of lectures/seminars, workshops and personal tutorials. In addition, students' learning is supported online through a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). On some modules students have the opportunity to share their learning with professionals from other backgrounds such as from health and social services.

Students engage in a range of professional learning activities, including:

- using role-play to experiment with new ideas;
- carrying out between-session tasks such as reading research findings or conducting a small-scale enquiry;

- working with tutors to identify learning goals and research foci which link to real classroom issues;
- working with tutors to identify the ways in which they link their professional learning to school targets; and
- sharing practice with other students and the tutor by reviewing data collected from action research and enquiry.

In some cases Associate Tutors themselves are studying at Doctoral Level at the same time as their students. One tutor has completed a dissertation on mentoring. This experience and her own school background in mentoring students at ITE level enables her to encourage existing mentors for ITE to have their work accredited for M level study and to guide them through a series of workshops at UWE to that end.

Collaboration is an important part of the programmes and tutors facilitate support groups (learning sets) that provide opportunities for students to experiment with new ideas. These become particularly helpful for students during the dissertation phase. There are also one-to-one tutorials.

City Academy Bristol is a key school partner. Staff at the school have developed a successful research culture at the same time as building M level learning at the school. The CPD leaders use coaching: five 'leaders of learning' each coach five other members of staff who are engaged on PPD courses.

School-based Associate Tutors (ATs) receive training sessions from UWE staff. They are also fully supported via access to UWE's Blackboard VLE. ATs carry out a number of functions in support of students including:

- providing advice and support, including '*nagging*' in the words of one AT;
- running sessions in the school;
- helping students link their foci of study to performance management requirements;
- dealing with problems students encounter such as time, anxiety and assignment writing; and
- reading students' first drafts for assessment.

Students on the portfolio (school-based) route write reflective journals which contribute to assessment, have the options of sequential assessment in 'bite-sized chunks', and oral and poster presentations as well as written assignments. If students opt for poster presentations they still need to submit a written piece of work, but it is smaller than a full written assignment would be. An independent study module can be assessed by PowerPoint presentation; students make the presentation to a group of peers, who can ask questions, and the overall work is marked by two tutors. On taught modules assessment mainly involves students writing about directed tasks and reporting on school based action research projects. In all cases students need to complete a dissertation if they are to proceed to the full MA.

Learning outcomes and impact

The University monitors the impact of its PPD programmes in a variety of ways, including:

- systematic evaluation of individual modules based on perspectives of students and tutors;

- annual review involving partners;
- external examiners who attend exam boards twice a year;
- students' assignments and research reports;
- head teachers' comments;
- presentations by students to other members of the group during taught modules;
- monitoring attendance and completion rates;
- an annual event at which students celebrate achieving their MAs and present summaries of their research which are posted on the University's intranet; and
- external consultants.

The partnership reported a strong feeling that the PPD programmes benefited teachers in a number of ways, including their:

- motivation, commitment and self confidence;
- skills in using evidence to inform them about the current issues in their schools and classrooms;
- subject knowledge and understanding of pedagogy;
- skills of reflection and collaboration;
- use of coaching and mentoring; and
- confidence and competence in engaging in professional dialogue.

These teacher quotes are illustrative of the range of impact:

I have changed the way I plan lessons. I look for ways to incorporate peer assessment, independent learning and creative tasks.

One of the best things for me was that my MA studies supported my professional role as a mentor for trainee teachers...

UWE staff also believe that pupils gained from their teachers' participation in M level study, with improvements in pupils':

- use of pupil voice;
- engagement in research;
- skills of reflection;
- understanding of how they learn;
- communication skills; and
- attitudes to learning, motivation and confidence.

One teacher commented:

There has been a definite improvement in my students' ability to look at problems and use information to develop an opinion based on evidence...

While another noted:

My pupils were intrigued by the notion of their teacher being back in school and when I shared my difficulties with them there was an enhanced sense of empathy between us....

Summary of messages to TDA

The partnership believes the current arrangements work well and wish to see them continue. In particular the Partnership Coordinator commented favourably on:

- the flexibility it offered in relation to the content of the modules;
- the variety of routes to accreditation through the modules available to students, especially the portfolio route for school-based learning; and
- the range of LA and school expertise it made available for delivering the programmes.

Partnership representatives also identified a number of key messages for the TDA, including:

- the TDA funding for PPD should be continued and not subsumed under MTL funding;
- there should be transferability of PPD credits to MTL;
- changing the funding so that it relates to 30 credit modules rather than a PG Certificate; and
- giving consideration for funding for non-QTS staff, e.g. many TAs are interested in the behaviour module run by UWE in conjunction with LAs.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England

- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

The University of West England’s telephone interview responses

Key motivating factors for the 9 participants on the University of West England’s courses have been: improving subject knowledge (2), career development (4), personal professional development (5) and being funded (2).

When asked what they hoped to learn, responses were varied and included: personal professional development (7), improving subject knowledge (2), improving leadership skills (1), career development (1), improving practice (4), to become more reflective (2) and to do research/implement change (2).

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

The University of West England's telephone interview responses

The majority of participants received some financial support (8). 7 were fully funded and 1 received some help with funds. 1 received no support at all.

Schools supported their practitioners by providing the following: study leave/time (3), professional/moral support (6) and funding (4).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)
- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

The University of West England's telephone interview responses

7 of the 9 participants said they had to overcome barriers in order to participate in their PPD course. Participants identified time to attend sessions and study (6), personal commitments (2) and level of challenge offered by the course (1). 2 participants faced no barriers.

5 participants made suggestions to improve the accessibility of the courses. These included: encouraging schools to support study leave (1), making sure the venue is accessible/time flexible (2) and providing/improving online and distance learning opportunities (2). 4 interviewees made no suggestions.

6 interviewees said that there were features of the course that they did not enjoy: writing up assignments (1), poor admin (1), time (2) and parts of the content (1). 3 participants said there was nothing they did not enjoy.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

The University of West England's telephone interview responses

All participants interviewed said that they had access to enough information about their course; 4 said it was well advertised; and 1 said it was not well advertised. The participants found out about the courses from a range of sources including: found out formally via school or LA (1), found out informally via a colleague in school or LA (2), chose the programme from the website (1), already had links with the provider (3) and from a previous course (4).

Suggestions for improving the accessibility of the courses included emphasising the benefits of improved practice (1) and visiting schools (2).

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching
- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13
Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

The University of West England’s telephone interview responses

6 participants said that they were encouraged to work collaboratively with other teachers. 5 said the course included coaching. 4 said they made use of observation as part of their course. 6 said tutors did not model new skills and practices in real classroom situations; 3 participants said this was not applicable to their course. 5 participants said the course built in opportunities to experiment with new practice in classrooms; 3 said it did not; and 1 said this was not applicable to their course. 4 said their course built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons; 3 said it did not; and 2 said this was not applicable to their course.

We asked the participants about the structure and organisation of the courses. Participants cited: venue- university (8), after school/evening (6), weekend meeting (1), whole day (1), specific hours/blocks (8), VLE/e-learning (1), lectures (3), seminars (3), tutorials (2) and workshops/group work/discussion-based learning (3). 4 said the teaching itself was at a good/excellent level, 2 said it was helpful and 1 said the lecturers/teachers were knowledgeable. 1 participant said some lecturers were better than others and 1 said the lectures were too dry.

All 9 participants were assessed by written essays. Other forms of assessment included: presentations (1), action research (1), dissertation (2) and creating a DVD (4). 5 said they found the methods of assessment effective for their own professional development; 1 said they did not.

Support given for writing assessments included submitting drafts for review (4), feedback from tutors (7) and a module/seminar/booklet on writing skills (1). 6 participants said the support given was good whilst 2 said there was not enough support.

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice

and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

The University of West England's telephone interview responses

7 participants had tried to involve other colleagues in their M level school work; 2 said they had not. 8 had been encouraged to share what they had found out with others. This was largely achieved by shared learning/research with colleagues (8) and 1 participant had also implemented a policy/project at school.

The majority of participants identified group work and sharing ideas with colleagues as the part of the course they enjoyed the most (6). Other participants enjoyed particular lectures/content (1) and independent study (1).

8 of the 9 participants said taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Participants identified that the course had: made a difference for professional practice (5), improved teaching practice (4), helped them in a change of role/promotion (1), helped them become more reflective (3) and helped them become more critical (1).

7 participants said they had influenced their colleagues learning. They said they had made a difference for professional practice (2), influence learning through INSET (3), improved teaching practice (1) and influenced their colleagues learning informally (1).

7 said the course had impacted on their pupils. Participants had noticed: improved learning (2), more engagement (4) and increased confidence (1). 1 felt it was too early to say.

The main benefits of engaging with research identified by the participants were: chance to reflect on practice (4), improved understanding/learning/confidence (5), updating professional knowledge (1) and the specific benefits to their school (3).

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and

- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development Quality Assurance Strand

Site Visit Report

The University of Winchester

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. The report also draws on the information gathered by the researcher who visited the site during March 2009, and interviews with the Head of CPD, CPD project manager, CPD programme administrator, six tutors (four internal, two external), one headteacher and three MA students. Further information has been gained from telephone interviews with students and reviews of student portfolios.

Partnership

The key partners in planning and developing the PPD provision led by the University of Winchester are Hampshire county council schools services, Hampshire Teaching and Leadership College, the Early Years Childcare Unit, the Education Psychology Service plus around 400 schools and clusters.

Winchester is also an active member of the Southern Partnership for Professional Development, a consortium of four local authorities (Portsmouth, Isle of Wight, Southampton and Hampshire) and six universities (Winchester, Chichester, Brighton, Portsmouth, Sussex and Southampton) which work together to maximise PPD coverage across the region and discuss the complementary nature and distinctiveness of the programmes offered.

Collaborative funding is partly invested in staffing to support links between the university and its partners and partly to subsidise fees for Masters level learning by teachers from partnership schools. The support team, particularly the programme administrator, ensure that external and internal communications are extremely smooth, efficient and clear. The director has additional responsibility for developing and managing partnerships associated with the programme, including course development and regular planning/feedback meetings with the various stakeholders.

Joint planning with specific LA personnel together with regular Programme Committees (with both teacher and LA representation) enables programmes to meet the needs of schools identified by the LA, for example, the need for an increase in the numbers of Hampshire teachers with an early years qualification. Another more recent example is of an English Adviser from Hampshire County Council wanting to put on CPD for primary teachers

in teaching writing and reading. HCC approached the university about accreditation and the university are working to accredit the training at M level.

Partnership working is strong in several areas. For example when citizenship became a key issue for schools, contact was made with the Association for Citizenship Teachers and the HCC advisor for citizenship and a new module was put together in a tripartite collaborative model, demonstrating strong partnership between the university and local authority. Between 20 and 25 teachers have completed this citizenship module each year for the past three years.

Members of the partnership external to the university confirmed that the university is very good at working with the local education community, is embedded within local networks and is viewed as an equal partner in developing and delivering PPD rather than simply a top down 'provider' as is the case with some higher education institutions.

A Partnership Advisory Group comprising headteacher representatives from a range of LAs and the various geographical areas within Hampshire provides a mechanism for the discussion of school needs on a termly basis. A thriving partnership with local primary schools, largely a result of the established ITT provision, facilitates the informal identification of training needs which can be followed up. It has led, for example, to the development of modules on mentoring designed to improve the support of student teachers and NQTs in partner schools and to new work engaging teachers in science at the foundation stage. Direct negotiations with school senior managers take place frequently. Students are predominantly from Hampshire schools but there are also significant numbers from other authorities (e.g. Southampton and west Wiltshire).

The partnership approach to PPD is showing benefits at many levels, in particular extremely positive relations with schools leading to needs-led provision, delivery of modules in collaboration with other specialist agencies and a demonstrably increasing commitment to PPD by individual local teachers.

Recruitment and participation

During 2007/08 there were 850 teacher registrations on the PPD provision, of whom only 9 withdrew. Qualifications awarded at exam boards (MAs, Post Graduate Certificates and Diplomas) have risen from 15 in the whole of 2004/05 up to 72 during the first 8 months of 2008/09. The post graduate Certificate in Advanced Educational Studies is currently proving particularly popular. Teachers are also increasingly continuing their studies beyond their first module and actively seek a Masters level certificate. More than 20 teachers started dissertations in September 2007. The ITT training at Winchester is Primary focused and therefore unsurprisingly there is a high female majority on most PPD provision.

Course evaluations, teacher surveys, discussions with LA representatives, head teachers on the Partnership Advisory Committee and informal discussions with teachers at Winchester's 400+ partner schools indicated a range of potential barriers, some of which have been successfully addressed. The barriers identified included pressures of workload, lack of time, difficulties in attending courses at a distance, problem with the timing of course sessions, difficulties with college processes as a part-time student, access to library facilities, and national initiatives, such as Ofsted Inspections that militate against engagement with award bearing professional development. Teachers have also commented that they would welcome a career structure linked to a funded PPD programme.

Currently the Head of CPD and the CPD project manager are visiting local schools and where appropriate inviting them to become 'learning hub' partners. These hubs will negotiate their own model of PPD delivery which will be provided on school premises at the time and structure individually designed to meet the needs of each school hub. Some hubs are groups of teachers from a single school; others include teachers from feeder and other local partner schools. This model is proving popular, judging by current interest and sign up. There are currently around 14 active learning hubs and several more due to come on line in September 2009. This model will require careful management by the University of Winchester, to ensure outreach tutors have the skills, resources and availability to deliver on a variety of school sites.

The learning hub model is a potentially powerful way of enhancing local collaboration and shared learning. For example for one of the hubs in Andover it was reported that this was the first time that secondary and primary schools have worked together closely in such a way, using collaborative CPD.

Generally headteachers and other senior teachers act as advocates for the PPD provision, recommending it to others by word of mouth. Several senior teachers who have undertaken some PPD have gone on to act as tutors on units and this is a model which the university is encouraging. Other modules are promoted informally at lead teacher meetings.

Despite high profile and high enrolments there remain schools unaware of provision. For example a recent visit to a Basingstoke school who wanted to talk about the future MTL highlighted their lack of awareness of PPD opportunities which already exist, despite a great deal of marketing effort. All schools in Hampshire (and beyond) are sent a brochure of PPD courses each year. Also flyers advertising individual courses are sent out prior to them starting. Despite this, students interviewed reported that some colleagues remain unaware of the flexibility of M level study, viewing it as a fixed programme of study which has to be completed in a set period.

Winchester has worked hard to make PPD provision more accessible. By ensuring that provision meets the identified needs of schools, Winchester has been able to negotiate with head teachers for release time, including cover for planning in groups, collecting data and tutorial time with a college tutor. Local Authorities have also provided supply cover for some teachers to attend planning and presentation meetings. Increasing the amount of provision that is taught in school premises and the growing volume of school-based work has reduced the travel time for teachers, enabling the professional development support to be embedded in their own school development plans and relates the support directly to their working environments. School-based provision makes use of training days. When supply cover is secured, day time rather than twilight teaching is possible. With the increased availability of library materials and journals online, teachers no longer need to visit the campus to access research literature.

Retention and completion rates for individual units are very good. When teachers do drop out it is usually only temporarily due to pressure of work or changes in personal circumstances. Overall the administration and support provided by the university is universally praised by partners and students as being particularly strong and being a prime factor in the recruitment and retention of students.

Engagement in CPD processes

Winchester offers a modular programme. Accredited exit routes are possible at 60 credits (Post Graduate Certificate), 120 credits (Post Graduate Diploma) or 180 credits (Masters Degree). Individual modules are 20, 40 or 60 (dissertation) credits. The programme consists of a choice of:

- 85 optional modules – maximum of 36 hours tutor contact, 164 hours student study and 4,000 word assignment;
- 2 compulsory modules – *‘development of professional practice’* and *‘research methods and dissertation planning’* – maximum of 36 hours tutor contact, 164 hours student study and 4,000 word assignment; and
- dissertation module – minimum 10 hours tutor support, 590 hours of student study and 18-20,000 word assignment.

Some of the optional modules focus on knowledge and understanding and others have a more specific pedagogic or school-based focus. Some popular areas are early years, SEN and mentoring and coaching and there are specialist named awards in these areas. Delivery has shifted from being campus-based to more distributed and local delivery, with much teaching taking place on school premises. E-learning is also on the increase. Teachers are able to undertake small tasks that contribute to portfolios of work rather than write up single research project reports. Pairs or small groups of teachers can make joint submissions to enable them to work collaboratively on school-based research. Generic modules facilitate provision based on individual school development plans or identified school priorities, particularly in those modules focusing upon school-based enquiry and the examination of professional issues. The growth in take-up of school-based enquiry modules shows evidence of need for this.

There is a strong focus on teacher led practitioner research. The approach helps to improve practice by encouraging teachers to be aware of their own practice, be critical of that practice and be prepared to try out and evaluate change. Teachers are expected to draw on academic research, inspection evidence and national test and examination data in the process of examining their own practice.

With the school- based programmes, a tutor undertakes a preliminary needs analysis with the headteacher or senior management team before identifying the focus for the support programme (based on school development plans, school targets and teachers’ own professional targets). More detailed planning takes place with a small working group, SMT or designated coordinator. The area of research and principles and practices that underpin the area are introduced at a whole group session, where opportunities are also given for teachers to explore and challenge their values and practices. The session also includes an introduction to action research and the notion of teachers as researchers.

Teachers identify their area of concern in small working groups based on an agreed school focus of improvement. They undertake some preliminary research in their classrooms to find out the particular needs of their pupils and from this evidence plan a small-scale research project. Action planning includes: providing a context for their area of concern, identifying research question(s), strategies for improving the situation, success criteria (e.g. changes in pupil behaviour and performance), evidence to be collected, and reading that will improve teachers’ knowledge and understanding of the problem.

Teaching on school premises and e-learning are increasingly common methods of delivery. There is a great deal of face-to-face support for students, as well as electronic support through VLE and e-learning / e-tutoring. Visits to other schools are built into many modules. This has proved to be a powerful learning tool.

Learning and evidence (collected by teachers, other adults in the classroom and by pupils themselves) is shared with other teachers through team meetings, staff meetings, presentations of team projects during whole-day INSET days. Reports describing the outcomes of the projects with evidence of impact on pupil performance are also shared with other members of staff and with other schools, if in a network. The impact on pupils' performance is discussed during feedback sessions led by tutors and teachers throughout the projects.

Learning outcomes and impact

Each module is succeeded by a student evaluation exercise that asks about impact (on practice, pupils and the wider school). Module tutors complete a summary based on these evaluations. Student and partner representatives (including head teachers) report on impact to the Programme Committee.

Staff delivering the PPD stress that impact is strongest when it is 'built in' to provision. For example several of the units require students to do a presentation on pupil impact resulting from their PPD to all staff in their school.

Evidence of impact gathered include samples of pupil work before and after the interventions, video of pupils working and reflecting on their own learning, interviews with pupils and other adults in the classroom, teachers' own observation notes and diaries, and teacher assessments.

The impact ranges from the acquisition of new skills, greater understanding of their professional role, understanding of the use of research, working more effectively with other teachers, improved self-esteem and career progression. Teachers' assignments for example, demonstrate they have gained knowledge of research, learned about a range of counselling techniques and considered the practical advantages and disadvantages to implementing them. Early years courses have provided examples of teachers developing observational skills. Improved self-esteem is often linked to promotion. A young reception teacher who worked with her colleagues for two years gained in confidence and in her ability to present her ideas to groups of other teachers was subsequently appointed to a new school as a deputy head.

The Impact Evaluation summary report completed for the University of Winchester gives a large number of examples of impact at a pupil, teacher and school level and these were confirmed by interviews with current students.

One of the PPD projects on reading part-funded by the DCSF required all pupils involved to be tested prior to and following the interventions. The participating schools were supportive of this rigorous impact measurement and the results were positive. Other units have used perception data to gauge impact. Head teachers are generally happy to support measurement of impact. In the citizenship unit schools of participating teachers are given follow up visits to assess impact on a longer timescale.

Written work is published where appropriate, improving the dissemination of impact. Dissertations are placed in the public domain and occasional papers are published and used by tutors.

The programme has had a marked impact on pupils too as a result of teachers offering them a range of new learning experiences, such as making sculptures outside. Many teachers collect pupils' views of the changes in practice and have reported the significant effect the new experiences have had on pupils' attitudes to working, their recognition that enjoyment of learning was important and the development of new skills. For example, pupils were reported as being more able to pose questions that extended their thinking and helped them come up with more ideas. Other evidence available demonstrates improvements in pupil confidence, engagement with learning and attainment in the areas of PPD (especially examples from the D&T, mathematics and art modules).

Teachers' end-of-module evaluations also show that almost all teachers feel that the school-based tasks support school improvement well or very well.

All programmes are regularly revalidated – review panels check for relevance and impact. In addition, all participating teachers contribute to an annual monitoring process through module evaluations.

Winchester evaluates the impact of its provision in several ways: end-of-module evaluations, teachers' PowerPoint presentations of their action research, teacher assignments and responses to the university's Student Satisfaction Survey. The nature of the impact on teachers' professional learning varies because of the variety of courses on offer and the personalised nature of the projects undertaken by the teachers.

The programme is subject to Winchester's usual quality assurance processes. These include monitoring of programme outcomes and evaluations of training through annual reports provided by programme directors for scrutiny by the Faculty Quality Committee that reports to the University Academic Standards Committee. The quality of training is monitored and evaluated through observation of teaching, auditing student support, informal discussion with course participants, staff/student consultative meetings and questionnaires. Each course is also formally evaluated by the tutor and participants in writing at the end. These evaluations are summarised by the tutor and held by the programme director. Programmes encourage feedback from professional partners through the partnership committees, advisory groups and subcommittees referred to above. External Examiners provide independent scrutiny of specific elements of the programme on a regular basis. The regular revalidation process requires both a critical analysis of the programme and evidence of how new proposals have been informed by evidence from a range of stakeholders.

Summary of messages to TDA

The PPD units are all in the process of being re-approved. Some uncertainty was expressed as to the value in re-approving the complete list of modules, as future funding to support M level study is uncertain.

Concern was expressed that some existing students will be left part way through subsidised PPD without funding to complete programmes of study and will therefore have to find additional funding or be forced to drop out prior to completion.

There was wide agreement that Winchester has developed a strong model of collaborative practice making use of existing skills and talents whenever possible.

Practitioner Perceptions of PPD

During Summer Term 2009, CUREE researchers interviewed 145 practitioners registered on PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the third year of the quality assurance project. The partnerships are:

- University of Bath
- Bath Spa University
- Bishop Grosseteste University College
- University of Brighton
- University of Bristol
- University of Derby
- University of Exeter
- University of Greenwich
- University of Hertfordshire
- Liverpool Hope University
- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Portsmouth
- St Mary's University College
- Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)
- Staffordshire University
- The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)
- University of Warwick
- University of the West of England
- University of Winchester

The researchers asked questions under six umbrella headings:

1. What motivated participants to engage in PPD?
2. What kinds of support did they receive?
3. What were the barriers to participation and how were these overcome?
4. Recruitment: how were PPD programmes marketed and how well-informed were potential participants?
5. What professional development processes were involved? (For 2009 we included additional questions about the CPD processes)
6. What was the impact of participating in PPD?

This section of the report offers programme-level outcomes from all the interviews across nineteen partnerships under these six headings. For each of these six headings, we also report on the outcomes of the interviews from the students within your own partnership.

1. Motivation to participate in PPD

The majority of the students (67%) said that they embarked on their PPD programme for their own personal and professional development purposes. 38% specifically identified their career development as a prime reason for participation. 17% mentioned funding as an incentive. Two students said they took part because the course was run at their own school and two said they wanted to benefit the school through their participation in PPD.

Asked what it was they hoped to learn as a result of their participation, 44% said they wished to improve their subject knowledge. 12% wanted to develop their leadership skills and over half (53%) wanted to acquire the skills to improve their practice. A substantial minority (17%) were keen to undertake classroom-based research and to implement changes as a result of this work. Nine students said that they wanted the opportunity to become more reflective about their own practice and two talked about “becoming more critical” and “engaging in discussion with other professionals.”

2. Financial and school support for students

2a Financial support

The large majority (86%) of all interviewees said that they had some sort of financial support in undertaking their PPD programme. Just over half (51%) were fully funded – i.e. all their fees were covered. About a third (35%) said they had “some” help with funds. Four students also received funds for supply cover and only 18 (12%) said that they received no financial support at all.

2b School support

Support provided by schools varied considerably. Just under a quarter of students interviewed (23%) said that they were given time off for study leave or to attend lectures. Over half (53%) said that their schools provided professional and/or moral support. Thirteen students (9%) said they received no support at all. Other forms of school support included funding (68%), venue provision (8%) and rearranged timetables (three students).

3. Barriers to participation

Students were asked what barriers they had had to overcome to take part in their PPD course. Finding the time to attend course sessions and to study was identified as the major barrier by the majority of respondents (62%). 19% mentioned their personal commitments. Travel was a problem for 10 students (7%). 10% of all students cited shortage of funding as an issue. Lack of access to resources (or the absence of resources) was cited by a further 10%. A handful mentioned the problem of finding cover in school, the timings of the course sessions they were required to attend or sustaining their motivation. However 27% of interviewees said that they had experienced no such problems.

Asked how the accessibility of course provision could be improved, half the students made no suggestions. Of the rest, the most significant recommendations were:

- Ensure accessible venues (11%)
- Encourage schools to support study leave (9%)
- Provide or improve online or distance learning opportunities (7%)

- Better access to library resources, library induction or improved library resources (6%)
- More funding of supply cover (5%)

Three students said they thought that the expectations of the course should have been made clearer and two suggested that deadlines and timings should be arranged to coincide with school holidays.

When asked about any issues and problems in terms of the nature and content of the course and its delivery nearly a third (30%) of the students said that there was nothing that they did not enjoy. Issues identified by the remainder included:

- Writing up assignments (18%)
- Content/relevance of parts of the course (15%)
- Quality of individual lecturers/speakers (10%)
- Unclear structure/expectations (6%)

Six students cited the amount/quality of background reading specified as part of the course preparations, four said they waited too long for marks and feedback on assignments and two said the timing of assignments was poor.

4. Visibility and Marketing of PPD Programmes

The largest block of respondents (36%) said that they had found out about the course formally, through their LA or through their school. A second group (17%) said that they had found out about the course informally, also through a school colleague or LA contact. 15% of students had responded directly to an advertisement or leaflet/flyer. 13% percent knew of the course as a result of previous study and 10% said they already had links with the provider. 12% had chosen the course from a website as a result of their own search efforts.

Students were asked whether they thought the courses were well advertised and whether initial information was sufficient to enable them to make a decision to participate or not. 31% said they thought their course was well advertised and 80% thought that enough information had been provided. 17% thought it was not well advertised and 12% thought that insufficient initial information had been provided.

When asked how they thought pre-course advertising and information provision could be improved, 42% of all interviewees had no suggestions to make. However, nearly a third of the rest wanted to see more direct advertising and information provision directly through CPD co-ordinators in schools. A few (7%) suggested that school visits by course providers would be beneficial and 6% suggested making use of ex-students to promote the courses to colleagues. Five students suggested advertising to PGCE students following completion of their courses; four suggested a greater emphasis on the benefits for teachers of improving their practice; and four thought that funding support could be better advertised.

5. CPD Processes

Students were asked specifically about their course design and delivery in terms of the following list of inputs and processes:

- Collaboration
- Coaching

- Modelling
- In-class experimentation
- Observation
- Lesson planning and review
- Course structure and organisation (e.g. venue, timing, etc.)

They were also asked about forms of assessment.

Table 1: Student responses

Does your course include:	Yes %	No %	N/A (For example if the course focused on leadership some classroom inputs may not have been relevant)
Working collaboratively with one or more teachers?	83	17	
Coaching	43	56	
Tutors modelling new skills and practices in real classroom situations?	22	66	11
Opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom?	74	15	10
Use of observation?	56	39	5
Built in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons?	54	30	14

Structure and Organisation of the course

Nearly two thirds of students said that their courses were organised around specific blocks of time of which 59% were in the evenings after school and 16% involved weekend meetings. 18% were designated whole days and 13% involved distance learning. 25% of students said that they were able to study on-site at their school and half (50%) said that they travelled to attend course sessions at a university venue.

Assessment

Asked what forms of assessment were used on their course, students replied as follows:

Assessment form	%
Written essays	85
Presentations	30
Dissertation	19
Action research	13

Portfolio	13
DVD/Posters/Journal	11
Other (Interviews, reviews)	3

Students said that they received a range of support with writing assessments. This included: Feedback from tutors (62%), reviews of early drafts (39%) and guidance/seminars on writing skills (21%). The majority of students (73%) felt that the level of support they received was good while 10% felt that they did not receive adequate support with assessment.

Students were also asked how they would characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful they found it. Their responses showed that most courses adopted a mix of delivery modes. 46% described their teaching inputs as tutorials; 37% said they had lectures; 37% said they took part in workshops and other forms of group or discussion-based learning; and 29% said they attended seminars.

Nearly all the students said that they either found their teaching inputs good, excellent or helpful. A handful thought that some lecturers were better than others and three felt their lectures were “too dry.”

6. Impact of Participation

Three quarters of the students (75%) said that they had attempted to involve their school colleagues in their PPD work while 23% said that they had not. Most (83%) had been encouraged either by their schools or by their PPD providers to share their learning or research with others. 59% had managed to share their work directly with colleagues at their school, of which 14% were colleagues also involved in the PPD course. 15% said they had implemented new policies or projects at their school and 7% had been involved in an event outside school where they had been able to share their learning.

Participants were asked which part of their course they had most enjoyed. They replied as follows:

- Group work, sharing ideas with colleagues (43%)
- Research (27%)
- All aspects (14%)
- Content and inputs from particular sessions (10%)
- Applying research/implementing change at school (8%)

Others mentioned their interactions with a particular tutor, field trips, independent study and updating their scientific knowledge.

87% of participant interviewees said that taking part in the course had influenced their practice. Only one student said that it had not. Of these, 92% said that it had made a difference to their professional/teaching practice. 9% said their leadership skills had improved. 14% said that they had implemented a policy or project, 17% said they were more reflective, 6% said they were more confident and 8% thought it was too early to say. Other outcomes mentioned by individual teachers included increased creativity, improved listening skills, more critical in their practice and changed roles/promotion.

Influence on colleagues

Nearly three quarters (71%) of respondents thought that they had directly influenced their colleagues' learning although 11% said they had not and 10% felt it was too early to say.

Impact on Pupils

Most (61%) of respondents had noticed the impact of their involvement in PPD on their pupils. A further 7% said they believed that there had been indirect impact on pupils. 12% had not noticed any impact and 14% thought it was too early to say. A large number (45%) of teachers said that their pupils were now more engaged with their learning as a direct result of changes to their own practice. 30% said that their pupils' learning had improved.

Benefits of Research

Finally, students were asked what they thought were the benefits of engaging with research. The large majority (72%) said that it improved their understanding, advanced their learning and increased their confidence. 41% said that it offered them a chance to reflect on practice and 37% said that engagement with research was a means of updating professional knowledge. Other mentioned sharing ideas, making a difference to children's learning, self fulfilment, thinking outside the school context and bringing specific benefits to the school as a whole.

Review of student portfolios

CUREE researchers conducted a review of student assignments and projects as part of their work for the PPD programmes offered by the 19 partnerships involved in the Quality Assurance project this year.

The purpose of the portfolio analysis was to enable the researchers to review the evidence in relation to the data already collected from the documentary analyses, site visits and student interviews. The researchers analysed data in five broad fields:

- assignment title plus type of project;
- the focus of the activity;
- what the intended learning for teacher programme participants 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.

We looked at samples of work from 96 student portfolios. A summary of the outcomes of the portfolio review is presented below under these five headings aggregated over the sites concerned. All figures are in percentages.

Project/assignment type

The students' portfolios reflected their professional learning activities at various stages of progression and credit level and so were not directly comparable. However, they provided evidence to illustrate and complement the data we had already collected.

This year we requested that all assignments should reflect student work and ruled out portfolios reporting, for example, on literature reviews.

Hence inquiry formed the basis of all the portfolio work with the largest number of projects being action research (72). Of the others, there were:

- 4 evaluations;
- 4 case studies;
- 2 examples of resource development;
- 3 'portfolios of activity';
- 14 descriptive studies; and
- 1 other.

The choice of themes for inquiry represented a range of issues, with some assignments covering more than one theme or subject area, including:

- subject teaching and learning (46);
- inclusion, well-being and SEN (18);
- teachers' professional learning (including reflection and mentoring and coaching) (17);
- leadership and management (9);
- behaviour (4); and
- AfL (4).

Other issues explored by students comprised a varied and evenly populated list: creativity, parental involvement, thinking skills and use of ICT. Unsurprisingly, many portfolio studies related to subject teaching and learning. In comparison with figures from a similar-sized sample of portfolios in Year 2 of the quality assurance project, the number of studies with a focus on inclusion and well-being almost doubled.

Intended learning for students and pupils

The intended learning outcomes for students were mainly focused on improved teaching skills (50) across a range of subjects including science (8), ICT (8), literacy (7), MFL (7), numeracy (4), geography (4), art and design (2), music (1), history (1), religious studies (1), citizenship (1) and psychology (1), some of which were cross-curricular. It was noticeable that there was a significant increase in the number of studies of MFL. The remaining learning outcomes for students were divided between:

- knowledge and understanding of school processes (24);
- professional learning skills (17); and
- leadership and management skills (5).

School processes were those which involved whole-school, whole-phase or other initiatives targeting a group of pupils rather than single classes. They covered a very varied field, including strategies to: increase pupils' achievement, improve behaviour and motivation, engage parents in pupils' learning and enhance creativity.

Fifty-two percent of studies referred to direct improvements in pupils' learning as an intended aim of their PPD work. Twenty-one percent of students explicitly referred to identified improvements in behaviour, motivation and confidence among specific groups of pupils as intended outcomes of the PPD work. The impact on pupil learning was referred to

indirectly in terms of a consequence of students' learning in 24% of studies, and 9% of the assignments did not make explicit reference to pupil learning outcomes.

Intervention processes

Students on the programmes engaged in a wide range of activities and processes. These clearly reflected the stated aims of the majority of the programmes to align course activities with the teachers' or schools' own priorities and issues. Forty-two percent of students sought to implement and evaluate a specific intervention. These were spread over a very large number of themes such as reading, writing, assessment for learning, behaviour for learning, numeracy, dialogue, learning difficulties, transition, inquiry approaches to learning, thinking skills, student voice and ICT, across the range of subjects listed in the previous section. Most of the interventions targeted specific groups of children.

Among the other portfolio studies there were many examples of teachers exploring issues related to enhancing teaching and learning, such as improving pupils' behaviour and/or motivation, promoting inclusion and well-being and tackling pupils' learning difficulties. The studies covered a wide range of professional learning activities and processes including: collaborative inquiry with colleagues, individual professional learning based on changing practice and coaching or mentoring colleagues.

Impact evaluation

The majority of projects in our sample included an element of evaluation (76) to assess the impact of the activities on the school, pupils or both. The majority of students engaged in inquiry-based methods for assessing impact. Data collection included:

- survey questionnaires (34);
- observation (including, in a small number of cases, the use of video) (25);
- interviews (interviewees ranged from parents and teachers to pupils, depending on the focus of the project) (22);
- learning logs/journals (7);
- tests and assessments (6); and
- document analysis (6).

Only six percent of the assignments made use of various (and sometimes unspecified) forms of assessment, mainly analyses of pupil work during the course of the intervention. One student assessed pupils' work before and after the intervention. Most of the students made use of more than one source of evidence.

In 59% of the reports there were examples of pupil impact data: these ranged from test results, survey responses and interview transcripts to observation records. Some projects explored organisational or whole-school processes and professional development activities such as reflection which it would be difficult to link with short-term pupil impacts. Others were still incomplete and data had yet to be collected.

Seventy-one percent of the portfolios in the sample discussed the strengths and limitations of the data and/or the project design in relation to the perceived impacts. This points to a high level of engagement with inquiry methods.

Appendix 3. Analytic Framework

Table name	Level	Question no.	Data description	Values
Organisation	*	*	Partnership provision ID (Provider ID)	Number
Organisation	*	*	Consortium partners	Free text
Organisation	*	*	Number of consortium partners	Number
Programme	*	*	AutoNumber	AutoNumber
Contact details	*	*	Provider ID	Number
Contact details	*	*	Lead organisation (Name)	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Name (Forename/ Surname)	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Address 1	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Address 2	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Address 3	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Address 4 (Town/County/Postcode)	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Email	Free text
Contact details	*	*	Telephone	Free text
Programme	*	*	Partnership provision name	Free text
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Course ID	Number
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Region	Free text
Region	*	*	Partnership provision ID	Number
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Priority areas (Logical fields for each of 6 priorities)	(Any of: Subject knowledge/pedagogy SEN 1 st 5 yrs Mentoring Other national priorities Local priorities)
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Stages (6 logical fields)	Any of:

				Foundation KS1 KS2 KS3 KS4 Post 16
Subjects	*	*	Course ID	Number
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
Course	*	*	Partnership provision ID	Number
Course	*	*	Course ID	AutoNumber
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Other priorities (Also 8 logical fields)	Free text
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Qualifications (4 logical fields)	Any of: Certificate Diploma Masters Doctorate
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Awarding body	Free text
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Number FT participants	Number

2005-08 programmes	*	*	Number PT participants	Number
2005-08 programmes	*	*	Course (Programme)	Free text
Course	*	*	Number of female students	Number
Course	*	*	Source	Free text
Course	*	*	Number of male students	Number
Course	*	*	Source	Free text
Phase	*	*	Partnership provision ID	Number
Phase	*	*	Type of school/ phase	Any of: Primary Secondary Special PRU Secure Unit Other
Phase	*	*	Source	Free text
Experience	*	*	Partnership provision ID	Number
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 +
Experience	*	*	Source	Free text
Programme	*	*	Total FT registrations	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text
Programme	*	*	Of which have completed	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text
Programme	*	*	Of which are expected to complete	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text

Programme	*	*	Total PT registrations	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text
Programme	*	*	Of which have completed	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text
Programme	*	*	Of which are expected to complete	Number
Programme	*	*	Source	Free text
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	Question 1	What did the needs analysis involve? Please tick all that apply	Local priorities National standards National strategies Needs identified by heads Ofsted Participants' feedback Pupil needs Teacher needs
			Any other aspect of needs analysis not included above	Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 2	What are the issues and needs for schools and teachers, relating to the focus of PPD? Please tick all that apply	Teaching and learning Assessment Leadership ICT Performance management Subject knowledge development Supporting particular groups of pupils (e.g. struggling readers)
			Please state any issues and needs not included above	Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 3	What are the issues and needs for schools and	Accreditation of previous work

			<p>teachers, relating to the delivery of PPD? Please tick all that apply</p> <p>Please state any issues not included above</p>	<p>Assessment tailored to teachers' existing work demands</p> <p>E-learning</p> <p>Flexible delivery</p> <p>Location</p> <p>Provision of mentors/tutors</p> <p>Timing</p> <p>Wide range of modules</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1	Question 4	<p>Have providers consulted with local and national stakeholders?</p> <p>Who have providers consulted with? Please tick all that apply</p> <p>Please state anyone who has been consulted not included in the list above</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Don't know</p> <p>Current and/or past participants</p> <p>Disability associations (e.g. Dyslexia Association)</p> <p>Employers</p> <p>HEIs</p> <p>LEAs</p> <p>National agencies</p> <p>Ofsted</p> <p>Private providers</p> <p>Professional development staff (e.g. CPD coordinators)</p> <p>Regional networks</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>Special interest groups e.g. NAGTY</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1	Question 5	What processes of accreditation are there?	Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 6	Have teachers had an input to course design?	Yes

			Please describe the input they have had	No Don't know Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 7	Have stakeholders had an input into course design? What sort of input have they had? Please tick all that apply Please state any stakeholder inputs not included in the list above	Yes No Don't know Co-developing programmes/modules Evaluation, monitoring and review Feedback on course plans/designs Contribution to course delivery (e.g. as external or associate tutors) Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 8	Has course provision been aligned with school goals and leadership? If yes, please specify how. Please tick all that apply Please state any other ways provision is aligned with goals and leadership not included above	Yes No Don't know Heads/schools identify school goals Student research project aligned to classroom issues Student research project aligned to school development plan/school improvement Learning targets linked to performance management targets Schools assess their specific training needs (e.g. SEN) Teachers select their own research/assignment focus Free text

Programme	Level 2	Question 9	What opportunities did the course design create for professional learning?	Free text
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	Level 1 Barriers	Question 10	What do the providers see as potential barriers to recruitment? Please tick all that apply Please specify what the providers see as potential barriers to recruitment	Transport Fees Timing Location Childcare Nature of the provision Access Concerns about academic work Lack of support Lack of confidence Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 11	Do the providers mention race or disability as a barrier to participation?	Free text
Steps	Level 1 Barriers	Question 12	What steps have providers taken to overcome these barriers? Please specify the steps providers have taken to overcome these barriers	Bursaries Nurseries Running courses locally Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 13	How is provision marketed?	Press and media CPD coordinators

				<p>Email</p> <p>Events/conferences/exhibitions</p> <p>Newsletters/leaflets/fliers</p> <p>School INSET</p> <p>Through headteachers</p> <p>University/LA networks</p> <p>Website</p> <p>Word of mouth</p>
			Please state any marketing not included above	Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 14	<p>What sources of information about the course are made available?</p> <p>Please state any other sources of information not included above</p>	<p>Fliers</p> <p>Information pages on website</p> <p>Course handbooks/guides</p> <p>Prospectus</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 15	Does the partnership provision marketing target BME and disability students? If yes please specify	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Don't know</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 16	Do providers monitor BME and disability data? If yes please specify	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Don't know</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 17	What do providers do with BME and disability data that they collect?	Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 18	<p>How many apply for the provision?</p> <p>Comment on application number</p>	<p>Number</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 19	<p>How many BME students apply for the provision?</p> <p>Comment on number of applications from BME</p>	<p>Number</p> <p>Free text</p>

			students	
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 20	How many students with disabilities apply for the provision? Comment on the number of enrolments	Number Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 21	How many students enrol? Comment on the number of enrolments	Number Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 22	How many BME students enrol? Comment on number of BME students enrolled	Number Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 23	How many students with disabilities enrol? Comment on number of students with disabilities enrolled	Number Free text
Programme	Level 1 Barriers	Question 24	What is the evidence that participation is increasing?	Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 25	What is the timing of the provision? Length of sessions e.g. 2 day blocks, 2 hours etc.	Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 26	When do sessions occur? Please state any session timings which do not occur above	Negotiated School time After school Weekends Holidays VLE Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 27	How does learning/embedding new practice occur? Please state any other ways learning/embedding new practice occur not included above	Workshops Distance learning Personal sharing with tutor In-school practice Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 28	How much time is spent on embedding new practice?	Not part of course Less than 2 hours 2-4 hours

			Comment on the amount of time spent putting learning into practice	1 day Variable Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 29	Duration of partnership programme/provision Please specify if the partnership provision duration is different from the options	1 term 2 terms 1 year 2 years 3 years 4 years Depends on qualification Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 30	Frequency of sessions Please specify if the frequency of sessions is different from the options given above	Weekly Fortnightly Monthly Termly Varies Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 31	What is the location of the provision? Please specify if the location of the provision is different from the options given above	Online In school In class Other schools Local firms Professional development centres University Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 32	How have individual teachers' starting points been	Initial assessment/audit by tutors

			taken into account? Please state any ways teachers' starting points have been taken into account not included above	Programmes of study negotiated between LAs, schools and participants School and pupil data collected Self-assessment by participants Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 33	What pre-course planning and support was available to applicants?	Free text
Evaluation objective 3 and 3.1 3.1 Lead to recognised qualifications at M level or above				
Programme	*	Question 34	What is involved in completing the modules? Please state anything involved in completing the modules not included above	Variety of reading Action research Analysing and evaluating examples of practice Case studies Dissertation Research and enquiry skills Literature reviews Free text
Programme	*	Question 35	How are modules assessed?	Free text
Programme	*	Question 36	How long does it take full time? Please state how long the course takes if different from above	1 year 2 years 3 years Free text

Programme	*	Question 37	How long does it take part time?	1 year 2 years 3 years 4 years 5 years 6 years Over 6 years
Programme	*	Question 38	How many re-enrol?	Free text
Evaluation objective 3.2				
3.2 Improve pupils' performance through embedded improvement in teachers' knowledge, understanding and practice				
Programme	Level 1	Question 39	How are improvements in pupil learning measured? Please state any ways improvements in pupil learning are measured not included in the list above	Anecdotal (reflections from participants) Attainment data Observation data Students' assignments/teacher enquiry projects Test results Assessment and evaluation outcomes External examiner report Formative feedback Programme evaluations Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 40	What evidence is there of direct improvements in pupil learning? Please state any other evidence of direct	Higher levels of involvement in learning Improved behaviour Increased motivation Improved knowledge Better inclusion strategies Improved achievement Free text

			<p>improvements in pupil learning not included above</p> <p>Please state any evidence of indirect improvements in pupil learning</p>	Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 41	<p>How have teachers' knowledge, understanding and behaviour changed?</p> <p>Please state any ways in which teachers' knowledge and understanding have changed not included above</p>	<p>Impact on pupils' learning</p> <p>Teachers' collaboration skills</p> <p>Teachers' action research skills</p> <p>Teachers' use of CT</p> <p>Teachers' understanding and skills relating to inclusion</p> <p>Links to work related learning</p> <p>Teachers' management and organisation skills</p> <p>Teachers' monitoring and assessment skills</p> <p>Teachers' pedagogical practice</p> <p>Teachers' knowledge and skills relating to specific subject areas</p> <p>Awareness of school's needs</p> <p>Teachers' leadership skills</p> <p>Teachers' confidence /self beliefs</p> <p>Teachers' questioning skills</p> <p>Use of coaching/mentoring</p> <p>Free text</p>

Programme	Level 1	Question 42	How are changes in teachers' knowledge and understanding measured? Please state any ways changes in teachers' knowledge and beliefs are measured not included above	Assessed tasks Assignments/school based projects Work sampling Self evaluation Sharing with other professions within school/department Interviews/reflection data Surveys Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 43	Have teachers' beliefs changed? If you answered yes please give details	Yes No Don't know Free text
Programme	Level 1	Question 44	What are teachers doing with their new knowledge and understanding?	Improvements in classroom practice Increase success teaching pupils with SEN Capacity building of teachers' skills Improving teachers' confidence Improving teachers' data analysis skills Improving teachers' use of feedback Improving teachers' participation in CP Improving teachers' problem solving skills Improving teachers' questioning Improving teachers' reflective practice Improving teachers' research skills Improving teachers' use of ICT Improving teachers' use of research Improving pupils' attainment Improving pupils' behaviour Improving pupils' engagement

			Please state any ways teachers are using their new knowledge and understanding not included above	Improving pupils' performance Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 45	Does the course involve in-school training? If yes Please give any other information about in-school training	Yes No Don't know After school tutorials E-learning opportunities School based mentors/tutors School based courses/meetings School visits by tutor Structured self study Classroom observation Meetings at neighbouring schools Video recordings Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 46	Does the course involve real time, in-class modelling? If yes Please give any other answers about whether the course involves real time, in-class modelling	Yes No Don't know Analysis of video Examples of practice School visits to see good practice Through workshop days Free text

Programme	Level 2	Question 47	Does the course address teachers' own concerns and issues? Please explain your answer	Yes No Don't know Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 48	Does the course include demonstration, practice and feedback? If yes Please explain any other ways in which the course includes demonstration, practice and feedback	Yes No Don't know INSET Watch video clips of good practice Coaching and mentoring Monitored by personal tutor Role play/simulations School visits including observation Through tutorials Students evaluate their own practice Workshop days Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 49	Is time built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning? Please explain how time is built in for in-class preparation and teacher planning	Yes No Don't know Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 50	Are there planned opportunities for peer support? If yes	Yes No Don't know Communication via email Inter-school visit

			Please explain any other planned opportunities for peer support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutorial group/seminars Workshops Coaching and mentoring Cross phase peer support Joint planning Collaboration between schools Collaboration within school Peer observation Use of VLE Video conferencing Video recordings of practice <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 2	Question 51	<p>What does the peer support aim to achieve?</p> <p>Please state any other aims of peer support not included above</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building Development of critical reflection/dialogue skills Development of teachers' confidence Development of teachers' problem solving skills Development of collaboration skills Sharing practice/expertise Development of use of research <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 2	Question 52	<p>Are there planned opportunities for classroom experimentation?</p> <p>If yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes No Don't know <p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action research Collaboration Critical reflection/evaluation Peer observation </p>

			Please explain any other planned opportunities for classroom experimentation not included above	Risk taking Tutor observation Free text
Programme	Level 2	Question 53	Does the course design relate to effective evidence of CPD? If yes Please explain any other ways the course design relates to effective evidence of CPD not included above	Yes No Don't know Builds on students' experience Coach/mentor/tutor support Collaboration between students Ongoing evaluation/review/development Uses feedback Uses observation Electronic support (conferences, email, Vle etc) Provision tailored to needs Shared practice/planning Shared resources Use of experts Free text

Programme	Level 2	Question 54	<p>Do teachers use feedback about pupil learning to inform their own professional learning?</p> <p>What data do teachers collect on pupil learning? Please tick all that apply</p> <p>Please state any other feedback about pupil learning teachers use that are not included above</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p> <p>Impact on classroom practice Impact on pupil performance Attainment data</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	Level 2	Question 55	<p>How do teachers use feedback about pupil learning?</p> <p>Please explain any other ways teachers use feedback about pupil learning to inform their own professional learning not included above</p>	<p>Action planning and reviewing Assessment tasks Participants required to write summaries of impact of project Reflection on practice Through classroom based research</p> <p>Free text</p>
<p>Evaluation objective 3.3 3.3 Develop teachers' research and problem-solving skills through the critical evaluation of evidence and research</p>				
Programme	*	Question 56	<p>What are participants' perceptions of their research/problem solving skills?</p> <p>Please state participants' perceptions of their</p>	<p>Familiar with research skills and method At a lower level than M level study Feel they are out of touch with them Low Frightened of research Varies Not a main focus of the course</p> <p>Free text</p>

			research/problem solving skills if not covered by the above	
Programme	*	Question 57	<p>Are participants using evidence from research and other data?</p> <p>If yes</p> <p>Please state any other types of evidence participants are using not included above</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p> <p>Case studies National data Regional data Research articles/journals School data Data from own action research</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 58	<p>How do participants gain access to the evidence?</p> <p>Please specify any other ways participants gain access to the evidence not include above</p>	<p>Action research Book boxes From tutors Library Ofsted reports Online Own search skills Taught sessions Handbook/booklet Observation</p> <p>Free text</p>

Programme	*	Question 59	How do providers offer access to the public knowledge base? Please state any ways providers offer access to the public knowledge base not included above	Access to library Additional courses Exchange visits Journals Other university resource Reading material/book boxes Taught modules Through tutorials Given access via Athens Online materials Through assignments Workshops Free text
Programme	*	Question 60	How do providers offer access to the local knowledge base? Please state any ways providers offer access to the local knowledge base not included above	Expected to use pupil, school and LEA data School priorities identified Action research Free text
Programme	*	Question 61	How do teachers use research skills to take their practice forward?	Case studies Collaboration Data analysis Modelling Discussion with expert Interrogation of research (e.g. literature appraisal) Assignments/tasks Enquiry/action research Links made to classroom practice Links made to own/school targets and

			Please state any ways teachers use research skills to take their practice forward not included above	<p>priorities Working with tutor</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 62	<p>How do they link this to solving learning and teaching problems?</p> <p>Please state any ways teachers use their research skills to solve learning and teaching problems not included above</p>	<p>Action research Combining knowledge from different area Interpretation of knowledge for own context Appraisal of literature Reflection/evaluation of learning Sharing practice Use of evidence Through taught course Coursework/assignments/case studies Encouraged to make links to classroom practice Through work with tutor</p> <p>Free text</p>
Evaluation objective 3.6				
3.6 Be subject to internal and external quality assurance procedures				
Institutional evidence	*	Question 63	What is the institutional evidence?	<p>Course validation processes Monitoring processes External examining arrangement Grades/measured achievements Quantitative data collected (e.g. attendance, retention and completion rates)</p>

			Please record institutional evidence not included above	Meetings/discussion forums Evaluation by participants Scrutiny of course documentation Baseline data Staff appraisal Peer review process Progression rates Analysis or assignments Free text
External evidence	*	Question 64	What is the external evidence? Please record external evidence not included above	Inspection reports School feedback Pupil questionnaires Student evaluations Case studies Impact on classroom Impact on pupils Student tracking Career paths Free text
Evaluation objective 3.7				
3.7 Provide specified management information and include an evaluation of the programme's (partnership provision) impact on practice in schools				
Programme	*	Question 65	Have providers established a baseline from which to assess participant impact? If yes	Yes No Don't know Assessment frameworks Observation frameworks Perspectives from Las Perspectives from tutor

			Please explain how providers have established a baseline if not covered above	<p>Pupil progress monitored School level data Skills audit Teacher-researcher defined baseline Self-assessment</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 66	<p>Has participant perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude (confidence, self-efficacy) etc. been included in the evaluation of impact?</p> <p>If yes</p> <p>Please state any ways participants' perception of changes in skill, knowledge, practice, beliefs, attitude etc. have been included in the evaluation of impact not included above</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p> <p>Action research projects Career trajectories Head teacher evaluations Participants' written evaluations/reflections School self-evaluations Student work/assignments Committee meetings External examiner Observations Student interviews/discussions Participants' reflections/learning journals Interviews/discussion with course tutors/LEA advisers/inspectors</p> <p>Free text</p>

Programme	*	Question 67	<p>Have other indicators: satisfaction surveys, school feedback etc. been included in the evaluation of impact?</p> <p>If yes</p> <p>Please explain any other indicators included in the evaluation of impact</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p> <p>Assessment by head/school CPD leader Portfolios of pupils' work Stakeholder evaluations Case study details Peer observations Satisfaction surveys Cohort monitoring data Student testimony Participant evaluations Formal feedback Telephone enquiries Impact on motivation, recruitment and retention Regular evaluation/feedback from students</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 68	What impact was found?	<p>Confidence raising Developed school culture Extended the range of teaching strategies available Focus on barriers to learning Improved collaboration Improved practice Improved reflection Improved understanding Positive effect on pupil behaviour Pupils' achievement</p>

			Please state any other impacts not included above	<p>Pupils' confidence Supported parents to deal with issues at home</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 69	<p>Have provider assessment outcomes been included in the evaluation of impact?</p> <p>Please explain how provider assessment outcomes have been included in the evaluation of impact</p> <p>Please state any other ways provider assessment outcomes have been included in the evaluation of impact not included above</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p> <p>Feedback questionnaire Mentors asked for comments Review meetings Students' reflection Through classroom based research Through quantitative data (recruitment, retention, completion and pass rates etc) According to university procedures Course impact evaluation By external examiners' perspectives Reports from HEIs Scrutiny of marking Scrutiny of students' work Whole school evaluation</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 70	<p>Have providers made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance? (e.g. through teacher action research techniques?)</p> <p>Please state what tools providers have used to assess</p>	<p>Yes No Don't know</p>

			<p>impact on student performance</p> <p>Please explain any other ways providers have made efforts to identify and use tools for assessing impact on student performance not included above</p>	<p>Analysis of school-based data e.g. Ofsted reports, assessment data Collection of case study data Interviews with participants/stakeholders/employers Marking or coursework/assignments Career trajectories Observations Participant evaluation of practice Portfolio of pupils' work Surveys of participants/stakeholders University assessment data Action research/enquiry Specialist assessment Students taught to measure pupil impact Teaching diary kept</p> <p>Free text</p>
Partnership				
Programme	*	Question 71	How well established is the partnership? How long has it been operating?	Free text
Programme	*	Question 72	How do the partners see their respective roles?	Free text

Programme	*	Question 73	<p>What added value has the partnership approach added to the PPD provision?</p> <p>Please provide any useful detail on the information provided above and/or additional information relevant to the question</p>	<p>Recruitment Expansion of provision Improved completion rate More diverse/inclusive student groups Ability to call on greater fields of experts</p> <p>Free text</p>
Programme	*	Question 74	<p>What are the characteristics of the partnership?</p>	Free text
Programme	*	Question 75	<p>What are the organisation structures of the partnership? E.g. is there a full time paid manager?</p>	Free text
Programme	*	Question 76	<p>How do partnership members learn from each other's experience and practice?</p>	Free text

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(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	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

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((Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
CLPE (Centre for Literacy in Primary Education)	LON	0	0	CLPE	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	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	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 Action	1	0	0	0	0	0	HEI/ Dyslexia Inst.	Head of training	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	
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	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	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	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	Head of INSET/ CPD	0	0	0	1	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(Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
											Business Partnership etc.													
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	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	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((Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
												for CPD												
North East Consortium - Durham LEA	NE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	Chief Inspector	0	0	1	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	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	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	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	
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	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	1	1	1	
School of Education (St Mary's	LON	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	HEI/ LA/ Schools/	Director	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((Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16	
College (2))											NLC/ NCSL														
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	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(Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
											Partnership Group													
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
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	CPD Coordinator	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	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(Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16			
											Group/ITT Partnership Management Group/Deaf Children Steering Group/Sing Bilingual Consortium/National Deaf Children's Society/Royal National Institute for the Deaf																
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	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	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			
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/	Professor	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(Other (specify)		1to5	6to10	11to15	16+	1to50	51to100	101to200	201to1000	1000+	Primary	Secondary	Post 16
											Council for Religious Education													
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

- 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. (2007) 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, University of London.
- 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, University of London.
- 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.
- Guskey, T. & Huberman, M. (Eds) (1995) *Professional development in education: new paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- 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.
- Soulsby, D. & Swain, D. (2003) *A report on the award-bearing Inset scheme*. London: TDA.