

**The POSTGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT (PPD) PROGRAMME
QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) STRAND YEAR 3
TECHNICAL REPORT TO TDA**



4 Copthall House,
Station Square
Coventry CV1 2FL

☎ +44 (024) 7652 4036

☎ +44 (024) 7663 1646

✉ info@curee.co.uk

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

- Michael Jopling (University of Wolverhampton)
- Chris Noden (freelance researcher)

The CUREE staff involved in the third year of the evaluation include:

- Philippa Cordingley
- Julie Temperley
- Miranda Bell
- Corinne Oldknow
- Janine McComiskey
- Natalia Buckler
- Donald Evans
- Colin Isham
- Kate Holdich
- Emma Jacobmeyer
- Sophie Kennedy
- Kirsty Bond
- Antoni Wojick
- Laura Smith

PPD Technical Report to TDA

TDA Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) Quality Assurance Strand Yr 3

Contents

Introduction	4
Budget Statement	4
CUREE Research Team	6
Sample	6
Partnership Managers' Conference	6
Methodology.....	7
Desk Research.....	7
Site Visits.....	7
Student Portfolio Reviews	9
Student Telephone Interviews	10
Report Writing	10
Appendix 1. Student Portfolio Review Grid	11
Appendix 2. Student Telephone Interview Questions	13

List of Tables

Figure 1. PPD Year 3 Budget Review	4
Figure 2. Breakdown of Costs for Year 3.....	4
Figure 3. PPD Year 3 Timeline	5
Figure 4. Breakdown of Site Visit Information.....	8
Figure 5. Number of Student Portfolios Reviewed per Site.....	9
Figure 6. Number of Telephone Interviews Conducted per Site	10

Introduction

1. 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.
2. The evaluation aimed to identify, highlight and communicate examples of good practice and areas where provision could be strengthened, and inform the nature and direction of further research.

Budget Statement

Figure 1. PPD Budget Review

The total budget for the three years of the evaluation is:

Year 1	2006-07	£94,472
Year 2	2007-08	£74,877
Year 3	2008-09	£67,623
Total	3 years	£234,972

Figure 2. Breakdown of Costs for Year 3

Project element	Cost
Project planning and management Project set up Project co-ordination Project board meetings Attendance at partnership managers conferences	£ 13,981
Research Desk research – data extraction of submissions documents, data returns, impact evaluations and any additional documentation Database population Site visits – preparation, visits, data input, travel and subsistence Telephone interviews with students Student portfolio review – including postage of student work	£ 31,903
Data analysis, report writing and QA	£ 21,739
Total costs	£ 67,623

Figure 3. PPD Year 3 Timeline

	September					October				November				December					January 2009				February				March					April				May				June					July				August											
<i>Week</i>	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5			
<i>Date</i>	01/09/2008	08/09/2008	15/09/2008	22/09/2008	29/09/2008	06/10/2008	13/10/2008	20/10/2008	27/10/2008	03/11/2008	10/11/2008	17/11/2008	24/11/2008	01/12/2008	08/12/2008	15/12/2008	22/12/2008	29/12/2008	05/01/2009	12/01/2009	19/01/2009	26/01/2009	02/02/2009	09/02/2009	16/02/2009	23/02/2009	02/03/2009	09/03/2009	16/03/2009	23/03/2009	30/03/2009	06/04/2009	13/04/2009	20/04/2009	27/04/2009	04/05/2009	11/05/2009	18/05/2009	25/05/2009	01/06/2009	08/06/2009	15/06/2009	22/06/2009	29/06/2009	06/07/2009	13/07/2009	20/07/2009	27/07/2009	03/08/2009	10/08/2009	17/08/2009	24/08/2009	31/08/2009							
Project set up and planning																																																												
Review of database and desk research																																																												
Site visits																																																												
Student telephone interviews																																																												
Student portfolio review																																																												
Data analysis and writing reports																																																												
Ongoing project management																																																												

CUREE Research Team

3. The CUREE research team comprised:

Project Directors	Philippa Cordingley (Chair Project Board) Julie Temperley (Fieldwork and Project Management) Miranda Bell (Data Analysis and Reporting)
Project Co-ordinators	Janine McComiskey Corinne Oldknow
Researcher	Colin Isham
Researcher	Donald Evans
Researcher	Kate Holdich
Researcher	Elinor Wilde
Researcher	Natalia Buckler
Researcher	Michael Jopling (University of Wolverhampton)
Researcher	Chris Noden (sub-contracted researcher)

Sample

4. A sample of 19 course providers/partnerships was selected for detailed investigation in Year 3. In Years 1 and 2 we sampled from the overall population. The sample in Year 3 therefore, was comprised of those providers/partnerships remaining that were not picked up by the Year 1 and 2 sampling frameworks. In Year 3 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

Partnership Managers' Conference

5. 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.

Methodology

Desk Research

6. CUREE continued to use the analytic framework developed in association with the Project Advisory Board and in consultation with TDA, based on an adapted version of the EPPI systematic review data extraction tool, to analyse documentation. The analytic framework is based on 3 key evaluation objectives and predictive indicators. It was designed to be capable of storing and analysing multi-method data types.
7. The evaluation objectives were:
 - Evaluation Objective 1: Effectiveness, quality and impact of course preparations;
 - Evaluation Objective 2: Effectiveness of participant recruitment and preparation activities; and
 - Evaluation Objective 3: Provider performance funding criteria and quality threshold.The evaluation objectives were subdivided into level 1 and level 2 indicators; these were developed from cumulative knowledge and expertise in the field of effective professional development.
8. 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.
9. 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

10. 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'.

Figure 4. Breakdown of Site Visit Information

Site Name	Date of visit	QA (researcher accompanied by CUREE Director)
University of Bath	26 th February	QA
Bath Spa University	21 st January	
Bishop Grosseteste University College	20 th February	
University of Brighton	17 th February	
University of Bristol	24 th February	
University of Derby	13 th March	
University of Exeter	25 th February	
University of Greenwich	11 th March	
University of Hertfordshire	26 th February	
Liverpool Hope University	18 th February	QA
Manchester Metropolitan University	26 th February	QA
University of Portsmouth	11 th February	
St Mary's University College	23 rd February	
Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)	30 th January	
Staffordshire University	25 th February	
The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)	No visit required ¹	
University of Warwick	24 th February	
University of the West of England	23 rd February	
University of Winchester	5 th March	

11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Site reports were validated by each provider. Copies of the 19 site reports are available in the Year 3 research report.

¹ No visit required as TDA commissioned a separate evaluation of this programme which was published in 2008

Student Portfolio Reviews

15. 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 (see Appendix 1 for Portfolio Review Grid) 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.

Figure 5. Number of Student Portfolios Reviewed per Site

Site Name	No. student portfolios reviewed
University of Bath	5
Bath Spa University	5
Bishop Grosseteste University College	5
University of Brighton	5
University of Bristol	5
University of Derby	5
University of Exeter	5
University of Greenwich	5
University of Hertfordshire	5
Liverpool Hope University	5
Manchester Metropolitan University	5
University of Portsmouth	5
St Mary's University College	5
Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)	5
Staffordshire University	5
The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)	5
University of Warwick	5
University of the West of England	5
University of Winchester	5

Student Telephone Interviews

16. Sample providers were asked to supply 10 student volunteers to take part in a telephone interview.

Figure 6. Number of Telephone Interviews Conducted per Site

Site Name	No. telephone interviews conducted
University of Bath	8
Bath Spa University	11
Bishop Grosseteste University College	6
University of Brighton	9
University of Bristol	9
University of Derby	9
University of Exeter	8
University of Greenwich	8
University of Hertfordshire	9
Liverpool Hope University	8
Manchester Metropolitan University	6
University of Portsmouth	3
St Mary's University College	5
Slough Partnership ITTP (Slough Grammar School)	9
Staffordshire University	6
The Networked Learning Partnership (The Learning Institute)	8
University of Warwick	11
University of the West of England	9
University of Winchester	3
Total	145

17. The interviews lasted between 20 and 30 minutes and focused on the following key areas (see Appendix 2 for Student Telephone Interview Questions):

- students' motivation to participate in postgraduate study;
- support for students;
- barriers to participation and possible solutions;
- marketing and availability of information about the course;
- effectiveness of teaching, assessment and support provided;
- impacts of studying at M level; and
- perceptions of the CPD processes.

Report Writing

18. 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. A full report with appendices was submitted to TDA on 31st August 2009.

Appendix 1. Student Portfolio Review Grid

Site name	
Student name	
Assignment title	
<p>1. What kind of project is this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action research • Evaluation • Case study • Portfolio of activity/evidence • Journal • Resource development • Description 	
2. What was the intended learning outcome for students (teachers)?	
3. What was the intended learning process for students (teachers)?	
<p>4. What was the intended learning for pupils?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did they hope to improve? 	
5. Has the project built on what is already known in field?	
6. What was the intervention – what did they do?	
7. Is there any mention of specialist or peer coaching being made available and/or used by the student (teacher)?	
8. Is there any evidence of problem based learning being offered by providers?	
<p>9. Did the intervention connect with any of these MTL themes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching and learning (particularly personalised) • Assessment for learning and use of performance data • Subject knowledge • Curriculum development • Child development, learning and behaviour • Inclusion • Leadership and management • Working with others 	
<p>10. What processes were involved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching • Mentoring • Collaborative enquiry • Individual enquiry 	

11. What was the focus? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedagogy • Subject • Curriculum • Student characteristics 	
12. Was impact evaluated?	
13. If so how?	
14. What was the impact for students and their pupils?	
15. Are assertions supported by evidence?	
16. If so what?	
17. Is there any consideration of contradictory evidence?	
18. If so what?	

Appendix 2. Student Telephone Interview Questions

This interview schedule is intended to guide the researcher in the areas that they should cover with the students when conducting interviews. The main focus of the telephone interview is the student's experience of the course (section 3) so please could you spend the most time on this section, the other information is to flesh this out.

Key areas to be covered in the telephone interview:

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

1. Information about the interviewee	
1. Name	
2. What is your role in school?	
3. How many years have you been teaching?	
4. What phase do you teach?	
5. What PPD course are you studying?	
6. What is the focus of your research or study? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissertation • Research masters 	
2. Getting involved in PPD	
7. What motivated you to become involved in PPD and why this course? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career • Improve knowledge in a certain area 	
8. What is it you hope to learn?	
9. How did you find out about this course?	
10. Was the course well advertised and did you have access to enough information about the course?	
11. Can you see any ways of improving the marketing of the course to get more people involved?	
12. What barriers have you had to overcome to take part in this PPD course? (e.g. location, time, access to resources)	

13. In what way could the course be made more accessible for you and other teachers?	
14. Do you have any financial support?	
15. Have you been tempted/tried to involve other colleagues?	
3. Students experiences of the course	
16. What parts of the course do you enjoy? Why?	
17. Do tutors encourage and support you to work collaboratively with one or more other teachers? (on the course or in your own school)	
18. Does the course include coaching? What does that entail?	
19. Do tutors model new skills and practices in real classroom situations? (i.e. do tutors actually come into class and demonstrate?)	
20. Does the course build in opportunities to experiment with new practice in the classroom? (e.g. do you have opportunities to try out new things and see what difference it makes to the pupils' learning?)	
21. Do you make use of observation as part of the course? How?	
22. Does the course build in opportunities for planning and reviewing lessons? How?	
23. What parts of the course do you enjoy the least? Why?	
24. How is the course structured and organised? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timings • Locations • Who sets the agenda 	
25. How would you characterise the teaching on the course and how helpful is this to you? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lectures • Seminars • Tutorials 	
26. What forms of assessment are used on the course? How effective do you find these for your own professional development?	
27. What support do you get with writing assessments? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation, planning and structure • Writing styles 	
4. Students and their schools	
28. Does your school support your involvement in PPD? If so, in what practical ways?	

29. Has taking part in the course influenced your practice? What have you done differently as a result?	
30. Have you influenced your colleagues learning?	
31. Have you noticed any impact of the course on your pupils? If so what?	
32. What do you think are the benefits from engaging with research?	
33. Have you been encouraged to share this with others? (i.e. do you share what you have found out with others? If so how?)	