



**An Evaluation for the General Teaching Council for Wales
of the Professional Development Pilot Projects
2001 – 2002**

Final Report Prepared by Professors David Egan and Roy James

EVALUATION TEAM

Project Directors:	Professor David Egan Professor Roy James
Project Manager:	Mr John Haslett
Project Consultants:	Mrs Sandra Davies Dr Nick Evans Mr Alwyn Evans Ms Elin Ogwen Dr Gwyneth Briwnant-Jones Ms Jayne Edwards Ms Pat Williams Ms Dorothy Morris

CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
1. Introduction & Methodology	3 - 5
2. The Participants And Their CPD Activities	6 - 12
3. The Views of Participants Based Upon Questionnaire Responses	13 - 15
4. Benefits To The Individual Teachers	16 - 19
5. Benefits To Schools	20 - 23
6. Strengths and Weaknesses of the Pilot Projects	24 - 29
7. Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions.	30 - 32

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. In November 2001, the PPI Group/UWIC were appointed by the General Teaching Council for Wales [GTCW] to undertake an evaluation of the three National Assembly for Wales funded Professional Development Pilot Projects (PDPP) being offered for the first time to teachers in Wales. The three projects were the:

- Professional Development Bursary Pilot Project [Bursaries];
- Visit and Exchange Pilot Project [V and E]; and
- Teacher Research Scholarship Pilot Project [TRS].

1.2. The brief of the evaluation was to identify the following:

- the impact of individually focused and controlled professional development activity on a teacher's professional effectiveness;
- the impact of participants' involvement on their schools, including the impact on raising standards;
- the impact and effectiveness of individually identified and controlled professional development activity by comparison with institutionalised GEST funded activity and professional development mechanisms elsewhere in and outside the UK;
- the effectiveness of the Council's three professional development pilot projects, in relation to promotion of the philosophy of Continuing Professional Development [CPD], take-up of funding opportunities and administration of projects.

1.3. To fulfil the brief the evaluators were required to:

- produce a desk-based review of individually focused Professional Development activities in other professions in the UK and in teaching in the UK and other countries;
- work with the Council to develop an evaluation pro-forma for the pilot project participants;
- work with the Council to develop a questionnaire for headteachers and/or line managers of participants;
- work with the Council to develop a questionnaire for tutors/mentors of Teacher Research Scholarships participants;
- produce a qualitative and quantitative report outlining:
 - the number of participants in each pilot including a statistical analysis of the breakdown in relation to phase, location, sex and linguistic ability;
 - the nature of activities undertaken in each pilot. This element should include analysis and a grouping of activities;
 - the benefits that individual teachers have gained from participating in the pilot projects;
 - the benefits for the school of teachers participating in the pilot projects;
 - comparing the outcomes identified from the project with outcomes for other means of undertaking CPD;
 - the strengths and weaknesses of the pilot projects (including the administration of the projects);
 - recommendations for the future implementation of the pilot projects;
 - suggested areas for future pilot projects.

- 1.4. In the first phase of the evaluation – the desk based review – continuing professional development [CPD] activities in the following professions within the UK were considered: Engineering; Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting; Solicitors; and Medicine. PD activities in teaching in the following countries were investigated: Malaysia; Ghana; New Zealand; Korea; USA (New Jersey); Australia; European Union; Ireland; and France.
- 1.5. A separate report on this phase was submitted to the GTCW on 21 January 2002 and is, therefore, not included here in full. However, the findings are taken into consideration in the discussion in sections 6 and 7.
- 1.6. In the second phase:
 - an evaluation pro forma was sent to all participants in the pilot schemes;
 - a questionnaire designed to elicit views of the effectiveness of the schemes was sent to the headteacher of each of the participants;
 - a questionnaire with a similar purpose was sent to each tutor/mentor of participants in the TRS scheme.

The pro-forma and questionnaires were devised in consultation with GTCW officers. Responses were received from 1025 participants, 104 headteachers / line-managers and 29 tutor/mentors. An analysis of the responses is given in section 3. The responses, together with the other aspects of the evaluation, referred to below, inform sections 4 – 6.

- 1.7. The questionnaire surveys were supplemented by face-to-face interviews with at least 45 participants in each of the three schemes and by face-to-face or telephone interviews with 30 headteachers/line-managers of participants' schools.
- 1.8. The interviews were undertaken by a team of 10 experienced consultants who hold, or have held, senior posts in education. The consultants worked to a common aide memoire to ensure consistency of approach.
- 1.9. The interviewees were selected to provide a representative sample of the participants in the three schemes. The following factors were taken into account:
 - The age, experience, seniority, phase, specialism and gender of the participants.
 - The location, size, status and medium of instruction of the participants' schools.
- 1.10. In addition to conducting the interviews, the consultants, between them, read all the completed pro-formae and questionnaires, and also the reports that each participant was required to submit to the GTCW on completion of their project.

2. THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR CPD ACTIVITIES

- 2.1. The quantitative analysis that follows is based upon information relating to the 1471 teachers who participated in the GTCW scheme, as supplied by the Council.
- 2.2. Of the 1471 applications, 1113 (76%) were from females and 358 (24%) from males [Table 2.1]. These percentages are close to percentages of each gender (72%female and 28% male) currently registered with the GTCW; but there is a very slight skew towards female applicants overall, and in the secondary and special sectors; the gender balance of primary applicants is exactly the same as that on the GTCW register. Table 2.2 shows that females are proportionately under-represented on the TRS and over-represented on the V and E.

Table 2.1 : Applicants by sector and gender compared to GTCW Register

Sector	Total Applicants	Female	Male	On GTCW Register	
				Female	Male
Nursery	8	8			
Other	3	2	1		
Primary	942	784 [83%]	158 [17%]	[83%]	[17%]
Secondary	483	295 [61%]	188 [39%]	[58%]	[42%]
Special	35	24[69%]	11[31%]	[66%]	[34%]
TOTAL	1471	1113 [76%]	358 [24 %]	[72%]	[28%]

Table 2.2 : Applicants by category and gender

Category	Female	Male	Total
Bursary	642 [74%]	225 [26%]	867
V & E	370 [82%]	79 [18%]	449
TRS	101 [65%]	54 [35%]	155

- 2.3 The applicants were drawn from 570 schools: 8 nursery, 397 primary, 144 secondary and 21 special schools. Thus nearly 30% of the schools in Wales were involved in the PDPP: this appears a significantly high proportion for a pilot scheme and indicates that these opportunities have been received enthusiastically by teachers in Wales. Whilst primary *teachers* are well represented, the proportion of primary *schools* involved in the scheme is low in comparison with secondary schools.
- 2.4. The table below provides detail on the number of years teaching experience of applicants and compares it with information on the current GTCW register:

Table 2.3 : Applicants by number of years as a teacher compared to GTCW Register

Years	Number of teachers	Percent of teachers	GTC Register Percent
0 – 5	319	22	23
6 – 10	337	23	14
11 – 15	231	16	8
16 – 20	184	13	7
21 +	400	27	48
TOTAL	1471	100.0	100.0

There is, therefore, a skew towards teachers with 6-20 years of service, with teachers in the initial stages of their careers (0-5 years) being represented in fairly close approximation to their numbers and those with 21+ years of teaching being significantly under-represented. There is no evidence to indicate the reason for this imbalance, but it is worthy of consideration by the GTCW.

- 2.5 Table 2.4 shows that a high percentage of applicants have been in their schools for less than 10 years(nearly 73%), with most (48%) having spent less than 5 years in their current post. There is a lack of qualitative evidence available to suggest a reason for this situation, although it is possible to speculate that the majority of teachers attracted to the scheme were seeking to add to their professional experience, in a way that might assist career progression.

Table 2.4 : Applicants by number of years in school

Years	No of teachers	Percent
0 - 5	698	48.2
6 - 10	362	25.0
11 - 15	231	15.9
16 - 20	85	5.9
21 +	73	5.0
TOTAL	1449	100

- 2.6 Table 2.5 shows the percentage of applicants of different status within the participating schools. There is a slightly different pattern for primary and secondary schools, with a higher proportion of applications from senior management in the former. This is likely to result from the fact that almost all deputy heads and many heads in this sector, are also responsible for a class. Only a small number of supply teachers [22 in all] took advantage of the PDPP.

Table 2.5 : Status of applicants

Status	Primary	Secondary
Head	9.5	1.5
Other Senior Management	11.7	6.9
Head of Dept/Curriculum Leaders	35.6	39.5
Special needs teacher	5.9	2.9
Standard National Scale	36.1	47.2
Supply teacher	1.2	2.1

2.7 Table 2.6 shows the number of teachers undertaking the PDPP from each LEA in Wales, the percentage this represents of total applicants and how this compares with the percentage of teachers from each LEA on the GTCW register:

Table 2.6 : Applicants by LEA and comparison with GTC Register:

LEA	No of applications	Percent	Percent on GTCW Register
Unallocated	3	0.2	N/A
Anglesey	27	1.8	2.2
Gwynedd	76	5.2	4.1
Conwy	44	3.0	3.6
Denbighshire	52	3.5	3.2
Flintshire	23	1.6	4.9
Wrexham	41	2.8	3.8
Powys	89	6.1	4.5
Ceredigion	32	2.2	2.5
Pembrokeshire	28	1.9	4.0
Carmarthen	84	5.7	5.8
Swansea	124	8.4	7.7
Neath Port Talbot	57	3.9	4.9
Bridgend	56	3.8	4.5
Vale of Glamorgan	141	9.6	4.2
Rhondda Cynon Taff	115	7.8	8.6
Merthyr Tydfil	58	3.9	2.1
Caerphilly	89	6.1	5.8
Blaenau Gwent	7	0.5	2.3
Torfaen	37	2.5	3.3
Monmouthshire	47	3.2	2.5
Newport	33	2.2	4.7
Cardiff	208	14.1	10.3

There is a clear variability in rates of application; particularly noticeable is the high take-up in Cardiff and the Vale of Glamorgan, and the low application rate in Blaenau Gwent, Flintshire, Pembrokeshire and Newport.

- 2.8 Table 2.7 shows the numbers and percentages of participants who undertook activities leading to a qualification or accreditation:

Table 2.7 : Applicants by those seeking qualification/accreditation

Yes	No	Male Yes	Male No	Female Yes	Female No
12%	88%	14.5%	85.5%	11.1%	88.9%

Whilst these figures should be treated with some caution, they nevertheless indicate that the vast majority of teachers involved in the GTCW projects were not seeking professional and/or academic accreditation for their work. Whilst this is the general trend in teaching, it is more marked than in other professions. The GTCW might, therefore, wish to consider how it might make applicants aware of opportunities to achieve accreditation through APL (accreditation of prior learning)/APEL (accreditation of prior experiential learning).

- 2.9. Tables 2.8 and 2.9 provide detail on the areas in which participants undertook their PDPP. Table 2.8 indicates that there was a 70/30 split between projects focused respectively on classroom and management issues. There seems to be nothing exceptional or surprising about such a distribution. Table 2.9 offers a breakdown into development areas, including curriculum subjects, cross-curricular areas and management/leadership. Most curriculum areas seem well represented, although the proportion of both Welsh first and second language related projects seems low. The cross-curricular areas of Early Years and SEN seem to have elicited a good number of applications. By contrast Key Skills, PSE and Vocational Qualifications are less well represented; this could be a reflection of the relatively small number of teachers with a major commitment in these areas.

Table 2.8 : Total applications by nature of proposal.

	Number	Percent
Classroom	1035	70.4
Management	436	29.6
TOTAL	1471	100.0

Table 2.9 : Total applicants by development areas.

	Number	Percent
Art	43	2.9
Cross-Curricular	98	6.7
Design & Technology	52	3.5
Economics	5	0.3
English	141	9.6
Extra-Curricular	3	0.2
Early Years	117	8.0
General Studies	3	0.2
GNVQ	8	0.5
Humanities	99	6.7
IT	100	6.8
Key Skills	17	1.2
Languages	26	1.8
Leadership	67	4.6
Management	199	13.5
Mathematics	83	5.6
Music	27	1.8
Physical Education	32	2.2
Personal and Social Education	49	3.3
Religious Education	23	1.6
Science	86	5.8
Special Education	141	9.6
Welsh 1 st Language	34	2.3
Welsh 2 nd Language	18	1.2
TOTAL	1471	100.0

2.10. Table 2.10 shows the percentage (overall and by development areas as in table 2.9) of projects which had an IT component. As can be seen, except in the case of Design and Technology, the proportion is low.

Table 2.10 : Applicants inclusion of IT in proposals.

Area	Percent with IT Component
Overall	18%
Art	18.6%
Cross-Curricular	5.1%
Design & Technology	42.3%
Economics	20.0%
English	7.8%
Early Years	1.7%
GNVQ	12.5%
Humanities	24.2%
Key Skills	11.8%
Languages	15.4%
Leadership	6.0%
Management	8.0%
Mathematics	13.3%
Music	22.2%
Physical Education	6.3%
Personal and Social Education	4.1%
Religious Education	4.3%
Science	31.4%
Special Education	7.1%
Welsh 1 st Language	17.6%
Welsh 2 nd Language	18%

2.11. Of the 1471 successful applicants, 109 failed to complete their activity, for various reasons as set out in Table 2.11 below.

Table 2.11 : Reasons for failing to complete the activity

Reason	Bursary	Visit & Exchange	Teacher Research Scholarship	Total
Activity / Course postponed	15	4	3	22
Change of post	5	1	1	7
Course cancelled	10	0	0	10
Illness	7	4	2	13
Lack of time	12	10	3	25
Personal circumstances	9	1	1	11
Decided not to undertake activity	3	2	0	5
Other	8	1	7	16
TOTAL	69	29	11	109

2.12. On the basis of the above statistical data and the analysis offered, it would be appropriate for GTCW to consider the following issues:

- 2.12.1 How a better take-up of opportunities might be encouraged by teachers with long periods of service [21 years +] in the profession, as these are currently under-represented.
- 2.12.2 How a better spread of applications can be achieved from local authority areas, as some are currently over-represented and others under-represented.
- 2.12.3 How a better spread of applications can be achieved across the primary schools of Wales.
- 2.12.4 How participants can be made aware of opportunities to seek accreditation for the work they undertake.
- 2.12.5 How more applications can be encouraged from under-represented subjects and curricular areas.
- 2.12.6 How more participants can be encouraged to use IT in their projects.
- 2.12.7 How more applications can be attracted from supply teachers.

3 THE VIEWS OF PARTICIPANTS BASED UPON QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

3.1. The evaluation pro-forma and questionnaires sought information from participants, headteachers, line-managers and mentors (TRS only) on:

- the administration of the schemes;
- the planning of the activities;
- the benefits to participants;
- the benefits to participants' schools;
- opportunities for disseminating the outcomes of the activities; and
- suggestions for improvements to the schemes.

3.2. The responses to the three schemes is very similar and no significant differences emerge from the three sources of information. To avoid repetition, the following account is therefore a distillation of the main findings, which refers to individual schemes or sources only where relevant.

3.2.1. Administration of the scheme

There are exceptionally high levels of satisfaction with the general administration of the scheme. Almost 100% reported they found the application process easy or very easy with around 95% finding the scheme administration 'very easy'. Very nearly all stated their application had been processed within a reasonable timescale, though a number felt that more time to submit their application would have been useful. A very small number (less than 5%) of those returning their pro-formas complained of the excessive paperwork associated with the scheme and referred specifically to the requirement to complete a report at the end of the activity.

3.2.2. The planning of the activities

In virtually all cases, the activities were linked with one or more of the following:

- participant's personal action plan;
- a school development plan;
- a departmental plan;
- an action plan on an aspect of school improvement.

Participant's responses indicate that about 80% of Bursaries and V and E and 90% of TRS were used to fund an activity that was within the teacher's own personal action plan. Where the activity was not within the teacher's personal action plan, there were more instances of the activity being within the departmental action plan than with the school development plan. In a few instances the Bursary was used to follow up an action point arising from an Estyn inspection report. Given the strong link between the activities and the schools' priorities that the above suggests, it is hardly surprising that 98% of teachers experienced no difficulty in securing agreement and support from their headteacher. However, in a very small number of instances, teachers have made comments that suggest that a few headteachers, have considered themselves to be 'guardians of the purse' and controlled access to the funding, as well as being directive on the activity to be undertaken.

3.2.3. Benefits to participants

This is discussed fully in Section 4. It is sufficient to note here that virtually all participants, heads and mentors considered the activities to be effective or very effective in improving teachers' professional skills, knowledge and understandings.

3.2.4. Benefits to schools

This is discussed fully in Section 5. Again, virtually all respondents considered the activities were, or had the potential to be, effective or very effective in improving provision and raising standards. Many commented that it was too early to see improvements in standards.

3.2.5. Opportunities to share the outcomes

99% of those responding to this question indicated that there either had been, or would be, opportunities for the teacher to feedback to staff and colleagues and, in a few instances, also to governors. In the main, feedback was given through whole staff meetings, departmental meetings and INSET days. Where the activity had been very specific in nature, feedback tended to be limited to colleagues in the same area of expertise, for example, early years teachers and support staff. A small number indicated the need for wider dissemination outside their own school.

3.2.6. Suggestions for improvement

As can be deduced from the above analyses, suggestions for improvements are made in the context of very high satisfaction rates for each of the three schemes. All respondents indicated that they would recommend the scheme to other colleagues. Just over 95% of teachers and 90% of heads stated that activity would not have been undertaken without the funding from the GTCW. The small proportion of heads and teachers who said it would have taken place anyway, usually also added that the funding enabled the activity to be undertaken earlier than would have been possible otherwise. The main issues raised were:

- Small primary schools and schools with a number of teachers involved in the activities considered that waiting for funding until the end of the project imposed an unnecessary financial burden on participants and/or schools. They would like the GTCW to pay 'up front' or in instalments. Some suggested a separate budget for supply cover that is accessible on demand and not at the end of the project. These schools were not aware that the GTCW had already introduced a system of interim payments.
- A significant number of heads commented on the difficulty of arranging supply cover '*of the right quality*' and commented on the disruptive/adverse impact that supply days could have on the school.
- A number of heads would like to see funding aligned to the academic year to make it easier to fit the activities within the school development planning cycle.

- Schools that had large groups of staff involved, felt they would benefit by being able to make a group application rather than separate individual applications.
- Some respondents would have welcomed more guidance and a wider choice of projects for funding.
- A small number of participants suggested that funding should be available to allow follow-up activities in, say, years 2 and 3 to build on those activities already funded.
- A number of respondents argued for funding over a longer time scale. Heads felt that this would allow them/their teachers to better plan CPD and allow for progressive reinforcement and development of the initial activity. Mentors considered that more time was necessary for the research projects.
- A number of respondents, including a third of mentors, suggested that the 'end products' of the activities should be disseminated more widely and reports published on the web.
- Some suggested that a database of available INSET and of schools willing to take part in 'project work' should be produced.
- Some mentors would have appreciated becoming involved at an earlier stage than they did and suggested this might usefully be more strongly emphasised in the guidance to heads and teachers on the involvement and selection of mentors.
- Some mentors considered that clearer guidance on the final report writing format was required.
- A very small number have requested the flexibility to use the money to purchase materials in support of their activity and a few said that more prominence needed to be given to the requirements to keep receipts.

4 BENEFITS TO THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

- 4.1. In their questionnaire responses all participants, and virtually all headteachers and mentors indicated that the CPD activities had been effective or very effective in improving participants' professional knowledge and skills. As table 4.1 below shows, there were some slight differences in the perceptions of participants and their headteachers, with the former more inclined to rate the activity as very effective than the latter, especially in relation to visits and exchanges.

Table 4.1 : Effectiveness of activities in developing teachers' professional skills and knowledge.

Grade Awarded	Bursary		V & E		TRS		
	Participants %	Heads %	Participants %	Heads %	Participants %	Heads %	Mentors %
1[very effective]	93	77	50	10	90	80	85
2	7	22	50	90	10	20	12
3	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
4[ineffective]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 4.2. The following benefits are evident from the evaluation evidence:

- the development of individual needs and skills;
- motivational and career factors;
- engagement with good practice;
- time to develop reflective practice;
- work-based learning;
- working collaboratively with other professionals;
- learning and teaching gains.

These are described and illustrated in the paragraphs below.

- 4.3. The effect which the PDPP have had in allowing teachers to identify and develop their own needs and skills, has been seen as a particular advantage of the scheme and is compared favourably, in this respect, with GEST, which is seen to be less attuned to individual CPD requirements. For a number of teachers this fitness for purpose, made possible by a tailoring of INSET to personal needs, has led to the most effective CPD they have experienced. There is a feeling that this strength of the scheme flows from its focus on self-planning and development, allowing teachers to decide what they require, when they wish to access it and who, or what, will be the provider. Whilst examples of this type of benefit, include development of personal skills, they are more generally related to opportunities for classroom teachers, co-ordinators, Heads of Department and those involved in school management, to develop and enhance their specific roles and responsibilities.

A secondary Head of Music used her Bursary to acquire skills in using new technologies to ensure that all pupil performances and compositions were recorded in as professional a way as possible. She received two days of personal training in a wide range of areas, including using a multitrack mini disc recorder, recording live groups and soloists, the use of microphones and relevant software, mixing music, CD-R technology and transferring material from CD to MD and tape. The benefits to the learning and teaching process were many and are still being realised, as confidence grows in using new knowledge. An interesting feature of the activity has been that GCSE and A level pupils were invited to join some of the training and, as a result, a pyramid learning scheme was adopted – pupils who gained confidence in using some skills, then teaching them to others. The fact that the training was work-based, taking place at the school and using its own equipment, made it a bespoke experience.

A primary DT Coordinator used her Bursary to review subject provision and enhance her role within the school. The funding enabled her to purchase supply cover, which gave her three days non-contact time to visit all classrooms in the school, observe lessons, talk to pupils about their DT tasks and to teachers about the scheme of work, monitor the quality of provision and review resource implications.

4.4. Whilst perhaps the most difficult to illustrate in concrete terms, the incentives offered by the PDPP in motivational and career terms, were widely reported by teachers. These included the:

- enthusiasm and inspiration afforded by opportunities, for example by the V and E, to consider new perspectives and innovation;
- insights (through needs identification and future planning) and opportunities (through CV enhancement) for career development;
- increase in status and esteem felt by those who had received GTC support and the perceived effect that this was seen to have on confidence, morale and retention within the profession;
- value which teachers themselves added to the projects by giving extra time to the work, because it was felt to be 'owned';
- financial support towards HE course fees, enabling academic accreditation and the opportunity to develop and trial, learning and teaching materials for assignments;
- breaking down of professional isolation felt by teachers in particular situations, for example, those in the SEN community, Welsh-medium and small primary schools, where there was no culture of CPD in the school or inadequate local provision .

A head of a rural primary school used V and E funding to develop closer links with two colleagues he had met on the Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers. He visited their schools and observed their practice in a wide range of areas, for example, planning, teaching literacy, target setting, assessment, leadership styles, behaviour management and curriculum leadership. On his return, he drew up an action plan to implement the good practice he had observed.

- 4.5. The V and E funding, in particular, has allowed good practice to be identified and adopted by teachers. In some cases, it is apparent that the main benefit of seeing practice in other schools has been to increase teacher confidence in what they are doing already, but in the majority of cases opportunities allowed by the PDPP have led to teachers taking up/adapting approaches which are not currently part of their professional practice.

An NQT used V and E funding to spend three days visiting schools inside and outside his LEA to see identified good practice related to targets in his Career Entry Profile. In most cases this affirmed practice that he and his school were already using, but this was seen as useful confirmation. By looking at others teaching and comparing it with his practice, the confidence of the NQT was developed.

- 4.6. The time allowed for professional growth by the PDPP funding was perhaps the benefit most often cited by respondents. There were two related aspects to this claim:

- The facility for teachers to take 'time out' to read, plan, undertake research and in general, display the traits often ascribed to the reflective practitioner - the epitome of the successful professional.
- The time to develop existing ideas, knowledge and practice, through applying new educational research and/or approaches to learning and teaching. Examples of this include attention to pupils' preferred learning styles, the application of knowledge on thinking skills, developing links with outside agencies and the adoption of approaches to Early Years learning associated with Reggio Emilia.

A primary school teacher used the Bursary to utilise specialist outside support in the arts. A local artist, poet and drama specialist collaborated with the teacher in devising a programme of activities on the theme of 'buildings' to develop pupils' language, art and movement skills. The project has been highly successful and will be extended throughout the school.

- 4.7. The various PDPP have given teachers the opportunity to engage in work-based learning of a type that is common in CPD activity in other professions and which many teachers clearly prefer. Undertaking work in their own school, visiting other schools and sometimes experiencing conditions in schools in other countries, is often preferred to hearing, or reading, about new practices.

A GNVQ coordinator used V and E funding to study vocational opportunities for students of leisure and tourism and business studies in Canada. He visited the Toronto Student Convention where he participated in interactive seminars and visited local industries.

- 4.8. A related aspect of work-based learning has been the manner in which the PDPP has enabled teachers to collaborate and consult with their colleagues, in a way that has not been previously exploited. This may have been because of pressures of work and time: the GTC funding will have, therefore, provided the opportunity and sense of purpose to overcome this.

A primary school ICT coordinator used Bursary funding to produce a series of lessons in various subjects, which were then used as the basis for internal INSET to spread good practice.

- 4.9. Although one of the strengths of the PDPP in comparison to other forms of CPD is the opportunities they provide for personal development, it is inevitable, and desirable, that these advantages spill over into benefits for pupils and the school, through a more general improvement in learning and teaching. A number of TRS have been used to explore the increasing emphasis in recognised successful practice, on the importance of learning. Bursaries have often been used to identify and develop good practice in KS2/KS3 transition. V and E have created an awareness that higher expectations could be held for pupil achievement, for example in a situation where structured play is more carefully planned and developed in Early Years provision.

In one secondary school, a teacher has used TRS funding to carry out an action research project concerned with the value of IT as a learning aid for under-achieving pupils. In focus groups they were offered the opportunity to participate in a range of activities using IT, instead of paper-based tasks. This has resulted in an improved attitude to learning, increased confidence and some evidence of improvements in standards.

5 BENEFITS TO SCHOOLS

- 5.1. In their questionnaire responses, virtually all participants, on each of the three schemes, and their headteachers indicated that their chosen activity had been effective or very effective in improving provision and raising standards in their schools. As table 5.1 below shows, there were some slight differences in the perceptions of participants and their headteachers, with the former more inclined to rate the activity as very effective than the latter. The bursaries received the highest percentage of 'very effective' ratings from both groups. Many heads and participants added the caveat that it was too early to judge whether the activity had improved provision or raised standards.

Table 5.1 : Effectiveness of activity in improving provision and raising standards.

Grade Awarded	Bursary		V & E		TRS	
	Participants %	Heads %	Participants %	Heads %	Participants %	Heads %
1[very effective]	68	77	55	0	62	31
2	32	22	45	99	38	69
3	0	1	0	1	0	0
4[ineffective]	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 5.2. Interviews with participants and headteachers and the reading of participants' reports both reinforced and modified the views expressed in the questionnaires. Some claimed measurable improvements in pupils' specific skills such as reading, spelling and aspects of mathematics. Generally, it is recognised that improvements in standards arising from the activities, will take some time and schools have introduced strategies to reflect this. The more immediate effects are improvements in provision and in intra- and inter-school arrangements.

- 5.3. The main benefits and potential benefits identified, are listed below with examples:

5.3.1. Improvements in specific skills

As indicated above many of the activities were aimed at improving specific skills with specific children.

A TRS Project into the effects of a language enrichment programme arose from the identification of poor language acquisition in the teacher's school area. The teacher stated in her report that after six months of this programme, 'All the children benefited from the programme. Sixty nine percent of the children increased in their British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS) scores over the increase that should have taken place in accordance with their increase in chronological ages.' This led the teacher to conclude that:

- (a) *A group of children suffering from a delay in the acquisition of language increased their test results on the BPVS by taking part in a daily intervention programme.*
- (b) *the intervention programme has promoted a measurable increase in the acquisition of receptive language.*
- (c) *Children experiencing difficulties acquiring basic literacy skills, benefited from the identification of, and an intensive intervention for, deficits in the acquisition and understanding of language.'*

5.3.2 Introduction and evaluation of new teaching strategies

Many of the activities, especially the visits, were concerned with the identification and implementation of good practice.

For example, one teacher who visited schools in England to observe the National Numeracy Strategy being delivered records: 'The visits were extremely interesting and pertinent to my current role as Mathematics Coordinator. The visits have benefited my classes and other members of the department through discussion leading to implementation of the strategy in their classes. Staff members have arranged to visit my classroom to observe and evaluate the strategy and I in turn will observe and evaluate their lessons.'

Another teacher who has two autistic pupils in her mainstream class visited a school with a good reputation for teaching pupils with autism. She writes: 'I feel the needs of both children can now be met using the PECS, TEACCH and toileting programmes. The children's communication and understanding will greatly be improved and the behaviour will be modified. As a result, standards will be raised.'

5.3.3. Curricular enrichment through collaboration between schools.

Some of the funding in the V and E scheme has been used to fund liaison activities between schools.

One school in the Wrexham area links with a school in Llanelli. Another in Ruthin links with a school in Caernarfon. The linking activities are wide ranging. Teachers have made exchange visits to see others' practices, to set up suitable activities for pupils and to make arrangements for pupils to undertake exchange visits. Pupils send e-mails between the schools, have written and produced videos of their local environment to share with the other school and have produced and sent magazines about themselves. There are plans afoot to widen the use of technology to improve links, such as developing websites, and using web cams and video conferencing. Teachers report that such experiences have a positive effect upon pupils. They learn about the geography and history of another area in Wales and about the aspirations, interests and lifestyles of pupils of similar ages in those areas. They take a pride in the presentation of their productions and, it is reported, standards in literacy have risen. Standards in ICT skills have also improved through these initiatives.

5.3.4. Curricular enrichment through the production or acquisition of new materials.

There is evidence of improved pupil motivation and engagement as a result of the introduction of new teaching approaches or more imaginative resources.

For example, a history teacher who had produced fresh teaching materials commented: 'We have noticed that pupils like using the booklets, particularly because it has some sources directly about their locality. I have been able to choose sources which are more relevant to our pupils ... so that pupils have a

much broader knowledge and understanding of life in South Wales during the war years'.

5.3.5. Improved continuity and progression on transfer between schools

A number of activities in each category were designed to improve progression and continuity in the transition between primary and secondary schools in various aspects of the curriculum, for example, literacy, numeracy, science and the creative arts.

A teacher who undertook research into curriculum continuity and progression in literacy between KS2 and KS3 writes. 'This project has played a vital part in breaking down barriers and misconceptions between the primary and secondary schools. The teachers who took part in the study felt that following this project, liaison between the two schools would be easier. They acknowledged the differences as well as similarities between the working methods in the two key stages – curricular, administrative and pastoral. The evaluation of this project will be ongoing. Its success will only become apparent as more pupils move from primary school to the secondary school, and their performances can be assessed. Increased progression and continuity will, it is hoped, lead to higher levels of pupil attainment.'

5.3.6. Improved continuity and progression within schools

The bursaries were frequently used by primary school curriculum coordinators to provide time to undertake an audit of how their subject was being taught throughout the school. The consequent benefits included:

- Feedback to teaching colleagues about strengths and areas for development.
- A revision of the scheme of work to improve progression and continuity and introduce greater challenge in the work.
- The production or revision of materials to support teaching and learning.

5.4 The evidence derived from visits to schools and reading participants' reports, indicates strongly that the activities which have the greatest potential to be of lasting benefit to the school are those:

- which have clear, pupil-oriented objectives linked to the SDP, a departmental plan, or a specific action plan on an aspect of the school's work; and
- where there are structured opportunities to share the experience with others and disseminate the outcomes to a wider group.

6. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PILOT PROJECTS

- 6.1. Based upon the views of participants (drawn from evaluation pro-formae, reports and interviews), their headteachers/line-managers/mentors (derived from questionnaires and interviews) and the evaluations of the consultants, this section considers the identified strengths and weaknesses of the PDPP. It then compares these with the findings of recent studies/evaluations of CPD activity in teaching and other professions, before suggesting some conclusions.
- 6.2. The great majority of the evaluation evidence suggests that the PDPP have had far more **strengths** than weaknesses. These are identified as being:
- 6.2.1. Worthwhile projects which, otherwise, would either have not taken place (due to a lack of alternative funding) or, if they had been undertaken, would have progressed more slowly, less systematically and with lower quality outcomes.
- 6.2.2. In comparison with GEST funding, the PDPP:
- facilitate greater concentration on individual, class and school-based initiatives, developed through flexible and work-based learning;
 - enable some activities – particularly in the areas of V and E and TRS- to take place that would not have been funded through GEST;
 - are particularly financially beneficial to primary schools, which generally do not receive sizeable GEST budgets.
- 6.2.3. The gains made in the skills (personal and professional) and knowledge (subject specific and generic) of teachers.
- 6.2.4. The careful planning and clear purpose of most of the projects, leading in the vast majority of cases to outcomes which have led to useful outcomes, including some instances of genuinely innovative practice that deserve wide dissemination.
- 6.2.5. The administration of the scheme by officers and staff of GTCW.
- 6.2.6. The focus of a large number of the projects on learning, the needs of the learner and the potential this represents, therefore, for gains in the quality of learning in our schools.
- 6.2.7. The perceived and experienced effect the scheme has had upon the confidence, morale, self-esteem and professionalism of teachers.
- 6.2.8. Whilst the emphasis in the scheme on the individual entitlement of teachers to receive support for CPD is strongly welcomed, in the majority of cases this has not prevented a harmonisation of their area of interest with the needs of the school, including collaboration with colleagues.
- 6.2.9. The significant collaboration between schools (including a number of instances of KS2/KS3 continuity) and other agencies, that has been fostered.

- 6.2.10. The chance afforded to teachers to come into direct contact (through work-based learning) with new ideas and interesting practice and to have the time to try out and adapt such approaches.
- 6.2.11. The opportunity which teachers have had to investigate literature on educational research, learning and teaching and school improvement, to reflect on this and to consider its application in their own situations so as to improve the standards and quality of education.
- 6.2.12. The facility to share ideas between teacher and teacher, thereby increasing the credibility and uptake of innovative ideas and practice.
- 6.3. A small number of possible **weaknesses** in the PDPP have been identified:
- 6.3.1. In a very small number of cases, the outcomes of the projects appear to be superficial and do not represent either value for money, or worthwhile CPD. This suggests that quality assurance procedures need to be strengthened.
- 6.3.2. The number of possible weaknesses in the TRS, appear to be more apparent than in the other two schemes. The perceived shortcomings have been:
- The quality of some of the *proposals* and, in particular, the extent to which they ask genuine research questions, the robustness of the methodology they employ and the degree to which they are based upon a literature review and thus avoid the possibility of exploring already well-researched terrain. It is likely that these shortcomings might have been minimised if all applicants had been required to make contact with an appropriate mentor/supervisor before submitting their proposal.
 - The quality of some of the *outcomes*. In a small number of cases, this has been disappointing. In some instances this appears to be a result of the poor quality of the report itself; it would be useful in future, therefore, to provide exemplars. In other cases, this seems to have been caused by inappropriate research design and, in particular, the pursuit of unwieldy topics incapable of realization, or reporting upon, within the timescales. This again could be largely overcome through initial mentor/supervisor guidance.
 - The quality of *mentoring*. There does appear to have been a strong correlation between the quality of mentoring and successful outcomes to the TRS. GTCW might, therefore, strengthen the emphasis which it places on the importance of TRS holders securing high quality guidance and support, so as to assist them in maximizing the use of their funding.
 - *Timescales* for some of the projects were unrealistic and ultimately unrealisable. To some extent this could be improved through better research design and focus.
- 6.3.3. The availability of appropriate supply cover to release teachers, has been problematical and there is a concern that this can have a detrimental effect on pupils.

- 6.3.4. It appears from the statistical data that the following groups/types of teachers have been under-represented in the first tranche of the PDPP; the GTCW will need to consider marketing/promotion strategies to address this:
- those with 21+ years experience;
 - those under-represented LEAs;
 - supply teachers;
 - those under-represented subject areas/ cross-curricular areas.
- 6.3.5. In some cases where funding was used to 'buy in' specialist support, such as resident artists or poets, participants did not always demonstrate the effect this has had on their professional development, as well as on the enrichment of learning. To meet the criteria for the PDPP scheme, this should be required.
- 6.3.6. In a limited number of cases where funding was used to attend an award-bearing course, reports concerned themselves with a description of the course and not the impact it had upon the participant and the school. It would be useful for GTCW to clarify requirements in this respect.
- 6.3.7. Whilst it is not a weakness of the scheme, it would seem appropriate for GTCW to indicate the acceptability, or otherwise, of funded projects having commercial outcomes.
- 6.4. The above outcomes can be usefully compared with the following recent studies of CPD:
- The desk-top review of CPD in other professions in the UK and teacher CPD in other countries, completed for the GTCW in January 2002 by David Egan and Christine Simmonds.
 - A study by A.Friedman, K.Davis and M.Phillips, *Continuing Professional Development in the UK: Attitudes and Experiences of Practitioners*, published for the Professional Associations Research Network at the University of Bristol in 2001.
 - An evaluation of the Teacher Training Agency, Teacher Research Grant Scheme, carried out by the Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy and Practice at Brunel University in 1997.
 - S.Brown, S.Edmonds and B.Lee. *Continuing Professional Development: LEA and School Support for Teachers*, a study carried out for the National Foundation for Educational Research in 2001.
- 6.5. The review undertaken by Egan and Simmonds, identified the following features:
- 6.5.1. The culture of CPD was found to be stronger in the other professions surveyed, than was the case in teaching.
- 6.5.2. Teacher CPD relies more heavily on traditional (teaching-led) formats, compared to other professions where work-based learning, private study, involvement in research, scholarly and professional activity are more prevalent.

- 6.5.3. In other UK professions, and to some extent in teaching in other parts of the world, CPD is increasingly self-managed and linked (through appraisal and performance management processes) to career progression.
 - 6.5.4. Other professions place greater emphasis on the development of generic and personal skills, as well as professional competency.
 - 6.6. The work of Friedman, Davis and Phillips, based on a survey of 436 professional associations in the UK, produced the following main findings:
 - 6.6.1. CPD is generally viewed negatively as a way of measuring competence, but positively as a way of achieving professional and personal development.
 - 6.6.2. CPD is still a contested area, in a state of transition, where:
 - definitions are unstable;
 - purpose is unclear;
 - importance and value are disputed;
 - progress is often blocked or hindered.
 - 6.6.3. The major difficulty confronting CPD is that it is 'attempting to achieve a wide range of goals at the same time'.
 - 6.6.4. It, therefore, seems possible, that what is now called CPD will 'fracture into different sets of activities with different labels'.
 - 6.7. The NFER research produced by Brown, Edmonds and Lee was based upon a survey of 105 LEAs (including 15 in Wales), questionnaires to 62 schools (7 of which were primary schools in Wales) and case studies in 18 schools. Among its main findings were the following:
 - 6.7.1. CPD is seen to be at its most effective when teachers are able to choose and direct it.
 - 6.7.2. Teachers identify effective CPD as being that which improves their confidence, skills and competence.
 - 6.7.3. It is not always easy for teachers to identify tangible evidence of the impact of CPD on teaching and, particularly, upon learning.
 - 6.7.4. The role of schools and LEAs is important in identifying and supporting teachers CPD needs. These are generally related to national education policies and the SDP/EDP.
 - 6.8. The evaluation undertaken by Brunel University of the TTA Teacher Research Scheme included amongst its findings the following:
 - 6.8.1. The quality and quantity of the reports produced by the teachers was of a high standard.
 - 6.8.2. There was a discernibly positive impact on teachers, particularly in relation to an increase in their confidence and self-esteem.

6.8.3. The research findings were being disseminated through INSET, professional networking, conference papers and the publication of articles.

6.8.4. The scheme could be improved in a number of ways, including:

- more realistic timescales and school-friendly scheduling;
- more rigorous selection criteria;
- careful assessment of research proposals, to ensure that teachers have the necessary skills;
- ensuring that projects are contained and focused, so that they are 'do-able' within the timescales;
- the strengthening of links between researchers and HE;
- the provision of exemplars and advice on report writing.

6.9. On the basis of the above, the following conclusions can be offered:

6.9.1. Whilst in a state of transition across professions in the UK, CPD is generally stronger in other professions than it is in teaching. The evidence of this evaluation suggests, however, that the GTCW projects have made a significant initial contribution to changing this situation in the teaching profession in Wales. In particular, they have impacted positively on teacher confidence and self-esteem.

6.9.2. There is strong evidence from a number of professions (including the most recent study on teaching from the NFER), that the most effective form of CPD addresses the needs of individuals, uses a range of learning opportunities (including work-based study and engagement with research) and is self-managed. The GTCW projects are, therefore, well attuned to these characteristics.

6.9.3. It is also recognised that CPD needs to concern itself with professional and personal competencies, aligned to organisational and governmental objectives; it is also accepted that this is the most difficult area to evaluate in terms of impact. The evidence of the GTCW scheme suggests that whilst there should be consideration of how projects can be better harmonised with school and LEA objectives, they are more appropriately used to meet the needs of individual professionals in the manner suggested in 6.9.2, with GEST funding being targeted at CPD to address national/LEA/school objectives. Such an approach to discrete and targeted funding, marries well with the perspective, pointed to in 6.6 above, that increasingly CPD attempts to address different goals and requires distinct approaches.

6.9.4. There appear to be a number of areas in the GTCW scheme where there could be improvements in quality control to ensure best value for money. This is particularly the case with the TRS, where the recommendations made in the evaluation for the TTA can be usefully considered.

7. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE SCHEMES.

Conclusions

7.1 In relation to each of the points set out in the evaluation brief [1.2 above], the following conclusions can be offered:

7.1.1 The PDPP have had an extremely positive impact on teacher's professional effectiveness. This is attested to by participants, headteacher/line-managers and by the team which has carried out this evaluation. It can be demonstrated through the evidence presented in sections 3 and 4 of this report and in the strengths identified in section 6 [particularly 6.2.1; 6.2.3; 6.2.7; 6.2.10 and 6.2.11].

7.1.2 The projects have also had a significant impact upon participants' schools and have contributed/can be expected to contribute, to raising standard. Evidence for this can be located in sections 3 and 5 of this evaluation and in the strengths identified in section 6 [notably 6.2.1; 6.2.4; 6.2.6; 6.2.8; 6.2.10 and 6.2.11].

7.1.3 The PDPP provide niche funding which is able to complement GEST (see 6.2.2 for a fuller articulation of this) and which allows for a level and quality of entitlement to teachers in Wales, that reflects good practice elsewhere in education and in CPD in other professions [see the coverage given in 6.4 -6.9 in support of this claim].

7.1.4 The GTCW PDPP represent a step-change in the promotion of the philosophy of CPD within the teaching profession in Wales; the take-up of these opportunities by teachers has been enthusiastic and the administration of the schemes by GTCW staff has been of a high order of efficiency.

Recommendations

7.2 On the basis of all the evidence that has been assembled during the evaluation, it is clear that PDPP have been an overwhelming success in developing teachers' professional skills, knowledge and understanding and in stimulating their enthusiasm and motivation. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that the NAFW should continue to make funding available through the GTCW to enable PDPP to become a settled entitlement for teachers .

7.3 In order to further maximise the impact of the PDPP, the GTCW should consider:

7.3.1 How it can better promote the scheme so as to get increased participation from the following under-represented groups and areas:

- Those with 21+ years of service;
- certain LEAs;
- certain subject specialisms ;
- cross-curricular areas;
- supply teacher.

7.3.2 With HEIs, how the possibility of more participants seeking accreditation for the work they undertake can be facilitated.

7.3.3 Ways in which good practice generated by the PDPP can be shared and disseminated, for example, by posting exemplars of activities considered as good practice on its web-site.

7.3.4 How it can encourage a greater use of ICT in projects.

7.4 In order to further enhance quality control, GTCW should:

7.4.1 Tighten the criteria for the awarding of TRS funding to ensure that proposals are robust in conception and that participants are able to secure high quality mentoring support;

7.4.2 Encourage participants to engage in discussion with their headteachers/line-managers, to agree objectives and outcomes for their planned activities, so that they can be of mutual benefit to the participants and the school.

7.5 Administrative procedures could be further improved in the following ways:

7.5.1 Developing a facility for the electronic completion of application forms;

7.5.2 Considering aligning funding with the academic year to facilitate school planning of CPD activities;

7.5.3 Maintaining its requirements regarding report writing, but post exemplar reports on its web-site to give teachers further guidance on what is required;

7.5.4 Produce clear criteria on the eligibility of award-bearing courses for bursaries and TRS awards.

Suggestions For Future Schemes

7.6. Suggestions from those involved in the evaluation study for future pilot schemes, include:

7.6.1 Support for visits to other countries, including countries outside the European Community.

7.6.2 Support for teacher networks – keeping teachers interested in a specific area, in touch with each other, through meetings and on-line newsgroups or conferencing.

7.6.3 Funding for clusters of schools to co-operate on a project.

7.6.4 Funding for larger scale research projects over a longer period of time

7.6.5 Progression funding, to consolidate work undertaken in the initial pilot scheme.

It is recognised that some of these suggestions have already been adopted by GTCW in phase 2 of the PDPP.