

# **Synthesis report**

***Schools and continuing professional development (CPD) in  
England – State of the Nation research project (T34718)***

A report commissioned by the  
Training and Development Agency for Schools

David Pedder, Anne Storey and V Darleen Opfer

Cambridge University and The Open University  
October 2008

## ***Table of contents***

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Executive summary                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| Section 1: Introduction                           | <b>20</b> |
| Section 2: Overview of research methods           | <b>23</b> |
| Section 3: CPD benefits, status and effectiveness | <b>33</b> |
| Conclusions and recommendations                   | <b>44</b> |
| Section 4: CPD planning and organisation          | <b>46</b> |
| Conclusions and recommendations                   | <b>61</b> |
| Section 5: CPD access                             | <b>63</b> |
| Conclusions and recommendations                   | <b>73</b> |
| Appendices note                                   | <b>74</b> |
| References  | <b>75</b> |

## ***List of tables***

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Table 1: Primary school sampling  | <b>26</b> |
| Table 2: Secondary school sampling  | <b>20</b> |
| Table 3: Patterns of teachers' professional learning practices and values                                       | <b>35</b> |
| Table 4: Percentage of teachers who took part in CPD type in the previous 12 months                             | <b>35</b> |
| Table 5: Percentage of teachers taking part in forms of learning in CPD activities                              | <b>36</b> |
| Table 6: Percentage of teachers identifying CPD impacts   | <b>38</b> |
| Table 7: Teachers reasons for deciding to take part in CPD  | <b>40</b> |
| Table 8: Significant relationships between teacher characteristics and reasons for deciding to take part in CPD | <b>41</b> |
| Table 9: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of types of CPD                                   | <b>42</b> |
| Table 10: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of foci of CPD                                   | <b>43</b> |
| Table 11: School leaders' perceptions of value for money of CPD impacts   | <b>43</b> |
| Table 12: Teachers reasons for deciding to take part in CPD   | <b>48</b> |
| Table 13: Persons leading and organising the CPD activities in which teachers spent the most time               | <b>51</b> |
| Table 14: Regional practices and values for performance management processes (adapted)                          | <b>54</b> |
| Table 15 Comparing teachers by years of teaching experience   | <b>55</b> |
| Table 16 Survey report: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of types of CPD                    | <b>58</b> |
| Table 17: CPD opportunities offered to teachers and levels of teacher participation                             | <b>64</b> |
| Table 18: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by years of experience  | <b>65</b> |
| Table 19: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by career stage   | <b>66</b> |
| Table 20: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by leadership responsibility                                    | <b>67</b> |
| Table 21: CPD opportunities offered to primary and secondary teachers   | <b>69</b> |
| Table 22: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by school achievement band                                      | <b>70</b> |

## ***Acknowledgement***

The authors would like to thank the TDA and all schools and teachers throughout England, who contributed to the work of this report. In particular we thank Angharad and James and their colleagues on the TDA Steering Group who contributed useful advice and guidance throughout the process of the research study.

## ***Executive summary***

### **Overview of the State of the Nation study**

The State of the Nation study of schools and the continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers in England focused on three core themes:

- the benefits, status and effectiveness of CPD
- the planning and organisation of CPD, and
- access to CPD.

To address these themes we carried out:

- a literature review of reports of empirical research into CPD since 2004 (see McCormick *et al*, 2008 for the full report)
- qualitative ‘snapshots’ in nine primary and three secondary schools (see Storey *et al*, 2008 for the full report), and
- a survey of a national random sample of primary and secondary teachers in England.

Our survey sample consisted of 329 primary and 59 secondary schools. The survey was undertaken between March and June 2008. Surveys were returned by 151 schools in total, which was a 39% response rate; 118 primary schools responded – a response rate of 36% - and 33 secondary schools responded – a response rate of 56%. Overall, 1126 teachers’ surveys were returned by teachers and senior leaders in participating schools. In addition 251 leaders surveys were returned by senior leaders in the same participating schools.

Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches with insights from our literature review optimised the breadth and depth of the validity of our findings about variations in the CPD practices, values and beliefs of primary and secondary school teachers in England.

The findings from all our research activities are summarised in three different ways. Firstly, we summarise the findings that relate specifically to the original questions posed by TDA at the beginning of the project. Secondly, we list the findings that were seen to be part of cross-cutting themes emerging as the research progressed. Finally, in order to best analyse and draw recommendations from the findings we constructed 11 ‘issue statements’ around which the synthesis report is structured and which are listed in this summary with recommendations.

## 1. Findings relating to original TDA questions

### **1. Benefits, status and effectiveness of CPD**

#### **(a) What are the benefits of engaging in CPD as perceived by teachers and head teachers?**

- A wide range of benefits are reflected in teachers' and head teachers' reasons for participating in CPD including: opportunities to work with other colleagues, to improve their professional abilities and classroom practice, to address immediate school needs, to have a positive impact on pupil learning, to improve academic achievement, to follow-up previous CPD activities, to address immediate classroom needs, and to gain a better understanding of national curriculum requirements.
- Overall, teachers tend to view the benefits of participating in CPD more in terms of individual fulfilment than for collective or collaborative reasons
- However, teachers' perceptions of benefits of CPD vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics. Primary teachers tend to identify wider benefits of CPD that go beyond their personal learning such as addressing immediate school needs, working with colleagues and impacting pupil learning. Secondary teachers are more likely to participate in CPD for long-term career goals. New teachers tend to favour accreditation as a tool for career development more than their more experienced colleagues.
- Teachers in the upper career stages and with more leadership responsibility tend to have more collective reasons for participating in CPD.

#### **(b) How important is CPD seen to be for retention of teachers? What evidence is there of CPD improving the retention of teachers?**

- Only weak evidence is available to argue that increased teacher retention, a projected outcome of the changes associated with professional growth and *New Professionalism*, had directly resulted from effective CPD in schools.
- In our snapshot schools, opinion was divided as to whether the Masters in Teaching and Learning (MTL) qualification would be a factor that would encourage retention.

#### **(c) Are there differences in views of CPD's effectiveness held by teachers/senior management team in different types of school (eg pupil referral units (PRUs), special schools, primary/secondary, academies and specialist schools) or at different career stages (ie trainees, newly qualified teachers (NQTs), main scale teachers, senior teachers (STs), advanced skills teachers (ASTs), excellent teachers, deputy heads and head teachers)?**

- Differences in views of CPD's effectiveness emerged most clearly between teachers by school sector. Secondary teachers describe their CPD activities as having the least number of effective characteristics while primary teachers describe CPD activities with more effective characteristics.
- Teachers and senior leaders do not consider the form of current CPD activities to be always effective. CPD activities in which teachers participate most often reflect more passive forms of learning and participation such as listening to a lecture or presentation (67%). Few teachers report spending most time in more active forms of CPD such as practising the use of pupil

materials (17%), extended problem-solving (9%) and demonstrating a lesson, unit or skill (6%).

- In their survey responses teachers report that CPD activities are not sustained or embedded over time. While 45% of teachers overall engage in sustained learning of 1 month or more, another 46% of teachers engage in short-term activities of 1 week or less.

**(d) Which CPD activities or resources are evaluated by head teachers to be effective and of good quality?**

- School leaders evaluate school-based or school-focused CPD activities to be more effective than non-school-based or non-school-focused CPD. These include, for example: learning through experimenting with and adapting classroom practice, self evaluation and responding to feedback from pupils and colleagues, collaborative research and development, reading and making links with published research along with in-school workshops, mentoring, and participation in teacher networks.
- The web, good practice from other schools and the insights of pupils were all valued by head teachers as effective resources for supporting CPD.

**(e) How many of the characteristics of effective CPD as identified by TDA are commonly present in CPD activity in schools?**

- Research-informed and classroom-based collaborative approaches to CPD are characteristics of effective CPD identified by the TDA and the literature review. However, most teachers' approaches to CPD tend not to be collaborative, nor clearly contextualised in classroom practice, nor research informed.
- Teachers, irrespective of school characteristics (such as school location, sector, region and achievement band) and irrespective of teacher characteristics (such as levels of responsibility, career stage, and years of teaching experience) record levels of practice for collaborative, class-room based approaches to CPD that are significantly behind their values. ASTs/excellent teachers and head teachers record higher levels of practice than others.
- Teachers record even lower levels of values and practice for research-informed approaches to CPD.
- The qualitative data indicates that these kinds of approaches are inconsistent both within and between schools and this might suggest an absence of systematic school support for collaborative, research-informed approaches to CPD in both primary and secondary.

**(f) How important is it to teachers that their CPD is accredited?**

- 75% of surveyed teachers indicate that accreditation is 'not important' or 'of limited importance' in their decisions to participate in CPD.
- Distinct differences of view emerged in focus group discussions around status and accreditation, with an overall evenly-spread balance of opinion in both primary and secondary sites. However, in about half of the focus groups accreditation of CPD achievement was rated last or somewhere near this point in terms of CPD prioritisation.
- Opinion was divided as to whether the Masters in Teaching and Learning (MTL) qualification would raise the status of the profession, serve as an

attractive recruitment element, or as a factor that would encourage retention.

**(g) What kinds of CPD activity are perceived to be value for money? How is value for money measured?**

- Generally, school leaders perceive school-based and classroom-based types of CPD to provide better value for money and therefore more benefit than CPD taking place outside schools.
- In terms of focus of CPD, school leaders rate highly those CPD activities that attend directly to learning processes and improving pedagogy as providing good value for money. CPD that addresses behaviour management, thinking skills and pupil consultation tend to be rated less highly.
- In terms of impact of CPD, most school leaders consider CPD impacts that address immediate school needs, allow colleagues to work together and provide new information as providing good value for money and benefit.

**(h) How is CPD seen to be having an impact in terms of raising standards and narrowing the achievement gap?**

- The impacts that most teachers identified CPD as having were the development of their individual professional skills and knowledge (77%) and increased awareness of teaching and learning issues (71%). Qualitative findings reflected an emphasis of CPD on teachers' personal professional knowledge and skills and not on more strategic questions of school improvement, the use of school data and Ofsted inspection judgements.
- 63% of teachers indicate that CPD activities improve pupil performance and 59% of teachers report an impact of CPD on pupils' learning practices. Far fewer teachers report an impact of CPD on pupil behaviour (22%) and classroom climate (39%).
- School level impacts or impacts on beliefs and practices of others such as teachers or pupils are rarely identified by teachers. Thus there is little indication that current CPD is perceived as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap.
- These findings are consistent with the ambivalent nature of evidence in the literature related to links between CPD and pupils' learning achievements. The literature also suggests, though, that CPD is most effective in schools where senior leaders understand its potential for raising standards and school improvement.

**2. Planning and organisation of CPD**

**(a) What is the role of local authorities (LAs) in CPD?**

- Teachers' CPD activities are delivered by many different sources, but LAs especially take this role for primary schools.
- There are limited LA-provided CPD opportunities available to teachers: Literature sources have suggested that the gaps in the CPD provided by LAs are linked to the local authorities' new role as *broker* rather than *provider* of professional development activities.

**(b) Is there inter-professionalism in CPD planning in schools (eg to support the extended schools agenda)?**

- Focus groups revealed some sense of an ethos of life-long learning and

development to support the extended schools agenda but this was not positively or broadly confirmed elsewhere.

- Discussions about CPD in snapshot schools tended to be predominantly focused on individual teachers' performance and professional growth in connection with their classroom practices rather than on inter-professionalism or wider responsibilities associated with the Every Child Matters (ECM) and extended schools agendas.

**(c) Is CPD in schools determined consistently by the priorities for school improvement (ie is CPD approached strategically, how are the needs of the individual balanced with the needs of the school in CPD planning, and how, and by whom, are the CPD activities agreed)?**

- There is a widespread absence of a strategic approach to CPD in schools: it is often not coherently planned and leadership of it can be diffuse and reactive.
- Teachers tend not to make connections between CPD and strategic benefits such as school improvement.
- Schools have difficulty in achieving a balance of school and individual teacher CPD needs for a wide range of contextual reasons that frequently disrupt agreed plans. Schools with a changed status – placed in special measures, for example – often experience a CPD programme structured exclusively around school-wide targets. In primary schools these have most regularly been focussed on improving numeracy and literacy skills.
- There was a fairly common perception among teachers in the snapshot schools that issues for whole-school improvement are prioritised at the expense of personal-professional CPD needs.
- Those who organise CPD activities in schools rarely lead them. CPD is most often led by subject leaders, consultants and peers.

**(d) How does CPD feature in performance management (PM) reviews?**

**(e) Do plans for CPD link to career aspirations as well as immediate needs?**

**(f) How are CPD choices influenced and informed by the professional standards?**

- Schools vary in their practice in terms of linking performance management (PM) processes, the professional standards and CPD opportunities. In some cases these links appear symbiotic, in other cases dislocated. An important contributory factor relates to the structural divisions of leadership responsibility in these two areas. There was less interaction of these elements where the two functions were independently organised and led.
- There was a strong link between CPD and the *Framework of Professional Standards* (implemented from September 2007) in almost half the snapshot schools yet practically none in others. Using the professional standards to gauge individual professional CPD needs attached to a different career stage, is cited as illustrative of how CPD choices are influenced and informed by the professional standards.
- The *Framework of Professional Standards* and the career stage or roles associated with it and with PM, indicate to some teachers that there is a link between CPD and career aspirations as well as to immediate needs.
- Beginning teachers more typically see CPD as an entitlement and something

which would equip them for the next career stage or role development.

**(g) What resources and sources of information do teachers use and how helpful do they find them?**

- Resources and sources of information used include departmental and school human resources - such as subject leader; CPD leader; new colleagues to the department and their resources; and materials and ideas brought into the school from outside speakers, workshop leaders, student teachers and other short-stay colleagues.
- Information provided by examination specification update sessions by examination boards is viewed as essential and directly helpful.

**(h) What are the mechanisms used for the evaluation of CPD activities?**

- Few mechanisms are used for the evaluation of CPD activities. Evaluation forms or questionnaires are used in many schools but in some cases the purposes of these is not evident to teachers.
- Where something more than a participant reaction to the CPD is requested, there is often a problem experienced in interpreting evaluations. In many schools, follow-up action, linked to a CPD strategic plan and specific outcomes, including pupil achievement, are absent.
- Value for money is generally seen as important but evidence is rather limited in terms of whether it is rigorously considered by school leaders when evaluating CPD, and, as a result, there are very few studies that can show evidence of this dimension relating to CPD.
- In none of the twelve snapshot schools was there evidence of a detailed and criterion-referenced value-for-money calculation made of a CPD event that had occurred, or might do so, as part of an established evaluation and action process.
- Overall, 'evaluation' of CPD appeared instinctive, pragmatic and without explicit reference to clearly defined learning outcomes for teachers or students.

**(i) How, and why, are external experts used in CPD? What is seen to be the impact of this?**

- External sources of expertise included examination board officials who provided exam update material (see g) above); individual experts known and contacted by CPD leaders or the LA, talking about a 'new' topic or one of interest to the teaching staff and wider work-force (eg about Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL); a local primary headteacher talking about practical aspects of leadership, and so on).
- Speakers assessed as 'inspirational' (illustratively, the professor on SEAL) were described as having had a lasting impact.

**(j) How are advanced skills teachers (ASTs) and excellent teachers used in CPD in schools?**

- In many schools ASTs and excellent teachers play an important part in organising and leading CPD activity.
- Beyond governors and the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF), non-teaching staff (45%), CPD leaders (44%) and ASTs in schools (41%) are identified as organising CPD most often.

- In some of the snapshot schools a 'strategic' organisational decision not to appoint ASTs and excellent teachers impacted upon CPD planning and provision. Where they were perceived as 'divisive', head teachers had offered new and different roles in the school as a method of retention.

**(k) What are the roles of other players in schools' decisions about CPD (eg governors, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), subject associations)? Are these roles different in different contexts?**

- HEIs and subject associations contribute to core CPD activity and enquiry, the latter operating to a great extent as a distance learning support source
- HEIs work in partnership with school staff, usually in relation to tracking qualified teacher status (QTS) and Induction standards' achievement of beginner teachers and in associated mentoring and coaching processes. HEIs also provide a wide variety of CPD courses for established teachers many of which are clearly contextualised and informed by school and classroom practices and professional challenges.

**3. CPD access**

**(a) What proportion of teachers engage in which types of CPD (eg take-up of external courses, proportion of teachers involved in mentoring and coaching as a part of their daily work, proportion of teachers engaging with national strategies resources, etc)?**

- Teachers engage most often in in-school (85%) and out-of school (64%) workshops.
- Very few teachers participated in either university (11%) or non-university (16%) accredited courses.
- Generally, teachers rarely participate in more active types of CPD including mentoring (34%), teacher study groups (16%) or independent study (26%).

**(b) How accessible are different types of CPD activity?**

- Opportunities to participate in CPD activities and teachers' participation in CPD activities closely track one another.
- Less than half of all teachers responding to the survey were offered opportunities to attend non-university accredited courses (26%), university courses (19%), conferences (43%), curriculum committees (31%), teacher study groups (19%) and independent study (29%).

**(c) What are the barriers to teachers engaging in CPD?**

- The primary barrier to CPD for teachers is a lack of access to a range of opportunities.
- This is especially true for teachers with little experience, at early career stages and with little leadership responsibility, who have a narrower range of CPD opportunities available to them than their more experienced or senior colleagues.
- School type and conditions can also serve as barriers to CPD engagement. Primary school teachers and teachers in schools with low achievement levels have a narrower range of CPD opportunities offered to them.
- Teachers often make decisions to participate (or not participate) in CPD activities based on their perceptions of the financial resources available and

the perceived quality of supply teachers.

**(d) Are there differences between the needs and requirements of teachers in different types of school or at different career stages?**

- The vast majority of teachers at all career stages would prefer more CPD that is on-going, based in practice, involves their immediate colleagues and is situated in their schools.
- There is some indication that teachers with one to two years of experience value courses leading to accreditation more so than teachers with more experience.

**(e) In what area are there gaps between demand and supply?**

- It is difficult to assess gaps between demand and supply of CPD because teacher demand for CPD is constrained by their perceptions of what is available and is not necessarily representative of their needs

**(f) How much time is spent on each form of CPD, during and outside working hours?**

- It is not clear, in this study, the overall amount of time being spent on CPD by teachers either during or outside working hours.
- The duration of the CPD activities in which teachers spent the most amount of time was either sustained (45% of teachers engaged in learning of 1 month or more) or short-term (46% of teachers engaged in activities of 1 week or less). Very few CPD activities occur for more than 1 week but less than one month (8%).
- The time spent by teachers in CPD activities is also broken up over a large number of activities for each teacher (6 – 12 different activities per year).
- The majority of CPD time is being spent in either in-school or out-of-school workshops (see 3a).

**(g) What proportion of the school budget do senior management teams believe is spent on CPD (ie cost of courses, cost of supply cover, cost of resources, etc)? How is CPD defined in this context?**

- Spending for CPD varies significantly by school characteristics and no overall patterns emerged. Reported estimates of the proportion of school budgets spent on CPD ranged from 0.25% to as much as 15%. However, there are significant differences between primary and secondary spending on CPD activities. Secondary schools spend significantly more on external courses and materials for CPD than primary schools. Primary schools spend significantly more on supply cover and school-led CPD than secondary schools.
- Schools in different locations (non-rural and rural) or regions spend on CPD differently but how they do so varied greatly within and among school type.
- Of the amounts spent on CPD, school leaders reported spending a significant, although not a majority on supply cover for CPD (46%). Another substantial proportion of costs are spent on external courses (32%) with fewer costs being allocated to school-led CPD (16%) and materials (6%).

**(h) What are the most commonly identified CPD foci (ie how much CPD is accessed to support curriculum, how much to support assessment for**

**learning, to support leadership, etc)?**

- The emphases of the CPD activities in which teachers spent the most time varied but tended to have a 'quite strong' or 'strong' emphasis on: curriculum, teaching and learning, approaches to assessment, catering to the needs of different student groups, and evaluation of learning.
- CPD activities tended to have less emphasis on behaviour management in the classroom, leadership development and numeracy.
- It is clear from the pattern of emphases of CPD identified by teachers that most CPD activities have multiple emphases.

**(i) Are there differences between the CPD accessed at different career stages or by different types of school?**

- As would be predicted, teachers with one to two years of experience are more likely to participate in CPD with an emphasis on behaviour management and deepening their pedagogical knowledge than their colleagues with more years of experience.
- While primary teachers are offered less variety of types of CPD, the CPD in which they participate has a greater number of foci than secondary teachers. For example, primary teachers are more likely to participate in CPD with foci on curriculum, assessment, behaviour management, and subject and pedagogical knowledge than are secondary teachers.

**(j) What kinds of delivery modes are utilised (eg professional networks, courses, e-learning, etc)?**

- Unfortunately, the forms of learning in which teachers spent the majority of CPD time were more passive than active. Teachers spent the most time listening to lectures or presentations (67%). They also spent a substantial amount of their time participating in small (58%) or large group discussions (44%). Some teachers did, however, tend to participate in CPD activities with colleagues (47%).
- Teachers were less likely to spend their CPD time in active learning forms. For example, few teachers participated in practicing the use of student materials (17%), engaging in extended problem-solving (9%) or in conducting a demonstration lesson, unit or skill (6%).

## **2. Key findings as part of cross-cutting themes**

### **Teachers' values**

- Teachers place most value on CPD that involves experimenting with classroom practices, working collaboratively, and adapting approaches in the light of pupil/peer feedback and self-evaluation.
- They see the key purposes of CPD as improving pedagogy and having a positive impact on pupil learning. They tend not to connect CPD with strategic benefits such as school improvement. There is strong evidence in the literature that CPD can improve pupil learning, but this is rarely measured in terms of pupil achievement.

- Many teachers thought that personal CPD needs are often overlooked.

### **Quality of CPD**

- The CPD identified by surveyed teachers tends not to reflect TDA characteristics of effective CPD.
- CPD tends to centre around personal development rather than the wider impact on school improvement or improvements in pupils' learning. Therefore there is little indication that it is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap, though the literature suggests that CPD is most effective where senior managers understand its potential for this.
- Most teachers' approaches to CPD tend not to be collaborative or informed by research.
- CPD activities tend not to be sustained or embedded, often lack coherent focus, tend to have multiple emphases, and are rarely evaluated in relation to planned outcomes. The main focus of evaluation used by schools tends to be the views of participants expressed through questionnaires.
- There appears to be an overall lack of a strategic approach to CPD in schools. However, there is relatively strong evidence in the literature about the effectiveness of the kinds of CPD activities advocated by TDA. The most common activities identified as effective involve collaboration and experimentation. The effectiveness of coaching and mentoring, observation, collaboration and research-informed enquiry is also supported.

### **Organisation of CPD**

- School leaders believe CPD that is clearly based in school and classroom practice provides most value for money. CPD taking place outside schools – without a clear basis in school and classroom practice – is seen to provide least value for money.
- The most common CPD activity is in-school workshops or seminars, and most CPD learning occurs through lectures, presentations and discussions – passive rather than active modes of learning.
- Those who organise CPD activities rarely lead them; CPD is most often led by subject leaders, consultants and peers.
- Schools engaged in the qualitative study varied in their reliance on the expertise of their own staff and internal resources. Some schools had a marked reliance on external course provision. These schools often adopt a brokerage role, directing individual members of staff to particular external courses that appear to relate to an expressed need.
- The proportion of school budgets spent on CPD varies significantly by school characteristics. Overall, the major part of schools' CPD budgets is spent on external courses and supply cover allowing teachers to attend these courses.

- School structures and systems relating to CPD affect the forms and range of CPD available to teachers.
- CPD that addresses a deficit or need is usually prioritised.
- Most snapshot schools use CPD evaluation forms, but the purpose of the evaluation is not always clear to teachers. There is very little criterion-referenced consideration of *value for money* in relation to CPD. There is some evidence of a move towards including 'pupil voice' in evaluation.
- Evidence in the literature supports the idea that features of effective CPD are likely to include pupil consultation, classroom-based CPD, and teachers working together to carry out research, development and innovation into different aspects of their practice.

### **Links with standards and performance management processes**

- Schools vary in their practice in terms of linking performance management (PM) processes with CPD opportunities. In some cases these links are symbiotic, in other cases dislocated. An important contributory factor relates to the structural divisions of responsibility in a school.
- There is a strong link between CPD and professional standards in almost half schools, yet practically none in others. (The professional standards were implemented from September 2007 so this finding is unsurprising).
- Experienced teachers commented on culture change in teaching as a result of the introduction of professional standards, PM, and a more systematic approach to CPD.

### **Importance of school context**

- The perceived benefits of CPD are not universal. They are strongly associated with individual contexts.
- There was no overall pattern in school spending on CPD. Spending varies according to school characteristics.
- Changes in school status (eg the imposition of special measures) tends to influence teachers' perception of CPD by stressing school-wide outcomes rather than personal development.

### **Barriers to CPD engagement – including equality and diversity**

- Snapshot schools asserted that teachers have equal access to CPD opportunities, although the Equality Acts appear not to be a conscious part of their frame of reference.
- CPD participation closely tracks opportunities for CPD, suggesting that a primary barrier to participation in CPD is a lack of varied opportunities.
- Other barriers identified are time, funds, and competing professional responsibilities or tasks.
- Most snapshot schools stated that there are generally no insurmountable barriers to accessing CPD which could meet a professional need and support pupil learning.

### **Accreditation and the proposed masters in teaching and learning (MTL)**

- Accredited courses with a clear basis in CPD that is rooted in school and classroom practices, and that foster collaborative and research-informed approaches to enquiry and capacity building, are valued by teachers and school leaders as useful and good value for money.
- Most teachers do not see gaining accreditation as an important benefit in itself. Three-quarters of surveyed teachers said that accreditation is 'not important' or 'of limited importance' in their decision to take part in CPD.
- In the focus groups there was an overall evenly-spread balance of opinion about accreditation in both primary and secondary schools. However, in about half of the focus groups, accreditation of CPD achievement was rated last or almost last in terms of CPD prioritisation.
- School leaders felt that CPD resulting in accreditation is less value for money and had less benefit than other forms.
- Beginning teachers tended to be more approving of accreditation because it could potentially lead to career-stage promotion. More experienced teachers tended to be less interested in CPD for career development.

### **3. Constructed 'issue statements' and recommendations**

**Issue 1:** *There is a lack of effective CPD in terms of levels of classroom contextualised practice, collaboration with colleagues, and research-informed professional learning.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Teachers need to be supported at school in developing more collaborative and research-informed approaches to their CPD.
- b) Schools need to be supported in seeing the value and potential of research-informed approaches to CPD.
- c) Schools need to be supported in developing strategies to help different groups of teachers across the school organisation develop and embed collaborative and research-informed approaches to classroom-based CPD.
- d) Advanced skills teachers (ASTs) and excellent teachers were the exception to the general pattern of low practices and values for collaborative approaches to classroom-based CPD. So they are particularly well placed to take CPD leadership roles working with teachers to encourage more collaborative and research-informed approaches to classroom-based CPD.

**Issue 2:** *There is a lack of effective CPD practice in terms of both the form and duration of CPD activities.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) CPD activities need to involve teachers in more active forms of learning with a clear link to classroom teaching and learning.
- b) CPD practices need to emphasise continuous, long-term, sustained professional learning.
- c) Teachers need to be supported in developing practices for collaborative, classroom-based and research-informed approaches to their professional development.

**Issue 3:** *There is little indication that current CPD is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of teachers thought that CPD would have a positive impact on pupils' learning and achievement.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Systems of support need to be developed to help senior leaders understand the potential of CPD for raising standards and school improvement.
- b) Teachers and senior leaders need to be supported in developing more strategic perspectives in relation to CPD. They need to be helped to develop their understanding of how CPD can promote school development and improvements in students' learning.

**Issue 4:** *Teachers identify a wide range of benefits of CPD; however, these benefits vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics.*

*Recommendation:*

- a) Greater coherence in schools' CPD programmes is needed by linking CPD to professional development plans and collective decision making.

**Issue 5:** *School leaders report that school-based and classroom-based CPD with a clear focus on learning processes and improving pedagogy provide more value for money than CPD that takes place outside schools.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) CPD practices should be mainly based in school and focused on learning processes and improving pedagogy.
- b) Programmes of out-of-school CPD should be limited to ones explicitly geared to supporting improvements in the learning and learning conditions of leaders, teachers and pupils.

**Issue 6:** *The strategic planning for CPD frequently does not provide for the wide range of professional development needs that exist in schools.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Schools need to be supported in understanding the core elements and processes of a truly 'strategic' plan for CPD.

- b) Schools would benefit from encouragement and advice about how to effectively meet the wide range of CPD needs identified.
- c) School leaders need to know and alert all their staff to the patterns of CPD activity operating within the school context and the rationale for them.

**Issue 7:** *Organisational choices made in schools about roles and responsibilities do not always support or help to develop CPD planning and provision.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) School leaders need to be supported to appreciate that organisational choices about role functions and systems can encourage or directly undercut strategic planning and implementation of CPD.
- b) School leaders need to be alerted to the disadvantages of disparate systems, differently led, for CPD and performance management processes in their schools and be encouraged to develop greater interplay between the two elements.
- c) School leaders could profitably be alerted to the distinctive remit of ASTs and excellent teachers and further develop the potential of these post-holders within schools' CPD contexts.

**Issue 8:** *Some changes to teachers' perceptions and actions in relation to their roles and responsibilities are evident, in tune with the New Professionalism agenda. Wholesale change has not occurred.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) The relative paucity of evidence in the literature linked to modernisation and New Professionalism indicates that these aspects require further investigation in the research field.
- b) The gap between values and practices and inconsistent performance management processes point to the need for more systemic developments over time to achieve projected benefits in a more consistent way across different school contexts.
- c) The potential of the professional standards to recognise the strengths and achievements of teachers and schools can profitably be developed to enable teachers to retain focus and to support their career stages and career-path plans.

**Issue 9:** *Evaluation systems of CPD used in schools are insufficiently tied to considering planned outcomes, identifying specific criteria and considering value for money.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Clear guidance for school leaders should be developed so that schools can recognise and use appropriate evaluation systems and processes linked to the strategic planning of CPD. This support could include a criterion-referenced value-for-money analysis.

- b) There should be wider involvement of senior leaders in CPD strategic planning and in developing informed and consistent patterns of CPD activity in their schools (with relevant follow-up action). This would help to develop closer links between teachers' CPD, pupils' learning and school improvement priorities.
- c) Training and development opportunities in CPD evaluation and follow up for school leaders would provide useful opportunities to plan strategically to more effectively meet 'the balance of needs' (Issue 1) in their schools.

**Issue 10:** *Teachers are offered a narrow range of CPD opportunities which vary significantly by experience, career stage and leadership responsibility.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Schools and teachers should be encouraged to take part in a range of CPD types and activities, especially those that are classroom-based, research-informed, and collaborative.
- b) Schools should provide equal opportunities for CPD regardless of career stage, leadership opportunities or teaching experience.
- c) CPD activities should be planned to coincide with career stage development. This may necessitate cooperation between networks of schools to meet the needs of career stages where few teachers may be present in one school – for example, newly qualified teachers (NQTs).

**Issue 11:** *Both school-level conditions and teacher perceptions serve as barriers to CPD participation.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) The need for CPD from schools and teachers may vary by context. But we need to make sure there is equal opportunity to CPD across school conditions and across teachers so that provision is driven by need rather than constrained by opportunity.
- b) Schools need to be supported in identifying better quality CPD activities for staff.
- c) Schools need to be assisted in understanding the elements and conditions of effective CPD.
- d) Methods should be identified to better determine teacher needs and demand for CPD that do not rely on informal perceptions of need.

## **Section 1: Introduction**

This synthesis report draws together key issues arising from the three strands of the Schools and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in England – State of the Nation Research Project (T34718) commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools.

- The first strand consists of a literature review (see McCormick *et al* for the full report).
- The second strand is a survey of a random national sample of primary and secondary school teachers in England (see Opfer *et al* for the full report).
- The third strand consists of school snapshots using a qualitative research approach (see Storey *et al* for the full report).

The following questions were developed with a focus on CPD practices and perceptions among teachers in England in relation to (a) benefits, status and effectiveness, (b) planning and organisation, and (c) access.

### **1 Benefits, status and effectiveness of CPD**

- (a) What do teachers and headteachers see as the benefits of CPD?
- (b) How important is CPD seen to be for the retention of teachers? What evidence is there of CPD improving the retention of teachers?
- (c) Are there different views of CPD's effectiveness among teachers and the senior management team in different types of school (eg pupil referral units (PRUs), special schools, primary/secondary, academies and specialist schools) or at different career stages (ie trainees, newly qualified teachers (NQTs), mainscale teachers, senior teachers (STs), advanced skills teachers (ASTs), excellent teachers, deputy headteachers and headteachers)?
- (d) Which CPD activities or resources do headteachers find effective and good quality?
- (e) How many of the characteristics of effective CPD identified by TDA (see appendix 1) are commonly present in CPD activity in schools?
- (f) How important is it to teachers that their CPD is accredited?
- (g) What kinds of CPD are seen to be value for money? How is value for money measured?
- (h) How is CPD seen to be having an impact in terms of raising standards and narrowing the achievement gap?

### **2 Planning and organisation of CPD**

- (a) What is the role of local authorities in CPD?
- (b) Is there inter-professionalism in CPD planning in schools (eg, to support the extended schools agenda)?

- (c) Is CPD in schools determined consistently by the priorities for school improvement (ie, is CPD approached strategically, how are the needs of the individual balanced with the needs of the school in CPD planning, and how, and by whom, are the CPD activities agreed)?
- (d) How does CPD feature in performance management reviews?
- (e) Do plans for CPD link to career aspirations as well as immediate needs?
- (f) How are CPD choices influenced and informed by the professional standards?
- (g) What resources and sources of information do teachers use and how helpful do they find them?
- (h) What mechanisms are used to evaluate CPD activities?
- (i) How, and why, are external experts used in CPD? What is seen to be the impact of this?
- (j) How are ASTs and excellent teachers used in CPD in schools?
- (k) What are the roles of other players in schools' decisions about CPD (eg governors, higher education institutions (HEIs), subject associations? Are these roles different in different contexts)?

### **3 CPD access**

- (a) What proportion of teachers engage in which types of CPD (eg, take-up of external courses, proportion involved in mentoring and coaching as a part of their daily work, proportion engaging with national strategies resources, etc)?
- (b) How accessible are different types of CPD activity?
- (c) What are the barriers to teachers taking part in CPD?
- (d) Are there differences between the needs and requirements of teachers in different types of school or at different career stages?
- (e) In what area are there gaps between demand and supply?
- (f) How much time is spent on each form of CPD, during and outside working hours?
- (g) What proportion of the school budget do senior management teams believe is spent on CPD (ie, cost of courses, cost of supply cover, cost of resources, etc)? How is CPD defined in this context?
- (h) What are the most commonly identified CPD foci (ie, how much CPD is accessed to support the curriculum, assessment for learning, leadership, etc)?
- (i) Are there differences between the CPD accessed at different career stages or by different types of school?
- (j) What kinds of delivery modes are utilized (eg, professional networks, courses, e-learning, etc)?

Relevant data from the three strands of the research are brought together to identify broad issues for policy makers and practitioners related to the three areas of CPD focus. An overview of the research methods used in the qualitative and quantitative studies are summarised in section 2 and presented in more detail in the respective strand reports. The survey instruments are presented in appendices 3 and 4.

In considering 'Benefits, status and effectiveness of CPD' we make a number of important distinctions between the following terms:

**Benefits:** these are conceived of in three ways. In the sense that:

- CPD leads to changes in pupils', teachers' or school practices seen as desirable by either teachers or headteachers – these are understood as *impacts*.
- CPD enhances a teacher's *status* or career prospects, even salary – these are considered *indirect benefits to teachers*.
- CPD increases recruitment or retention – these are considered *indirect benefits to the school*.

**Effectiveness:** we distinguish between what we see as *features* of effective CPD, and what we see as effective *forms* of CPD or CPD *activities*.

**Quality:** is a more difficult term as it could mean *effective CPD activities* or *features* of *effective CPD*, depending on the way *quality* is described. In effect it is subsumed under *effectiveness*.

**Value for money:** is a judgement that the *benefit* or the *impact* is worth the time, disruption to the education of pupils, and other resources committed to the CPD. It is best seen as a criterion in evaluating any CPD activity, though it involves being able to put a value on the *impact* and calculate the 'cost' of the activity, including the opportunity cost of not doing anything.

**Impact:** this is the *impact* of the CPD on the teacher, pupils or school.

These definitions and distinctions, and their interrelations, are important to keep in mind throughout our presentation of findings from the State of the Nation CPD study.

## **Section 2: Overview of research methods**

This synthesis report brings together the results of a mixed method study which combines insights from a literature review of reports of empirical research in CPD since 2004 (see McCormick *et al*, 2008 for the full report), qualitative ‘snapshots’ in nine primary and three secondary schools (see Storey *et al*, 2008 for the full report), and a survey of a national random sample of primary and secondary teachers in England (see Opfer *et al*, 2008 for the full report).

Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches with insights from our literature review provided scope for optimising breadth and depth of the validity of our findings about variations in the CPD practices, values and beliefs of primary and secondary school teachers in England. The survey methods and the qualitative snapshot methods are discussed below. See McCormick *et al* (2008) for an account of the methods used for the literature review.

### **Survey methods**

In this section we present information about the methods used in the survey study of teachers’ CPD in England. The discussion of the methods includes sections on:

- Survey focus
- Survey design
- Sampling
- Response rate.

#### Survey focus

The survey strand of the research was designed to capture a nationwide sample of teachers, headteachers and schools in England to identify patterns of variation in the CPD practices, values and beliefs of teachers at primary and secondary schools in England. The survey focus is based on the three core themes of the study: (a) benefits, status and effectiveness of CPD; (b) planning and organisation of CPD, and (c) access to different CPD opportunities.

Two questionnaires were administered: a Teacher Questionnaire and a Leader Questionnaire (see appendices 2 and 3). Teachers and headteachers were asked to complete the Teacher Questionnaire. It consisted of a variety of questions focusing on the content, amount and quality of continuous professional development activities undertaken, as well as the benefits of these activities for achieving personal, school-level and student learning goals.

Respondents were also asked about school leadership, professional community and organisational conditions (including matters related to developing human and social capital) which have been shown to influence

decisions about CPD, benefits gained through CPD activity, or effects of CPD activity on teachers' practice (Henry and Opfer, 2003; Pedder *et al*, 2005; Pedder, 2006; Pedder, 2007; Opfer *et al*, 2008; Pedder and MacBeath, 2008).

Headteachers and other members of senior leadership teams, including CPD leaders, were also asked to complete the Leader Questionnaire. This asked for additional demographic information about schools related to pupil background characteristics, staffing levels and staff turnover. They were also asked about the allocation of resources to CPD and to record their value-for-money judgments about different kinds of CPD in relation to impact, format, focus and activity.

Questions for the survey instruments were developed based on previous research. Through the survey we were able to identify national patterns of CPD activity that take place within and across schools in England. We also maintained a focus on how different CPD activities benefit different groups of teachers working in different school contexts.

By surveying teachers and headteachers within schools, we were able to assess the impact of school conditions and school context on the continuous professional development of teachers. We were also able to identify personal and organisational variables that mediate or moderate the effects of CPD activity on the individual and the school. This multi-layered focus enabled us to assess how different activities and strategies of CPD affected both individual professional development and organisational development with the assumption that both individual orientations and organisational conditions are likely to influence the quality of teachers' CPD.

### Survey design

The teachers' survey was designed to generate systematic quantitative data. Questions were shaped by a concern to understand more about the following facets of CPD:

- The role of teachers' beliefs in CPD choice and impact.
- Teachers' CPD values and practices.
- CPD content, delivery, duration and form.
- The school context of CPD.
- Individual and school-level barriers and access to quality CPD for teachers.

The teachers' survey (see appendix 2) builds on reliable and valid instruments that Opfer and Pedder have developed and used in recent large-scale research studies. It is structured in four main sections, each focusing on a theme that reflects the facets of CPD mentioned above:

- Section A: Professional learning practices and values (14 questions).
- Section B: Continuing professional development (14 questions).
- Section C: Organisational practices and systems (24 questions).
- Section D: Teacher background characteristics (7 questions).

Section A focuses on individual learning practices and values for learning. Teachers were asked to make two kinds of responses to 14 questions. The first response focused on professional learning *practices* teachers are engaged in. Staff could choose from the following response categories: not true, rarely true, often true and mostly true. The second response focused on their own *values*, indicating how important they felt a particular professional learning practice was for creating opportunities for pupils to learn. The response categories were: not important, of limited importance, important, or crucial.

Section B consists of 14 questions related to different CPD activities: levels of participation; reasons for participation; organisation, planning and leadership; opportunities for professional growth; content; processes; and benefits and impact of different kinds of CPD activity.

The focus of section C shifts to organisational practices and systems for supporting teachers' CPD. Teachers were asked to make two kinds of responses to 24 questions. The first response focused on teachers' perceptions of *practice* and the extent to which they regarded a particular practice as happening in their school. Staff could choose from the following response categories: not true, rarely true, often true or mostly true. As in Section A, the second response was about their own *values*, indicating how important they felt any given leadership practice was in creating opportunities for them as teachers to learn. The response categories were: not important, of limited importance, important, or crucial.

In section D teachers recorded a range of demographic information allowing for comparisons to be made between teachers according to length of experience, career stage, level of leadership responsibility, gender, ethnicity and disability or special educational needs (SEN) status.

To compare teachers' responses based on their school characteristics, we distinguished between the following: region, sector, location, and achievement band. We also compared responses in terms of the following teachers' characteristics: gender, level of responsibility, career stage and years of experience.

### Sampling

The survey set out to draw a nationally representative sample of teachers for participation and was undertaken between March and June 2008.

Tables 1 and 2 represent the distribution of schools in England by geographic area. The sample was drawn from the total number of schools using a 5% confidence interval (CI). To be able to determine the number of schools required in the sample we used the student/teacher ratios for every geographic area and the average school size (number of students) in England, since average school size was not available for each region.

Using these numbers we estimated the number of teachers per school within a region and calculated the necessary number of schools to be sampled.

While there is proportional variation in the number of schools per region, the variation in student/teacher ratio within the schools results in a relatively even number of schools for selection across the regions. 329 primary and 59 secondary schools were selected for the study, for 388 schools overall.

The final school sample was randomly selected from a database and the sample was checked for appropriate representation of school types by region. The only difficulty was selecting academies because there are only a few of them compared to the number of other school types, and most are in the London area. All academies were included in the sample.

| Primary                  | Number of schools | Proportion | CI 5% proportional | Student-teacher ratio | School size | Teachers /school | Sample for study |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| East Midlands            | 15,860            | 0.084      | 376                | 22.2                  | 225         | 10.14            | 37               |
| East of England          | 20,120            | 0.107      | 377                | 22.1                  | 225         | 10.18            | 37               |
| London                   | 30,000            | 0.159      | 380                | 21.9                  | 225         | 10.27            | 37               |
| North East               | 9,470             | 0.050      | 370                | 21.2                  | 225         | 10.61            | 35               |
| North West               | 26,380            | 0.140      | 379                | 21.9                  | 225         | 10.27            | 37               |
| South East               | 28,980            | 0.153      | 380                | 21.7                  | 225         | 10.37            | 37               |
| South West               | 17,400            | 0.092      | 376                | 21.6                  | 225         | 10.42            | 36               |
| West Midlands            | 21,240            | 0.112      | 378                | 21.7                  | 225         | 10.37            | 36               |
| Yorkshire and The Humber | 19,390            | 0.103      | 377                | 22                    | 225         | 10.23            | 37               |
| England                  | 188,840           | 1.000      |                    | 21.8                  | 225         | 10.32            |                  |
| Total:                   |                   |            |                    |                       |             |                  | 329              |

**Table 1: Primary school sampling**

| Secondary                | Number of schools | Proportion | CI 5% proportional | Student-teacher ratio | School size | Teachers /school | Sample for study |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| East Midlands            | 18,760            | 0.088      | 377                | 16.8                  | 948         | 56.43            | 7                |
| East of England          | 24,640            | 0.115      | 379                | 17.3                  | 948         | 54.80            | 7                |
| London                   | 30,080            | 0.140      | 380                | 16.1                  | 948         | 58.88            | 6                |
| North East               | 11,610            | 0.054      | 372                | 15.8                  | 948         | 60.00            | 6                |
| North West               | 29,590            | 0.138      | 380                | 15.8                  | 948         | 60.00            | 6                |
| South East               | 32,770            | 0.153      | 380                | 16.9                  | 948         | 56.09            | 7                |
| South West               | 20,410            | 0.095      | 378                | 16.6                  | 948         | 57.11            | 7                |
| West Midlands            | 24,470            | 0.114      | 378                | 16.1                  | 948         | 58.88            | 6                |
| Yorkshire and The Humber | 21,940            | 0.102      | 378                | 16.4                  | 948         | 57.80            | 7                |
| England                  | 214,270           | 1.000      |                    | 16.4                  | 948         | 57.80            |                  |
| Total:                   |                   |            |                    |                       |             |                  | 59               |

**Table 2: Secondary school sampling**

### Response rate

Our overall response rate for the survey was 39%, with 56% of secondary schools responding and 36% of primary schools.

While a 39% response rate (151 schools) is not considered statistically generalisable, it is on the high end of the range of response rates reported in recent literature. The response rate from secondary schools of 56% (33 schools) is approaching statistical generalisability where 50% is considered adequate and 60% is considered good for conducting analyses which assume generalisability. The secondary schools response rate is especially high in the current research context where a 36% response rate has become the average. Overall, 1126 teachers' surveys were returned by teachers and senior leaders in participating schools. In addition 251 leaders surveys were returned by senior leaders in the same participating schools.

## **Qualitative methods**

In this section we present information about the methods used in the qualitative study of teacher CPD in England. It includes sections on:

- The focus of the qualitative data gathering
- The data collection process
- Ethics
- The schools and their contexts.

### The focus of the qualitative data gathering

Qualitative data were collected from 12 schools – nine primary and three secondary – across England. Details of the schools are set out in *The schools and their contexts*.

Schools were selected to reflect different types (allowing for size, location, phase and so on). No attempt is made to generalise from the qualitative findings beyond the sample. Data generated from the 12 school site sources provide snapshots of perceptions and actions, set within specific contexts, and focussed on aspects of the three core questions investigated during the period of data collection.

The qualitative study made the school the unit of analysis as its ethos, custom and practice, culture, and recent history are important influences on CPD processes and systems and teachers' perceptions of these. These assumptions about the importance of school contexts were confirmed by the qualitative study outcomes. It was not intended that the qualitative work would address all aspects of the three core questions: the intention was to discover more about attitudes, perceptions, practices and reasons for them.

Another purpose of the qualitative work was to probe more deeply into some of the issues covered by the survey research and to focus on some of the areas that are largely absent or underdeveloped in the literature (Bolam and Weindling, 2006). These research gaps relate to elements such as the links between CPD and performance management review processes; CPD and the *2007 Framework of Professional Standards*; and the 'fit', if any, between CPD and career stage development. These omissions relate to aspects of the three questions posed by the TDA.

### The data collection process

Interview schedules (appendix 4) and focus group activities (appendices 5 and 6) and discussions formed two of the data collection instruments. Questions for the interview schedules were arranged into focus areas and follow-up questions devised for each of these areas. School-linked and other documentation provided a third source of data.

These data were sorted and analysed to answer key aspects of the three questions relating to teachers' perceptions of CPD. The qualitative data gathering instruments were trialled in three schools before the project began, and advice from teachers in these schools relating to improvements in content and process was discussed and utilised.

Each data collection school was visited for one or two days, depending on size. Teachers (up to eight in the larger schools) were interviewed. Data were sought from a range of career stages (NQTs, mainscale teachers, post-threshold teachers, and so on) and roles (eg head of department, curriculum area, union representative, leader of CPD) and where possible, part-time teachers.

A focus group meeting, consisting of four to eight members, also took place in each school. The groups provided new data not covered by the interview, typically from union representatives, supply or part-time teachers, teachers with Every Child Matters or personal, social and health education (PSHE) responsibilities, teachers from groups not selected for interview, and so on. They also included teachers at distinct career stages.

The focus group sessions involved three structured activities and a follow-on discussion (appendix 5.). A total of 65 teachers were interviewed; new sources of data in the focus groups were 64, totalling 129 different sources of qualitative data in the schools.

### Ethics

Confidentiality for interviewees was assured. Names of schools have been changed in the list below and referred to by the substitute name throughout. No opinion voiced in the interviews or focus group sessions was relayed to the Senior Leadership Team, to the CPD leader in the schools, or to any other interviewee. Teachers involved appeared to welcome the opportunity to share perceptions and experiences and also asked about how to access the final report of the project and its findings.

### The schools and their contexts

#### **1 Green Hedge Primary School**

An average-sized primary school of around 200 pupils serving local villages in a largely rural area in the Midlands. Created from the amalgamation of two village schools, Green Hedge occupies an attractive new site with purpose-built buildings in spacious grounds. Levels of social disadvantage are

relatively low, as is the proportion of pupils entitled to free school meals. No pupil has a statement of particular need.

## **2 Bellwood Primary School**

A community primary school serving a medium-sized town in the London commuter belt. Its catchment intake is varied, with a large proportion of children drawn from social housing in former council homes, some now in private ownership. A mixed area of middle and working class, the majority of children are from the latter. The majority also have English as their home language, but some have French, Gujarati, Bengali or Cantonese, and a very small number arrive with no English. Foundation stage profiles show a low starting point for children entering school, but there is evidence of 'value-added' attainment, with some children performing very well by the end of key stage 2. The proportion of free school meals is well below average, the percentage of special educational needs (SEN) is in line with the national average, and the number of pupils identified as 'vulnerable' is high.

## **3 Ballandyne Junior School**

A community junior school in the suburbs of a small city in the north of England with 214 pupils and 14 teachers (including the headteacher). Pupils come from a range of different social backgrounds and the school is surrounded by mixed housing. Pupils are mostly of white British background. The proportion of pupils with learning difficulties or disabilities is above average, as is the percentage of pupils with statements of special educational needs.

This is an established, successful, well-organised school. A 2006 Ofsted inspection judged the school a grade 1 for overall effectiveness, with grade 1 for all the sub-categories except teaching and learning (grade 2). Pupils here make 'outstanding progress.'

## **4 Falcon Junior School**

A community junior school situated in an economically and socially disadvantaged area of an army town in south east England. There are approximately 240 pupils, including several looked-after children. The proportion of pupils with learning difficulties and disabilities and those with statements of specific needs is well above average.

The vast majority of pupils have white British backgrounds, but increasing numbers of pupils are arriving from Eastern Europe, at an early stage of learning English. The number of pupils eligible for free school meals is well above the national average. A 2007 Ofsted inspection judged the school to be providing an acceptable standard of education; previously it had been in 'serious weaknesses'. The quality of care and promotion of pupils' personal development were noted as significant strengths. Pupils' attainment in year 3 is exceptionally low, and is still low at the end of year 6, but their overall progress is judged satisfactory.

## **5 Lofton Grange Junior School**

A junior school with 249 boys and girls in the north of England. The two-form

entry is uniformly white, largely working class, with roots in the now defunct local coal fields. Falling roles, a natural demographic, may mean that two classes in each year group may not be viable in the future. The headteacher characterises the parental body as 'passive'.

There are seven full-time qualified teachers, one of whom is male. None is an advanced skills teacher (AST) or an excellent teacher. There are two part-time qualified teachers and nine female learning support assistants (LSAs). The headteacher is also the CPD training manager. She is aged 50+ has been teaching for 33 years, five of these in her current post. She has postgraduate degrees and the national professional qualification for headship qualification.

### **6 Valley Road Primary**

The school has over 800 pupils aged between three and 11, from nursery to year 6. Situated in Greater London, it has a higher proportion of pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds and those without English as their first language than most schools in England. All teachers and leaders who took part in the school snapshot describe it as a very supportive school. As one senior leader reported, "No one is left floundering. No one." This was borne out in the accounts of the different teachers who were interviewed.

### **7 Thomas Paine Primary School**

The school is housed a light and spacious new building in an area of social deprivation in the north east of England.. It opened in 2002, amalgamating three previous schools. There is a swimming pool and out-of-hours community facilities on the site funded by the National Lottery. It is surrounded by council housing with indices of social disadvantage, including second generation unemployment and a higher proportion of free school meals.

Standards on entry are well below average and average on leaving. Ofsted reports this as a good school with strong focused leadership and outstanding local partnerships. It is larger than average, with nearly 400 pupils aged four to 11. There are 17 staff, including an SEN coordinator (SENCO), a hearing impaired teacher, and part-time staff. Most pupils are white and nearly a quarter are on the SEN register – a higher percentage than average.

### **8 Redway First School**

Housed in a traditional Victorian building near the town and sea, the school runs its own after school club and breakfast club on the premises and has links with Sure Start. The socio-economic context of this school in the north of England is mixed since the town is an area of deprivation but near an affluent coastal pocket. This is reflected in a number of transient children living in temporary bed and breakfast accommodation set alongside new build housing. There are 210 pupils on roll between the ages of 3 to 9. Standards on entry are lower than average and above average on leaving, this being credited to good teaching and extremely strong specialists from the locality and region.

## **9 St Mark's Primary**

A one-form entry school in the north west of England, taking children from foundation through to key stage 2. There are 220 boys and girls, almost entirely white working class, but with a few children of medics from the nearby hospital. 30% of students are eligible for free school meals. There are eight full-time equivalent (FTE) teaching staff, predominantly female, and six are over 50 years of age. Two of these, including the headteacher, who is also the training manager, are 60. The headteacher is retiring at the end of the summer term after 34 years teaching, 21 of these as a headteacher. There are only two candidates for her post. There are five FTE classroom assistants.

The age profile of the teaching staff and their long service at St Mark's mean that many parents of current students were also taught by them. This is seen to contribute to a strong family feel within the school. The school is in deficit to the tune of £50,000. Because of the age profile of the staff, most at the top of the salary scale, the current salary bill does not help to reduce the deficit. The school has no ASTs or excellent teachers. A 2008 Ofsted report gave grade 2 ('good') across the board, with a couple of provisos.

## **10 Heatherstone High**

A very large 11-16 comprehensive in the south of England near to a popular seaside town. Pupils come from a wide range of backgrounds, with a lower than average proportion entitled to free school meals. Most pupils are white British and only a few speak English as an additional language. The proportion of pupils with learning difficulties, statements of special educational needs, and disabilities, is below average. The school has specialist status for sport and is the centre of a school sports partnership with local primary and secondary schools. It holds Healthy School and Sportsmark Gold Awards. It is a designated eco-school, a European Project school, and an Enterprise Pathfinder school.

In 2007, an Ofsted inspection rated the school as 'good and improving with some outstanding features'. It characterised the headteacher as 'charismatic' and 'committed', 'well supported by the senior leadership team', and observed that 'parents and carers are very supportive' in what is 'a popular choice' of school by them. Heatherstone is also a specialist training school that takes students from a number of universities in the area.

## **11 Droley Comprehensive**

A large suburban 11-16 mixed comprehensive. When the school was last inspected by Ofsted there were 1,273 pupils. The percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals is about half the national average. There are few minority ethnic children or children with English as an additional language. The percentage with special educational needs is less than the national average, and those with statements approximately at the national average.

As well as the 90 teaching staff there are 16 learning support assistants, two assistant year managers in pastoral support, seven speech and language staff, three foreign language assistants and 20 technicians. The Speech and Language Centre staff form part of the school and also offer services to the

town and surrounding rural area. The leadership team comprises a headteacher, three deputies and three assistant headteachers.

### **12 Rockcliffe High**

This girls' grammar school occupies a very small site in the town centre by the sea in the south of England. It has buildings dating from about 1920, and some office space and music teaching is in a neighbouring house. Sports facilities are poor. There are 741 pupils with 161 in the sixth form.

In 2007 an Ofsted inspection awarded a grade 1 for every one of 41 inspection judgements except for 'the attendance of learners' (an arithmetical statistic, missed by 0.1%). The school was described in the report as having a 'calm and tolerant atmosphere' and a learning context where 'behaviour is exemplary'. In September 2007, the school was designated a specialist humanities school with an objective of strengthening community links.

### **Section 3: CPD benefits, status and effectiveness**

In this section we present five issues relating to CPD benefits, status and effectiveness developed from a synthesis of the literature review, qualitative research and survey strands of the State of the Nation CPD research.

#### **Issue 1: Relating to the effectiveness of CPD**

There is a lack of effective CPD in terms of levels of classroom contextualised practice, collaboration with colleagues, and research-informed professional learning.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e)*

#### **Issue 2: Relating to the effectiveness of CPD**

There is a lack of effective CPD practice in terms of both the form and duration of CPD activities.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 1e)*

#### **Issue 3: Relating to the impact of CPD**

There is little indication that current CPD is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of teachers decided on a CPD activity because they thought it would have a positive impact on pupils' learning and achievement.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 1a, 1c, 1d, 1f, 1g, 1h)*

#### **Issue 4: Relating to the benefits of CPD**

Teachers identify a wide range of benefits of CPD; however, these benefits vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics.

*(Addresses TDA Specification questions: 1a, 1c, 1d, 1f)*

#### **Issue 5: Relating to value for money**

School leaders report that school-based and classroom-based CPD with a clear focus on learning processes and improving pedagogy provide more value for money than CPD that takes place outside schools.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 1g)*

**Issue 1:** *There is a lack of effective CPD in terms of levels of classroom contextualised practice, collaboration with colleagues, and research-informed professional learning.*

**Most teachers' approaches to CPD tend not to be:**

- **collaborative**
- **clearly contextualised in classroom practice, or**
- **research-informed.**

This is despite strong evidence in the literature that these kinds of approaches are effective.

Research-informed and classroom-based collaborative approaches to CPD are characteristics of effective CPD identified by the TDA and the literature review (eg, Bolam and Weindling, 2006; Cordingley *et al*, 2005b; CUREE, 2008). However, with the exception of advanced skills teachers, excellent teachers and headteachers, our teachers' survey data indicate low levels of practice for the 'Collaborative classroom-based learning and research' grouping of CPD activities.

In their survey responses teachers record even lower levels of practice for 'Research orientation' ('teachers are positively oriented to and engage with research-based insights and ideas') and research-informed approaches to CPD.

Teachers, irrespective of school characteristics (eg location, sector, region and achievement band) and teacher characteristics (eg levels of responsibility, career stage, years of teaching experience) record levels of practice for 'Collaborative classroom-based learning and research' approaches to CPD that are significantly behind their values.

Teachers record the lowest levels of both values and practices for 'Research orientation' to CPD. The qualitative data shows these kinds of approaches are inconsistent both within and between schools which might suggest an absence of systematic school support for collaborative, research-informed approaches to CPD in both primary and secondary school classrooms.

Schools might not be aware of how such approaches to CPD can be realised in practice and may lack strategies for helping different groups of teachers develop such approaches to CPD.

**Teachers place most value on, and record the highest levels of practice for CPD that involves:**

- **experimenting with classroom practices, and**
- **adapting approaches in the light of pupil/peer feedback and self-evaluation.**

This is seen in the practice and values scores for the ‘Experimental and adaptive learning’ grouping of CPD practices and values (teachers learn through experimenting and adapting their classroom practices, reflection, self-evaluation and responding to feedback from pupils and colleagues (see table below.)

|  | Practices |       | Values |       |
|--|-----------|-------|--------|-------|
|  | Mean      | SD    | Mean   | SD    |
| Experimental and adaptive learning                   | 83.07     | 12.91 | 83.13  | 11.99 |
| Research orientation*                                | 46.00     | 23.92 | 52.50  | 22.40 |
| Collaborative classroom-based learning and research* | 63.64     | 21.49 | 73.18  | 17.11 |

**Table 3: Patterns of teachers’ professional learning practices and values**

Significant mean values-practice gaps (*sig* = < .05)

SD = significant difference

More specifically, when asked to report the types of CPD they have taken part in during the previous 12 months, teachers tend to emphasise types of CPD that are less closely connected to the school and classroom routines and contexts of their professional work, such as workshops and seminars.

For example, most teachers say they took part in in-school workshops (77%) and out-of-school workshops and seminars (60%) in the previous 12 months. However, levels of participation are considerably lower for types of CPD that more clearly relate to specific aspects of teachers’ school and classroom-based professional work. Only about half the teachers (52%) took part in mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers in the last 12 months, less than a quarter in committees or task forces (23%), while a mere 12% took part in teacher study groups (12%). (See table below.)

| Types of CPD  | Percentage (out of 1,123) |
|---|---------------------------|
| In-school workshop or seminar                         | 77%                       |
| Non-university accredited courses                     | 14%                       |
| University courses                                    | 7%                        |
| Out-of-school workshops or seminars                   | 60%                       |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives                    | 45%                       |
| Conferences   | 32%                       |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers | 52%                       |
| Committees or task forces                             | 23%                       |
| Teacher study groups                                  | 12%                       |
| Independent study                                     | 21%                       |

**Table 4: Percentage of teachers who took part in CPD type in the previous 12 months**

**Issue 2:** *There is a lack of effective CPD practice in terms of both the form and duration of CPD activities.*

**Teachers and senior leaders in England do not consider the form and duration of CPD activities to be always effective. CPD activities tend to involve teachers in passive forms of learning.**

The CPD teachers take part in most often reflect more passive forms of learning and participation such as listening to a lecture or presentation (67%). Few teachers are involved in more active forms of CPD such as practising the use of pupil materials (17%), extended problem-solving (9%), and demonstrating a lesson, unit or skill (6%). (See table below.)

| Forms of CPD activity                                      | Percentage of teachers taking part |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Listened to a lecture or presentation                      | 67%                                |
| Took part in a small group discussion                      | 58%                                |
| Collaborated as a colleague with other teachers            | 47%                                |
| Took part in a whole group discussion                      | 44%                                |
| Assessed pupil work  | 30%                                |
| Developed or reviewed materials                            | 23%                                |
| Used technology (computers, calculators, whiteboards, etc) | 22%                                |
| Reviewed pupil work  | 21%                                |
| Observed a demonstration of a lesson or unit               | 21%                                |
| Practised using pupil materials                            | 17%                                |
| Produced a paper, report or plan                           | 16%                                |
| Formal post-activity evaluation of the learning            | 11%                                |
| Led a small group discussion                               | 9%                                 |
| Engaged in extended problem solving                        | 9%                                 |
| Completed paper-and-pencil problems or exercises           | 8%                                 |
| Gave a lecture or presentation                             | 8%                                 |
| Led a whole group discussion                               | 6%                                 |
| Conducted a demonstration lesson, unit or skill            | 6%                                 |
| Assessed fellow participants' knowledge or skills          | 6%                                 |

**Table 5: Percentage of teachers taking part in forms of learning in CPD activities**

**CPD activities tend not to be sustained or embedded, often lack coherent focus, and are rarely rigorously evaluated.** In their survey responses teachers report that CPD activities are not sustained or embedded over time. While 45% of teachers overall engage in sustained learning of one month or more, another 46% of teachers engage in short-term activities of one week or less.

However, in the literature review we reported Boyle *et al*, 2004 research that found positive correlation between sustained long-term CPD and changes in teaching practice. Characteristics of effective CPD listed on the TDA website and supported by Cordingley *et al*, 2005a and b; 2007; Hargreaves, 2003; Hopkins *et al*, 2001; Ofsted, 2006, emphasise the importance of long-term, continuous CPD that is research-informed, collaborative, and embedded in contexts of teachers' work.

**Issue 3:** *There is little indication that current CPD is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of teachers thought that CPD would have a positive impact on pupils' learning and achievement.*

**CPD activities tend to centre around personal development rather than the impact on schools or learners.** The impacts that most teachers identify as a result of taking part in CPD are developing their individual professional skills and knowledge (77%) and increased awareness of teaching and learning issues (71%). However, although 63% of teachers indicate that CPD activities improve pupil performance, and 59% report an impact of CPD on pupils' learning practices, far fewer teachers report an impact on pupil behaviour (22%) and classroom climate (39%).

These survey findings are consistent with the ambivalent nature of research evidence related to links between CPD and pupils' learning achievements and discussed in the literature review (eg Wilson and Berne, 1999; Lawless and Pellegrino, 2007). The survey findings are also consistent with qualitative findings that reflect an emphasis of CPD on teachers' personal professional knowledge and skills and not on more strategic questions of school improvement, the use of school data and Ofsted inspection judgements.

Consistent with conclusions reached in the literature review, **there is no strong indication from teachers' survey responses to suggest that current CPD is seen as having an impact at the school level.** Although 53% of teachers report an impact of CPD on improved school-level practices, only 28% report that CPD leads to change in school-level organisation or structures (28%) or to changes in school policy (25%). The survey data indicates that most of the identified impacts tend not to occur beyond the personal level of individual teachers (see table on the next page.)

School-level impacts or impacts on beliefs and practices of others – such as teachers or pupils – are rarely identified by teachers. **Thus there is little indication that current CPD is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap.** This is despite the fact that for 94% of teachers the possibility that CPD would have a positive impact on pupils' learning was a motive for deciding on a CPD activity, and for 91% this decision was based on a belief that the CPD would have a positive impact on achievement. Furthermore, the research literature suggests that CPD is most effective in schools where senior leaders understand its potential for raising standards and school improvement.

| Impacts of CPD   | Percentage of teachers indicated 'Quite a lot' or 'A lot' of impact |
|--|---|
| Improved pupil performance/ outcomes                       | 63%   |
| Changed pupil learning practices                           | 59%   |
| Changed pupil behaviour                                    | 22%   |
| Changed the climate in my classroom                        | 39%   |
| Improved my knowledge and skills                           | 77%   |
| Prompted me to use new curriculum materials                | 66%   |
| Made me more aware of teaching and learning issues         | 71%   |
| Changed the way I think about teaching and learning        | 47%   |
| Changed my beliefs about teaching                          | 18%   |
| Caused me to seek further information or training          | 35%   |
| Changed my beliefs about pupil learning                    | 26%   |
| Improved school-level practices                            | 53%   |
| Led to a change in school-level organisation or structures | 28%   |
| Led to changes in school policy                            | 25%   |

**Table 6: Percentage of teachers identifying CPD impacts**

**Issue 4:** *Teachers identify a wide range of benefits of CPD; however, these benefits vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics.*

**Teachers' reasons for taking part in CPD reflect their perceptions of a wide range of benefits, but gaining accreditation is not seen by most as an important benefit.**

The wide range of benefits that teachers report in survey responses and in the qualitative research is consistent with the range of benefits identified in the literature review. Reasons teachers identified as crucial or important for deciding to take part in CPD included:

- to work with other colleagues
- to improve their professional abilities
- to address immediate school needs
- to gain more information
- to have a positive impact on pupil learning
- to improve academic achievement
- to follow up previous CPD activities
- to address immediate classroom needs, and
- to gain a better understanding of National Curriculum requirements.

School snapshot teachers' qualitative accounts overwhelmingly centre on improving current pedagogy and having a positive impact on students' learning in the classroom. There is far less evidence that teachers place much value on CPD with a wider more strategic focus on school improvement. This is typically viewed by snapshot teachers as the responsibility of the senior leadership team.

However, most teachers do not see gaining accreditation as an important benefit. 75% of surveyed teachers said that accreditation is 'not important' or 'of limited importance' in their decisions to take part in CPD (see table on the next page).

In the qualitative strand of the study, the issue of *status* was addressed by discussing the range of CPD accreditation opportunities available to teachers. Distinct differences of view emerged, with an evenly-spread balance of opinion in both primary and secondary. In about half of the focus groups accreditation of CPD achievement was rated last or almost last in terms of CPD prioritization. Opinion was divided as to whether the masters in teaching and learning (MTL) qualification would raise the status of the profession, serve as an attractive recruitment element, or as a factor that would encourage retention.

| Percentage of teachers responding to importance of reasons for CPD decision                  |               |                       |           |         |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Reasons for CPD decision   | Not important | Of limited importance | Important | Crucial |
| Provided accreditation   | 41%           | 34%                   | 22%       | 4%      |
| Allowed me to work with colleagues   | 6%            | 17%                   | 67%       | 10%     |
| Improved my professional abilities   | <1%           | 4%                    | 54%       | 41%     |
| Allowed me to meet long-term career goals  | 13%           | 27%                   | 44%       | 16%     |
| Addressed immediate school needs   | 2%            | 10%                   | 64%       | 24%     |
| Provided information that was new to me  | 2%            | 8%                    | 63%       | 26%     |
| Changed my views on teaching   | 13%           | 38%                   | 43%       | 6%      |
| Prompted me to seek further information/training   | 11%           | 34%                   | 49%       | 6%      |
| Had a positive impact on pupils' learning  | 2%            | 5%                    | 54%       | 40%     |
| Resulted in improved achievement for pupils  | 1%            | 7%                    | 55%       | 36%     |
| Followed up previous professional learning activities  | 5%            | 25%                   | 62%       | 8%      |
| Addressed immediate classroom needs and improved my understanding of the National Curriculum | 5%            | 17%                   | 61%       | 18%     |
| Improved my understanding of National Curriculum requirements                                | 7%            | 19%                   | 55%       | 19%     |

**Table 7: Teachers reasons for deciding to take part in CPD**

**However, teachers' perceptions of the benefits of CPD vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics. Teachers differ especially by school sector and by career stage, level of responsibility and experience.** Primary teachers tend to identify wider benefits of CPD that go beyond their personal learning such as addressing immediate school needs, working with colleagues and impact on pupil learning as more important than teachers at secondary schools. As the table on the next page shows, new teachers tend to favour accreditation as a tool for career development while more experienced teachers appear to be less interested in CPD for career development.

**Survey findings suggest that among different groups of teachers, perceived benefits of CPD are not universal; benefits are more strongly associated with individual context.**

**Differences in reasons for CPD decisions and by teacher characteristics**

|   |
|---|
| Gender (Mann-Whitney U, <i>sig</i> = < .05)   |
| There are no significant differences by gender in decisions about CPD.  |
| Career stage (Kruskal-Wallis Test, <i>sig</i> = < .05)  |
| Accreditation is of less importance in the CPD decisions of AST/excellent teachers and qualified headteachers than for teachers at other career stages.   |
| Working with colleagues is more important in the CPD decisions of AST/excellent teachers than for teachers at other career stages.  |
| Improving professional ability is more important in the CPD decisions of newly qualified teachers, AST/excellent teachers and qualified teachers than for teachers at other career stages.        |
| Long-term career goals are more important in the CPD decisions of newly qualified teachers than for teachers at other career stages.  |
| Acquiring new information is more important in the CPD decisions of qualified headteachers than for teachers at other career stages.  |
| Following up previous CPD is more important in the CPD decisions of AST/excellent teachers and qualified headteachers than for teachers at other career stages.                                   |
| Addressing immediate classroom needs is more important in the CPD decisions of newly qualified teachers than for teachers at other career stages.   |
| Years of teaching experience (Kruskal-Wallis Test, <i>sig</i> = < .05)  |
| Accreditation decreases in importance in CPD decisions as years of teaching experience increase.  |
| Improving professional abilities decreases in importance in CPD decisions as years of teaching experience increase.   |
| Long-term career goals are less important in the CPD decisions made by teachers with 20+ years' experience.   |
| Addressing immediate school needs are less important in the CPD decisions made by teachers with less than five years' experience.   |
| Gaining new information is more important in the CPD decisions made by teachers with one to two years' experience than other teachers.  |
| Changing views of teaching decreases in importance in CPD decisions as years of teaching experience increase.   |
| Seeking new information decreases in importance in CPD decisions as years of teaching experience increase.  |
| Improving student achievement is less important in the CPD decisions of teachers with 20+ years' experience than other teachers.  |
| Improving understanding of National Curriculum requirements is more important in the CPD decisions of teachers with one to two years' experience than other teachers.                             |
| Leadership responsibility (Kruskal-Wallis Test, <i>sig</i> = < .05)   |
| Accreditation is less important in CPD decisions as leadership responsibility increases.  |
| Working with colleagues is less important in the CPD decisions of teachers with little to no responsibility and with middle leaders than in the CPD decisions of senior leaders and headteachers. |
| Addressing immediate school needs is more important in CPD decisions as leadership responsibility increases.  |

**Table 8: Significant relationships between teacher characteristics and reasons for deciding to take part in CPD**

**Issue 5:** School leaders report that school-based and classroom-based CPD with a clear focus on learning processes and improving pedagogy provide more value for money than CPD that takes place outside schools.

**Generally, school leaders see school-based and classroom-based CPD as providing more value for money and benefit than CPD taking place outside schools.** For example, in-school workshops, mentoring, coaching, observation, and teacher networks were rated highly, while university courses and non-university accredited courses were seen to provide less value for money (see table below).

These survey responses are consistent with the relatively strong evidence in the literature of the effectiveness of collaborative CPD such as coaching and mentoring, observation and feedback, joint enquiry and evaluation. They are also reflected in the ratings of teachers in the qualitative study.

| Percentage of school leaders<br>(out of 247)          |            |           |             |       |
|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Types of CPD  | Not at all | Not a lot | Quite a lot | A lot |
| In-school workshop or seminar                         | < 1%       | 6%        | 49%         | 45%   |
| Non-university accredited courses                     | 15%        | 54%       | 29%         | 3%    |
| University courses                                    | 19%        | 54%       | 22%         | 4%    |
| Out-of-school workshops or seminars                   | 1%         | 17%       | 70%         | 14%   |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives                    | < 1%       | 21%       | 57%         | 22%   |
| Conferences   | 4%         | 39%       | 49%         | 9%    |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers | 2%         | 16%       | 46%         | 37%   |
| Committees or task forces                             | 9%         | 35%       | 49%         | 9%    |
| Teacher study groups                                  | 16%        | 43%       | 37%         | 6%    |
| Independent study                                     | 15%        | 45%       | 33%         | 8%    |

**Table 9: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of types of CPD**

**In terms of the focus of CPD, school leaders highly rate CPD that deals directly with learning processes and improves pedagogy as providing good value for money.** CPD that addresses behaviour management, thinking skills and pupil consultation tends to be rated less highly (see table below). However, there is a growing body of research evidence that consulting pupils can enhance the effectiveness of CPD because pupils tend to provide feedback that is practical, lesson specific and considered by teachers to be useful and insightful (eg, McIntyre *et al*, 2005).

| Foci of CPD                                     | Percentage of school leaders<br>(out of 247) |           |             |       |
|---|--|-----------|-------------|-------|
|   | Not at all                                   | Not a lot | Quite a lot | A lot |
| Curriculum                                      | 0%   | 7%        | 66%         | 27%   |
| Teaching and learning                           | 0%   | 7%        | 63%         | 31%   |
| Approaches to assessment                        | <1%  | 12%       | 55%         | 33%   |
| Pupil behaviour management                      | 3%   | 41%       | 43%         | 14%   |
| Use of ICT in learning                          | 0%   | 14%       | 62%         | 25%   |
| Catering to the needs of different pupil groups | <1%  | 21%       | 60%         | 19%   |
| Deepening knowledge in subject areas            | 0%   | 22%       | 66%         | 13%   |
| Deepening subject pedagogical knowledge         | <1%  | 26%       | 64%         | 10%   |
| Leadership development                          | <1%  | 17%       | 63%         | 20%   |
| Thinking skills                                 | 3%   | 33%       | 52%         | 13%   |
| Pupil consultation                              | 2%   | 39%       | 53%         | 7%    |
| Learning to learn                               | 2%   | 31%       | 55%         | 12%   |
| Numeracy  | 3%   | 15%       | 51%         | 36%   |
| Literacy  | 3%   | 13%       | 51%         | 36%   |
| Evaluation of learning                          | <1%  | 17%       | 65%         | 19%   |

**Table 10: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of foci of CPD**

**Most school leaders consider CPD that addresses immediate school needs, allows colleagues to work together and generates new information provides good value for money, benefit and impact. They feel that CPD that results in accreditation has less value for money.**

While there are significant differences in perceptions of value for money of CPD by school characteristics, these general patterns of value for money are maintained at each level of analysis.

| Impacts of CPD  | Percentage of school leaders<br>(out of 250) |           |             |       |
|---|--|-----------|-------------|-------|
|   | Not at all                                   | Not a lot | Quite a lot | A lot |
| Provides accreditation for staff                      | 7%   | 47%       | 41%         | 6%    |
| Allows colleagues to work together                    | 0%   | 9%        | 57%         | 34%   |
| Improves the professional abilities of teachers       | 0%   | 2%        | 51%         | 47%   |
| Allows teachers to meet long-term career goals        | 0%   | 25%       | 57%         | 18%   |
| Addresses immediate school needs                      | 0%   | 3%        | 47%         | 50%   |
| Provides new information to staff                     | 0%   | 4%        | 61%         | 35%   |
| Changes beliefs about teaching                        | 2%   | 49%       | 44%         | 5%    |
| Prompts staff to seek further information or training | 2%   | 34%       | 59%         | 6%    |
| Positively impacts on pupils' learning                | 0%   | 4%        | 58%         | 38%   |
| Results in improved pupil achievement                 | <1%  | 10%       | 61%         | 29%   |
| Changes beliefs about pupils' learning                | 0%   | 30%       | 56%         | 13%   |
| Follows up previous professional learning activities  | 0%   | 17%       | 71%         | 12%   |
| Changes teaching practices                            | 0%   | 13%       | 77%         | 10%   |
| Supports assessment for learning                      | <1%  | 8%        | 70%         | 22%   |
| Supports the National Curriculum                      | <1%  | 12%       | 64%         | 23%   |
| Prompts changes in school systems                     | <1%  | 24%       | 64%         | 12%   |

**Table 11: School leaders' perceptions of value for money of CPD impacts**

## **Conclusions and recommendations: CPD benefits, status and effectiveness**

Recommendations are summarised for each issue identified in section 3.

**Issue 1:** *There is a lack of effective CPD in terms of levels of classroom contextualised practice, collaboration with colleagues, and research-informed professional learning.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Teachers need to be supported at school in developing more collaborative and research-informed approaches to their CPD.
- b) Schools need to be supported in seeing the value and potential of research-informed approaches to CPD.
- c) Schools need to be supported in developing strategies to help different groups of teachers across the school organisation develop and embed appropriate collaborative and research-informed approaches to classroom-based CPD.
- d) Advanced skills teachers (ASTs) and excellent teachers were the exception to the general pattern of low practices and values for collaborative approaches to classroom-based CPD. So they are particularly well placed to take CPD leadership roles working with teachers to encourage more collaborative and research-informed approaches to classroom-based CPD.

**Issue 2:** *There is a lack of effective CPD practice in terms of both the form and duration of CPD activities.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) CPD activities need to involve teachers in more active forms of learning with a clear link to classroom teaching and learning.
- b) CPD practices need to emphasise continuous, long-term, sustained professional learning.
- c) Teachers need to be supported in developing practices for collaborative, classroom-based and research-informed approaches to their professional development.

**Issue 3:** *There is little indication that current CPD is seen as having an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of teachers thought that CPD would have a positive impact on pupils' learning and achievement.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Systems of support need to be developed to help senior leaders understand the potential of CPD for raising standards and school improvement.
- b) Teachers and senior leaders need to be supported in developing more strategic perspectives in relation to CPD. They need to be helped to develop their understanding of how CPD can promote school development and improvements in students' learning.

**Issue 4:** *Teachers identify a wide range of benefits of CPD; however, these benefits vary significantly by school and teacher characteristics.*

*Recommendation:*

- a) Greater coherence in schools' CPD programmes is needed by linking CPD to professional development plans and collective decision making.

**Issue 5:** *School leaders report that school-based and classroom-based CPD with a clear focus on learning processes and improving pedagogy provide more value for money than CPD that takes place outside schools.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) CPD practices should be mainly based in school and focused on learning processes and improving pedagogy.
- b) Programmes of out-of-school CPD should be limited to ones explicitly geared to supporting improvements in the learning and learning conditions of leaders, teachers and pupils.

## **Section 4: CPD planning and organisation**

In this section we present four issues relating to CPD planning and organisation, developed from a synthesis of the literature review, qualitative research and survey strands of the State of the Nation CPD research.

### **Issue 6: Relating to school contexts**

The strategic planning for CPD frequently does not provide for the wide range of professional development needs that exist in schools.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 1e, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2g, 2i)*

### **Issue 7: Relating to schools as organisations**

Organisational choices made in schools about roles and responsibilities do not always support or help to develop CPD planning and provision.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 2d, 2i, 2j 2k)*

### **Issue 8: Relating to culture change and aspects of New Professionalism**

Some changes to teachers' perceptions and actions in relation to their roles and responsibilities are evident, in tune with the New Professionalism agenda. Wholesale change has not occurred.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions: 2d 2e, 2f, 3d, 3i)*

### **Issue 9: Relating to evaluation of CPD and follow-up action**

Evaluation systems of CPD used in schools are insufficiently tied to considering planned outcomes, identifying specific criteria and considering value for money.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions 1d, 2h)*

**Issue 6:** *The strategic planning for CPD frequently does not provide for the wide range of professional development needs that exist in schools.*

Effective strategic planning of CPD in schools emerged in the literature review (2004 onwards) as a complex and constantly challenging requirement of schools and their CPD leaders. The task of successfully balancing and providing for different types of need has proved difficult for schools and was evident in the different sources of data analysed.

Our literature review report made the point that any alignment of 'needs', and strategically-shaped provision to meet them successfully, requires a complex planning process. This process would mesh school, department and individual staff priorities, set within the context of national and local priorities (CUREE 2008).

The survey data provide clues about why strategic planning for CPD in schools remains a challenge: it is often not coherently planned and leadership of it can be diffuse and reactive. Moreover, the many different renditions of what schools in this study call 'strategic' CPD are consistent with an important Ofsted finding in their 'Logical Chain' report (Ofsted 2006: 4) that,

'Few of the schools evaluated successfully the impact of CPD on the quality of teaching and on pupils' achievement because they did not identify the intended outcomes clearly at the planning stage.'

Schools have difficulty achieving a balance of CPD needs for a wide range of reasons. Survey findings gave weight to the view that decisions about CPD participation are more often made to satisfy personal interests than collaborative or collective ones. Strategic performance management processes (Issue 8) are also variable, although capacity building emerges as well regarded and the strengthening of teachers' skills and understandings strongly valued. These elements were revealed as needing to have a greater practical part in the process of strategy building.

In the survey responses, teachers in England gave a wide range of reasons for taking part in CPD. They also appear to be *ad hoc* rather than planned as part of an overarching strategic design for CPD.

| Reasons for CPD decision   | Percentage of teachers responding to importance of reasons for CPD decision |                       |           |         |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
|  | Not important   | Of Limited importance | Important | Crucial |
| Provided accreditation   | 41%   | 34%                   | 22%       | 4%      |
| Allowed me to work with colleagues   | 6%  | 17%                   | 67%       | 10%     |
| Improved my professional abilities   | <1%   | 4%                    | 54%       | 41%     |
| Allowed me to meet long-term career goals  | 13%   | 27%                   | 44%       | 16%     |
| Addressed immediate school needs   | 2%  | 10%                   | 64%       | 24%     |
| Provided information that was new to me  | 2%  | 8%                    | 63%       | 26%     |
| Changed my views on teaching   | 13%   | 38%                   | 43%       | 6%      |
| Prompted me to seek further information/training   | 11%   | 34%                   | 49%       | 6%      |
| Had a positive impact on pupils' learning  | 2%  | 5%                    | 54%       | 40%     |
| Resulted in improved achievement for pupils  | 1%  | 7%                    | 55%       | 36%     |
| Followed up previous professional learning activities  | 5%  | 25%                   | 62%       | 8%      |
| Addressed immediate classroom needs and improved my understanding of the National Curriculum | 5%  | 17%                   | 61%       | 18%     |
| Improved my understanding of National Curriculum requirements                                | 7%  | 19%                   | 55%       | 19%     |

**Table 12: Teachers reasons for deciding to take part in CPD**

The qualitative data confirmed that school contexts, culture, structures and recent history directly shaped or influenced teachers' perceptions and experience of CPD planning and provision,. Schools with a changed status – placed in special measures, for example – usually had a CPD programme structured around school-wide targets. In primary schools these focussed on improving numeracy and literacy, or some other assessed deficit of performance.

More usually, in the snapshot schools, numerous one-off, seize-the-moment CPD sessions were cited from a range of providers. These included individual educational professionals known to the CPD organisers, repeat commercial providers seen as successful, and other teachers in partner schools. These were often characterised by teachers as notable and welcome parts of a CPD programme.

An illustrative focus group activity (below) gives the varying views of teachers on their perceptions and experiences of the CPD environment in their own school. The contrasts evident – here from two of the teachers involved in the activity and also from evidence elsewhere in the focus groups – indicate something about competing demands and judgements that may be made of CPD planning and organisation in a single school context.

**Focus group activity 2**

CPD and the school environment: part of the TDA *Characteristics of effective CPD* list

| The CPD environment  | Securely in place<br>+ comments      | Starting to happen<br>+ comments   | Doesn't happen<br>+ comments  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is provided by people with the necessary experience, expertise and skills (colleagues, peers and also specialists from inside or outside the school).</li> </ul> |                                      | Including inset days<br><i>Not enough sharing on a whole-school level.</i>   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It takes account of participants' previous knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>   |                                      |  | I am not sure and think courses are offered because they seem like a good idea.<br><i>No</i>      |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional learning journals and various forms of accreditation are used to ensure a person's existing expertise is properly taken into account.</li> </ul>       |                                      |  | I am not sure if this happens.<br><i>Portfolios given out but left to us for self-assessment.</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is based on the best available evidence about teaching and learning.</li> </ul>  | And the school does feel up to date. | <i>Depends on the individual – can be effective.</i>   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each CPD activity is part of a coherent long-term plan and a deliberately planned process.</li> </ul>   |                                      | <i>Sometimes feels reactionary; but is occurring depending on need.</i>  | I am not sure and think courses are offered because they seem like a good idea.                   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school has an ethos of lifelong learning and development.</li> </ul>  |                                      | It can happen in certain areas.  | <i>Too focussed on data and assessment.</i>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is planned with a clear vision of the effective or improved practice being sought.</li> </ul>  |                                      | It can happen in certain areas.<br><i>My own experience has been very positive; but not sure it is happening for whole school.</i> |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This vision is shared by those undertaking the</li> </ul>   |                                      | It can happen in certain areas.  |   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>development and by the people leading or supporting it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPD plans show precisely what expertise, understanding or technique the CPD is intended to deliver. Sharply-defined outcomes are also the starting point for evaluating the impact of CPD.</li> </ul> <p>Others?</p> | <p><i>But due to the school's structure it is not always coordinated.</i></p> | <p>An evaluation takes place. Sometimes the outcomes are clearly defined.</p> |
|--|---|---|

**Black text** – Humanities teacher from overseas.  
*Italics* – post-threshold teacher with seven years' experience.

Not uncommonly, the qualitative study findings indicated what was also evident from the survey report (page 59). Teachers told us that the CPD activities they experienced had many functions and were often delivered by various session leaders, notably the local authority in primary schools. Inter-professional inputs were not referred to specifically in the data sources.

The picture of CPD that emerges from the survey and snapshot schools in England is one without a sustained focus, largely designed to provide information rather than learning and engagement with learning. Commonly, **the patterns of activity and the links that make up a school's 'strategy' were not apparent to key participants**, if they existed. As one head of CPD not untypically observed:

*"They [the senior leadership] do their own things well but don't see the connections... there should be a heart to it and that's what's missing. I think that that's what's stopping the expansion of it [CPD]."*

**Issue 7:** *Organisational choices made in schools about roles and responsibilities do not always support or help to develop CPD planning and provision.*

Once more, the literature reinforced the view that **CPD is most effective in schools where senior leaders and managers understood its potential for raising standards** and who were committed to using it as a key driver for school improvement (Ofsted 2006). This was borne out by the team’s survey data and strongly so by the qualitative data. Organisational choices made by senior leadership staff about roles, responsibilities and systems supported or undercut strategic planning and implementation of CPD.

Survey returns from teachers in England indicated that the professionals most commonly identified as organising CPD are not those identified as most often leading it. Beyond governors and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), non-teaching staff (45%), CPD leaders (44%), and advanced skills teachers in schools (41%), are identified as organising CPD most often.

| Percentage of teachers identifying the person as leading or organising the CPD in which they spent the most time |     |           |
|--|-----|-----------|
| Person or persons  | Led | Organised |
| Excellent teachers in my school  | 71% | 29%       |
| Excellent teachers from another school   | 68% | 32%       |
| Advanced skills teachers in my school  | 59% | 41%       |
| Advanced skills teachers in another school   | 74% | 27%       |
| Peers  | 82% | 18%       |
| Senior leadership team   | 67% | 34%       |
| Subject leaders  | 86% | 14%       |
| Local authority  | 72% | 28%       |
| CPD leader   | 57% | 44%       |
| Governors  | 28% | 72%       |
| Consultants  | 83% | 17%       |
| University staff   | 71% | 29%       |
| National organisation  | 67% | 34%       |
| DCSF   | 33% | 67%       |
| Non-teaching staff   | 55% | 45%       |
| Other type of professional   | 77% | 23%       |

**Table 13: Persons leading and organising the CPD activities in which teachers spent the most time**

The survey overview noted that ‘While... patterns are tentative... it appears that **AST and excellent teachers could play an important leadership role in school and teacher learning.**’(survey report page 11). This appears to be supported by the responses in table 13, though it may be argued that the different functions of these two distinct roles could be used more strategically by schools.

Some snapshot schools reported a symbiotic link between performance management processes and CPD opportunities. However, **the dislocation of CPD and performance management processes** in others could be largely attributed to the **organisational decision to appoint different members of**

**senior staff to lead these two areas.** Each function was usually well developed, with known routines and sequences of action attached to them.

However, integration of the systems and functions remained undeveloped. One CPD leader criticised the neglected links between CPD and performance management review: *“I should be involved in performance management in order to see links between school and individual priorities. [There’s] a schism... and no automatic discussion of CPD.”* Pressing for this kind of consideration would be this CPD leader’s prime objective – *“my next series of conversations, to be honest”*.

In some of the snapshot schools a ‘strategic’ organisational decision not to appoint advanced skills teachers and excellent teachers impacted upon CPD planning and provision. Where they were perceived as ‘divisive’, headteachers had offered new and different roles in the school to retain those who were capable of holding such posts. Elsewhere, current CPD plans were utilising the skills of teaching and learning responsibility (TLR) post-holders. Custom and practice, school context and culture all influenced organisational decision making.

However managed, **the absence of ASTs and excellent teachers might be viewed as valuable resources lost. Arguably, more careful distinctions made about the remit of these two roles could contribute profitably to CPD planning and provision.**

Other players in schools’ decisions about CPD such as HEIs and subject associations contribute to core CPD activity and enquiry. Subject associations operate to a great extent as a distance learning support source. HEIs work in partnership with school staff, usually in relation to tracking qualified teacher status (QTS) and induction standards achievement of beginner teachers and in associated mentoring and coaching processes. HEIs also provide a wide variety of CPD courses for established teachers many of which are clearly contextualised and informed by school and classroom practices and professional challenges.

**Issue 8:** *Some changes to teachers' perceptions and actions in relation to their roles and responsibilities are evident, in tune with the New Professionalism agenda. Wholesale change has not occurred.*

Ten years after the green paper, *Teachers: Facing the Challenge of Change* (DfEE 1998), performance management review systems, professional standards, career aspirations, professional life phases and career stages all form recognised elements of the New Professionalism modernisation agenda. A reformed performance management system has been operating in schools for a year, though its earlier variants have been experienced by teachers over a number of years.

However, the overall impression from the literature is that little evidence about these systems has yet emerged. This deficit appears to be the result of the time lapse between the publication of some of the most recent national-level documents and the structures and processes they herald.

Bolam and Weindling's (2006) systematic review of 20 research studies established that there is little direct evidence to demonstrate what 'New Professionalism', recently revised systems of performance management (PM), or the restructured Framework of Professional Standards (2007) look like in schools. Moreover, only weak evidence was available in the studies to argue that increased teacher retention, a projected outcome of the changes, had directly resulted from effective CPD in schools.

**The relative paucity of evidence about concrete systemic developments in schools, requires further investigation in the research field.** Currently, the research evidence in the literature 2004-2008 finds practically no marked change and no rapid movement to the kind of consistently applied performance-related practices, career-stage professional standards awareness and outcomes, such as increased retention, that government has sought.

With regard to relationships between PM and CPD, the survey asked teachers to rate how often PM practices helped them:

- become aware of the professional standards
- to see how their professional learning goals related to school improvement priorities, and
- to achieve their professional learning goals.

The survey also asked them to record the *value* they placed on these functions of PM. It found that:

- levels of recorded practice and values are both quite high, but not as high as for 'clear vision' and 'building social capital' dimensions of school support for CPD.
- PM is valued at high levels by teachers in primary schools, schools in the lowest achievement band, and also by senior leaders, headteachers,

ASTs/excellent teachers, and by teachers with less than two years' teaching experience.

The overall mean score for the first question about PM practices (How often are PM processes helping teachers in the ways outlined above?) was 68.57%, with a mean of 70.91% of teachers valuing this function of the PM processes highly. However, scores varied widely across the country (shown from high to low by practices):

| Region                   | Practices (mean score) | Values (mean score) |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Yorkshire and The Humber | 72.92                  | 73.52               |
| East Midlands            | 72.20                  | 71.61               |
| North East               | 71.97                  | 73.59               |
| North West               | 69.69                  | 65.75               |
| West Midlands            | 69.48                  | 69.12               |
| South East               | 69.31                  | 72.21               |
| South West               | 67.91                  | 69.15               |
| London                   | 65.94                  | 72.49               |
| East                     | 56.41                  | 65.91               |

**Table 14: Regional practices and values for performance management processes (adapted)**

It is interesting to note that there are few statistically significant gaps between practice and values, implying that where PM advantages are frequently realised, teachers value them highly, and vice versa – except in the two regions where the advantages are least frequently realised.

Other survey data collected indicated a relatively low values score for PM processes, a common finding across different groups of teachers, with a number of exceptions (see table 15 on the next page). For example, lowest values are recorded by teachers with more than 20 years' teaching experience, while teachers in the first two years of teaching value PM processes very highly. These exceptions are of interest for further research investigation.

Notable too are the high numbers of secondary school teachers in England, who are not leaders, ASTs or excellent teachers, who did not record high levels of PM practices. The dislocation of systems commented upon by teachers in some of the snapshot schools may account for these differences. In the survey responses, 'Building capacity' of teachers in schools and the importance of schools' social capital resources attracted support, possibly providing a valuable platform for enhanced PM and CPD connections.

**Achieving an appropriate balance between capacity building and PM processes** has been argued as being at the heart of school modernisation reforms of 1998 onwards (Harris 2003; Storey 2004). This remains a challenge in schools.

**Teachers by years of teaching experience**

|   |                     | Practices |       | Values |       |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|
|   |                     | Mean      | SD    | Mean   | SD    |
| Clear vision and formal systems of professional support and impact evaluation | one to two years *  | 73.42     | 19.52 | 81.91  | 12.86 |
|   | three to 10 years * | 73.42     | 19.61 | 81.33  | 11.73 |
|   | 11-20 years *       | 75.76     | 18.35 | 81.76  | 13.08 |
|   | 20+ years *         | 76.43     | 20.18 | 79.29  | 13.16 |
| Performance management processes**  | one to two years *  | 70.47     | 23.55 | 75.60  | 18.69 |
|   | three to 10 years * | 67.61     | 27.67 | 71.03  | 23.03 |
|   | 11-20 years         | 70.79     | 25.30 | 73.17  | 20.86 |
|   | 20+ years           | 68.64     | 27.73 | 66.73  | 24.58 |
| Building social capital   | one to two years *  | 78.47     | 17.85 | 82.51  | 12.85 |
|   | three to 10 years * | 77.43     | 17.96 | 81.42  | 11.78 |
|   | 11-20 years         | 79.91     | 16.27 | 81.67  | 12.06 |
|   | 20+ years           | 80.14     | 15.55 | 79.65  | 11.82 |
| Supporting collaboration, networking and experimentation                      | one to two years *  | 57.56     | 24.22 | 75.37  | 16.23 |
|   | three to 10 years * | 59.45     | 23.16 | 74.94  | 14.00 |
|   | 11-20 years *       | 61.17     | 20.27 | 75.00  | 13.92 |
|   | 20+ years *         | 64.12     | 23.11 | 72.69  | 14.76 |

**Table 15 Comparing teachers by years of teaching experience**

\* Significant mean values-practice gaps ( $sig = < .05$ )

\*\* Significant differences in mean values scores ( $sig = < .05$ )

SD = significant difference

These survey responses provide some indications of the cultural change hoped for in terms of attitudes and values. However, culture change is an accretive process (Mahony *et al* 2004; Storey 2007), and gaps between values and practices or inconsistent renditions of PM processes, for example, **point to the need for more systemic developments over a further period of time to bring about the projected benefits of New Professionalism** in a more consistent way across different school contexts.

The professional standards

In the snapshot schools, there was a relatively evenly balanced set of responses. Strong links were made between CPD and the 2007 Framework of Professional Standards for Teachers in some schools, but not in others. Where the link between CPD and the professional standards was recognised and enacted, there was often an awareness of appropriate professional development activity to achieve a new career stage position or role.

Teachers mentoring and coaching trainees and NQTs consciously targeted their own work to support these beginning teachers in achieving their professional standards, meeting some of their own standards in the process. In some sites, the standards were seen as a new way *“to recognise what we are good at”* **and as an opportunity for staff beyond NQT stage to retain focus.**

In other schools, teachers were less aware of the Framework of Standards, and there was little CPD planning and organisation in relation to them.

#### Career stage/role and perceptions and take-up of CPD

This is an area still under-researched and reported on in the literature. Survey data revealed that differences recorded between career stages for mean values and practice scores are significant for ‘Experimental and adaptive learning’ with mainscale and post-threshold teachers expressing lower levels of both practices and values than teachers at other career stages.

There was a significant distinction between teachers at different career stages, reflected in practice levels for ‘Research orientation’, which are, unsurprisingly perhaps, higher for AST/excellent teachers and qualified headteachers than for NQT, mainscale and post-threshold teachers.

In about half the snapshot schools, the reactions of interview respondents and focus group participants to CPD-specific activities differed with a teacher’s career stage: this had implications for the planning and organisation of CPD. **Beginning teachers, for example, tended to be more approving of accreditation** because of its potential as a tool for career-stage promotion.

#### **Beginning teachers also saw CPD as an entitlement and something which would equip them for the next career stage or role development.**

More experienced teachers, and those near retirement, were highly likely not to be interested in CPD for career development, although many such teachers said they wanted CPD to influence their current practice.

In about **half of the focus groups, accreditation of CPD was rated last or almost last in terms of CPD prioritisation.** Respondents generally supported variants of the view expressed by one of them: *“You can be accredited all you like, but if you are no good in the classroom you are not doing the children any good.”* As noted in Issue 4, opinion was divided as to whether the masters in teaching and learning (MTL) qualification would significantly raise the status of the profession, function as an attractive recruitment element, or act as a factor that would encourage retention.

Evidence of a culture change in teaching in the snapshot schools was noted by experienced teachers and was seen to be located in a series of structural changes: the phased introduction of the Framework of Professional Standards, the performance management review processes, and arguably, a more systematic set of CPD opportunities being planned and provided for teachers.

**Issue 9:** *Evaluation systems of CPD used in schools are insufficiently tied to considering planned outcomes, identifying specific criteria and considering value for money.*

A dominant view emerging from the literature is that evaluation processes constitute a problem area for schools (Goodall *et al* 2005; CUREE 2008). “Most schools do not have established processes for evaluating the impact of CPD at school, teacher or pupil level” (TTA, 2005, page 6). Bolam and Weindling (2006) concluded that schools found it difficult to evaluate the impact of CPD. The later CUREE study for the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) (CUREE, 2008) also noted a similar situation, and the literature review for this study (McCormick *et al*, 2008) does not reveal any improvement.

Elements of ‘strategic evaluation’ (CUREE 2008) of annual reviews using PM processes, the systematic use of data monitoring, coaching and peer review, and so on, have been presented as useful, with ‘strategic’ schools considering pupil outcomes as core indicators of the impact their CPD has.

Currently, however, the main focus of evaluation is directed at the views of the participants, usually through questionnaires. This limits the potential of incorporating judgements about CPD activities and processes into strategic planning. Our literature review notes the difficulty involved in identifying variables that contribute to changes in pupils’ learning outcomes in general, and the more specific difficulty of identifying particular aspects of CPD on pupils’ learning. Ofsted (2006, page 203) reported that:

*Few of the schools evaluated successfully the impact of CPD on the quality of teaching and on pupils’ achievement because they did not identify the intended outcomes clearly at the planning stage. (Ofsted, 2006, pages 2-3)*

Developing systems of ‘strategic evaluation’, and hence strategic approaches to CPD that involve planning for CPD impact on pupils’ learning outcomes, represents a major challenge.

Where something more than a participant reaction to the CPD was requested, there was often difficulty in interpreting evaluations. In these schools, follow-up action linked to a CPD strategic plan and specific outcomes, including pupil achievement, was absent.

Many schools were mainly concerned to evaluate participant satisfaction of a CPD event, value for money, participant learning, knowledge and skills, views/attitudes, behaviour, participants’ use of knowledge and skills, support from the school, and changes in pupil behaviour (Goodall *et al* (2006).

In a 2005 study, Goodall found that the most commonly used evaluation tool by schools was a survey or questionnaire. The use of this method across schools, however, was found to be highly variable and in many cases problematic, since the completion of the survey or questionnaire was viewed as an end in itself. In the same study, schools highlighted a need for CPD provision to help them carry out evaluation more effectively (Goodall *et al*, 2005, page 11).

*The gap between this problematic situation and the aspiration of 'strategic evaluation' is a wide one. CUREE pointed to a range of different processes to achieve the latter point, such as those referred to above. Additional dimensions were such processes as annual department review, a systematic use of data monitoring, the use of coaching and assessing goals and targets through the performance management system, with follow-up support mechanisms to achieve agreed goals. (CUREE 2008: 31)*

Value for money is generally seen as important, but evidence is rather thin in terms of whether it is rigorously considered by school leaders when evaluating CPD. As a result, very few studies showed evidence of this in relation to CPD.

CPD was most effective in schools where senior leaders understood and promulgated its potential for raising standards, and were committed to using it as a key driver for school improvement.

The survey data indicated school leaders' views about value for money in relation to CPD.

| Types of CPD  | Percentage of school leaders<br>(out of 247) |           |             |       |
|---|--|-----------|-------------|-------|
|   | Not at all                                   | Not a lot | Quite a lot | A lot |
| In-school workshop or seminar                         | < 1%   | 6%        | 49%         | 45%   |
| Non-university accredited courses                     | 15%  | 54%       | 29%         | 3%    |
| University courses                                    | 19%  | 54%       | 22%         | 4%    |
| Out-of-school workshops or seminars                   | 1%   | 17%       | 70%         | 14%   |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives                    | < 1%   | 21%       | 57%         | 22%   |
| Conferences   | 4%   | 39%       | 49%         | 9%    |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers | 2%   | 16%       | 46%         | 37%   |
| Committees or task forces                             | 9%   | 35%       | 49%         | 9%    |
| Teacher study groups                                  | 16%  | 43%       | 37%         | 6%    |
| Independent study                                     | 15%  | 45%       | 33%         | 8%    |

**Table 16 Survey report: Overall school leader perceptions of value for money of types of CPD**

School leaders perceived school-based or school-focused CPD to have more value for money than CPD which was not. In-school workshops, mentoring and teacher networks were rated highly, along with other foci that addressed pupil learning. As noted in Issue 5, school leaders felt that CPD resulting in accreditation had less value for money.

School leaders' perceptions of CPD impacts vary significantly by school level. There were significant differences between response patterns of primary

school leaders and secondary school leaders relating to value for money of CPD impacts. Primary school leaders perceived the impacts below to have more value for money than secondary school leaders:

- Improving professional abilities of teachers
- Addressing immediate school needs
- Positive impacts on pupils' learning
- Improving pupil achievement.

There were also significant differences between primary and secondary spending on CPD activities in all areas. Secondary schools spend significantly more on external courses and materials for CPD than primary schools. And primary schools spend significantly more on supply cover and school-led CPD than secondary schools.

School leaders in different regions varied in their perceptions of the value for money of CPD activities which result in changes in beliefs about teaching. In the North East, these leaders were less likely to see this impact as being value for money, while teachers in the West Midlands and in London were more likely to regard it as being so – and much more so than school leaders in other regions.

In 10 of the 12 snapshot schools, evaluation forms were used, but in some cases the purposes of these were not evident to interviewees. In a quarter of the schools, there had been a move to include 'pupil voice' in the evaluation processes, a feature supported in the literature. Where this practice was used, it was characterised as a tentatively promising development, rather than an embedded planned-for part of the evaluation process. Overall, evaluation of CPD appeared instinctive and pragmatic.

Value for money, an element of evaluating a CPD event, activity or process, was raised in the snapshot schools. The outcome here was quite distinct. Evaluation of CPD appeared instinctive, based on a shorthand, fast calculation of likely outcomes, their importance to the core development plans of the school, and how staff might react. Pragmatism was also in play, taking account of the previous year's programme, strong and influential opinion voiced by trusted colleagues in relation to prospective outside speakers, and even the time of term.

**There was no evidence in the 12 schools of a detailed and criterion-referenced value-for-money calculation of a CPD event that had occurred, or might do so, as part of an established evaluation and action process.**

This kind of omission returns us to Issue 1 where the point was made that most school leaders consider that CPD that focuses on pressing school needs, allows colleagues to work together, and provides new, useful information to be good value for money and beneficial. Such a response would appear to limit a strategically-oriented planning-action-review cycle for CPD. Again, restricted and differing definitions of the term 'strategic' impact

here, feeding back to the variable school contexts broached at the beginning of this strand report.

The challenge is to strategically balance all these needs and levels with reference to the impact on pupils and pedagogy, as well as on individual teachers and their personal and professional development agendas. School leaders would appear to have an essential role to play in helping to develop systems and orientations for the planning, evaluation and organisation of CPD that is more strategically linked to improvements in pupils' learning and school development than currently appears to be the case in schools in England.

Finally, while there are significant variations in costs by both location and region of schools, no identifiable patterns emerged. In brief, schools in different locations (non-rural and rural) or regions spend differently on CPD, but varied greatly within and among school type. No significant differences in costs for CPD were found between schools in different achievement bands.

However, school leaders in the highest achievement band are significantly less likely to rate a CPD focus on teaching and learning as being good value for money. Similarly, school leaders in the lowest achievement band are significantly less likely to rate a CPD focus on deepening subject pedagogical knowledge as being good value for money. And not surprisingly, we found that school leaders in the lowest and second lowest achievement bands are significantly more likely to rate a focus on literacy to be good value for money than their peers in other achievement bands.

A significant lesson learned from the findings above, and our analysis of school spending on CPD, is that cost allocation is notably variable and heavily dependent on the individual needs, contexts, ethos and interests of groups of teachers in specific schools.

## ***Conclusions and recommendations: CPD planning and organisation***

Recommendations are summarised for each issue identified in section 4.

**Issue 6:** *The strategic planning for CPD frequently does not provide for the wide range of professional development needs that exist in schools.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Schools need to be supported in understanding the core elements and processes of a truly 'strategic' plan for CPD.
- b) Capacity building and strengthening teachers' skills and understandings need to play a greater practical part in how schools' CPD strategy is formulated and implemented.
- c) Schools would benefit from encouragement and advice about how to effectively meet the wide range of CPD needs identified.
- d) School leaders need to know and alert all their staff to the patterns of CPD activity operating within the school context and the rationale for them.

**Issue 7:** *Organisational choices made in schools about roles and responsibilities do not always support or help to develop CPD planning and provision.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) School leaders need to be supported to appreciate that organisational choices about role functions and systems can encourage or directly undercut strategic planning and implementation of CPD.
- b) School leaders need to be alerted to the disadvantages of disparate systems, differently led, for CPD and performance management processes in their schools and be encouraged to develop greater interplay between the two elements.
- c) School leaders could profitably be alerted to the distinctive remit of ASTs and excellent teachers and further develop the potential of these post-holders within schools' CPD contexts.

**Issue 8:** Some changes to teachers' perceptions and actions in relation to their roles and responsibilities are evident, in tune with the New Professionalism agenda. Wholesale change has not occurred.

*Recommendations:*

- a) The relative paucity of evidence in the literature linked to modernization and New Professionalism indicates that these aspects require further investigation in the research field.
- b) The gap between values and practices and inconsistent performance management processes point to the need for more systemic developments over time to achieve projected benefits in a more consistent way across different school contexts.
- c) The potential of the professional standards to recognise the strengths and achievements of teachers and schools can profitably be developed to enable teachers to retain focus and to support their career stages and career-path plans.

**Issue 9:** *Evaluation systems of CPD used in schools are insufficiently tied to considering planned outcomes, identifying specific criteria and considering value for money.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) It would help to develop clear guidance for school leaders so that schools can recognise and use appropriate evaluation systems and processes linked to the strategic planning of CPD. This support could include a criterion-referenced value-for-money analysis.
- b) There should be wider involvement of senior leaders in CPD strategic planning and in developing informed and consistent patterns of CPD activity in their schools (with relevant follow-up action). This would help to develop closer links between teachers' CPD, pupils' learning and school improvement priorities.
- c) Training and development opportunities in CPD evaluation and follow up for school leaders would provide useful opportunities to plan strategically to more effectively meet 'the balance of needs' (Issue 1) in their schools.

## **Section 5: CPD access**

In this section we present two issues relating to CPD access.

### **Issue 10: Relating to CPD opportunities**

Teachers are offered a narrow range of CPD opportunities which vary significantly by experience, career stage and leadership responsibility.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions 2e, 3a, 3b, 3d, 3i, 3j)*

### **Issue 11: Relating to barriers to CPD participation**

Both school-level conditions and teacher perceptions serve as barriers to CPD participation.

*(Addresses TDA specification questions 2e, 2j, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3i)*

**Issue 10:** *Teachers are offered a narrow range of CPD opportunities which vary significantly by experience, career stage and leadership responsibility.*

**The primary barrier to participation in CPD is the lack of varied opportunities for CPD provided to teachers. Teachers in England are not offered the full range of types of CPD.** Opportunities to take part in CPD activities and teachers' participation in CPD activities closely track one another. When offered opportunities to participate in CPD, the vast majority of teachers take part in the activities offered.

However, what is clear is that many teachers are not offered the range of available CPD types. For example, less than half of all teachers responding to the survey were offered opportunities to attend non-university accredited courses (26%), university courses (19%), conferences (43%), curriculum committees (31%), teacher study groups (19%) and independent study (29%). (See table below.)

|                           | Percentage of teachers who were offered opportunity to take part | Percentage of teachers who took part |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| In-school workshops       | 88   | 85                                   |
| Non-university accredited | 26   | 16                                   |
| University courses        | 19   | 11                                   |
| Out-of-school workshops   | 70   | 64                                   |
| Teacher networks          | 56   | 51                                   |
| Conferences               | 43   | 34                                   |
| Mentoring                 | 61   | 57                                   |
| Committees                | 31   | 26                                   |
| Teacher study groups      | 19   | 16                                   |
| Independent study         | 29   | 26                                   |

**Table 17: CPD opportunities offered to teachers and levels of teacher participation**

The survey results were confirmed by teachers in the snapshot schools who said they attended when opportunities were provided.

*“If offered a course I would certainly go so as to take time out of school to reflect.”* (Teacher, Droley Comprehensive)

Teachers in the snapshot schools also reported that the opportunities provided to them were ‘familiar’ and ‘functional’ CPD options. Teachers often referred to these opportunities as ‘training’, and these types of opportunities appeared to have the first call on CPD funds available to the schools.

We would expect that teachers at different career stages have different development needs and that these differences would be evident in the opportunities provided to them. However, the significant variation that exists in the opportunities provided to teachers with differing years of teaching experience, career stages and school leadership responsibilities, does not appear to be related to levels of development. Differences in opportunities for teachers are discussed below. Teachers in the survey and teachers in the

snapshot schools did not perceive gender to be an issue in opportunities for CPD.

**Differences in CPD opportunities by years of teaching experience**

| CPD opportunity                                       | Percentage of teachers by years of teaching experience offered CPD opportunities |                         |                          |                        |
|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
|   | 1-2 years (out of 141)   | 3-10 years (out of 437) | 11-20 years (out of 215) | 20+ years (out of 264) |
| In-school workshops                                   | 89%  | 88%                     | 90%                      | 90%                    |
| Non-university accredited courses*                    | 15%  | 28%                     | 32%                      | 25%                    |
| University courses                                    | 16%  | 19%                     | 22%                      | 17%                    |
| Out-of-school workshops                               | 77%  | 68%                     | 72%                      | 67%                    |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives*                   | 44%  | 56%                     | 64%                      | 57%                    |
| Conferences*  | 33%  | 40%                     | 53%                      | 48%                    |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers | 65%  | 64%                     | 62%                      | 56%                    |
| Curriculum committees or task forces*                 | 16%  | 31%                     | 40%                      | 35%                    |
| Teacher study groups*                                 | 14%  | 22%                     | 23%                      | 14%                    |
| Independent study *                                   | 37%  | 32%                     | 27%                      | 23%                    |

**Table 18: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by years of experience**

\* Opportunities indicate those where significant differences ( $sig = < .05$ ) exist between opportunities offered to teachers by years of experience.

Generally, teachers with only one to two years of experience are offered fewer types of CPD than teachers with more experience. These teachers are offered fewer CPD opportunities for:

- Non-university accredited courses ( $sig = .003$ )
- Teacher networks and collaboratives ( $sig = .003$ )
- Conferences ( $sig = .000$ )
- Curriculum committees or task forces ( $sig = .000$ ), and
- Teacher study groups ( $sig = .020$ ).

Reversing this general trend, as years of experience increase, teachers are offered less opportunity to take part in independent study ( $sig = .012$ ). And teachers with 20+ years of teaching are also offered fewer opportunities to take part in teacher study groups ( $sig = .020$ ).

**Differences in CPD opportunities by career stage**

| CPD opportunity  | Percentage of teachers by career stage offered CPD opportunities |                                   |  |   |                                       |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
|  | Newly qualified<br>(out of 97)                                   | Mainscale teacher<br>(out of 417) | Post-threshold teacher<br>(out of 537) | AST/<br>excellent teachers<br>(out of 11) | Qualified headteachers<br>(out of 13) |
| In-school workshops                                    | 90%  | 85%                               | 90%                                    | 91%                                       | 100%                                  |
| Non-university accredited courses*                     | 13%  | 25%                               | 29%                                    | 36%                                       | 54%                                   |
| University courses                                     | 18%  | 18%                               | 20%                                    | 36%                                       | 42%                                   |
| Out-of-school workshops                                | 77%  | 67%                               | 70%                                    | 73%                                       | 85%                                   |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives*                    | 37%  | 54%                               | 61%                                    | 73%                                       | 77%                                   |
| Conferences*   | 34%  | 37%                               | 49%                                    | 73%                                       | 77%                                   |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers* | 74%  | 58%                               | 63%                                    | 82%                                       | 62%                                   |
| Curriculum committees or task forces*                  | 14%  | 28%                               | 37%                                    | 64%                                       | 54%                                   |
| Teacher study groups                                   | 19%  | 20%                               | 19%                                    | 36%                                       | 7%                                    |
| Independent study                                      | 35%  | 31%                               | 27%                                    | 18%                                       | 39%                                   |

**Table 19: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by career stage**

\* Opportunities indicate those where significant differences ( $sig = < .05$ ) exist between opportunities offered to teachers by career stage.

As teachers rise up through the career stages, they are offered more opportunities to take part in the following types of CPD:

- Non-university accredited courses ( $sig = .002$ )
- Teacher networks and collaboratives ( $sig = .000$ )
- Conferences ( $sig = .000$ ).

Teachers are also given the opportunity to take part more in curriculum committees and task forces as they rise in career stage ( $sig = .000$ ), although qualified headteachers are slightly less likely to be offered this opportunity than ASTs and excellent teachers. Finally, ASTs, excellent teachers and newly qualified teachers are both offered more opportunities to take part in mentoring, coaching, lead teaching and observing peers than teachers at other career stages ( $sig = .025$ ).

**Differences in CPD opportunities by leadership responsibility**

| Percentage of teachers by leadership responsibility offered CPD opportunities |   |                               |                              |                            |
|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| CPD opportunity   | Little to no responsibility<br>(Out of 408) | Middle leader<br>(out of 599) | Senior leader<br>(out of 57) | Headteacher<br>(out of 11) |
| In-school Workshops*  | 85%   | 91%                           | 90%                          | 100%                       |
| Non-university accredited courses*  | 20%   | 29%                           | 35%                          | 55%                        |
| University courses  | 17%   | 19%                           | 23%                          | 46%                        |
| Out-of-school workshops*  | 61%   | 75%                           | 77%                          | 82%                        |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives*   | 40%   | 66%                           | 72%                          | 82%                        |
| Conferences*  | 32%   | 48%                           | 61%                          | 91%                        |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers*                        | 55%   | 65%                           | 79%                          | 73%                        |
| Curriculum committees or task forces*   | 23%   | 36%                           | 44%                          | 55%                        |
| Teacher study groups  | 17%   | 20%                           | 30%                          | 9%                         |
| Independent study *   | 30%   | 27%                           | 49%                          | 27%                        |

**Table 20: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by leadership responsibility**

\* Opportunities indicate those where significant differences ( $sig = < .05$ ) exist between opportunities offered to teachers by leadership responsibility.

There are many differences between teachers with different leadership responsibilities and the CPD activities offered to them. In most instances, as leadership responsibilities increase, teachers they are offered more CPD opportunities. This trend is statistically significant for seven types of CPD as shown in the table above. Additionally, teachers with senior leadership responsibilities are statistically more likely to be offered opportunities to undertake independent study than teachers with all other levels of responsibility ( $sig = .006$ ).

Overall then, it appears that **teachers with fewer years of experience, teachers at earlier career stages, and teachers with less leadership responsibility have a narrower range of CPD opportunities available to them**. This finding contradicts assertions by snapshot schools who largely reported that staff have equal access to CPD opportunities.

There are two likely explanations for the limited CPD opportunities available to teachers. First, as cited in the literature review, Wilde (2005) has suggested that the gap in provision of CPD provided by local authorities (LAs) and the needs of schools is linked to the LAs new role as a broker rather than provider

of development activities. Similarly, the gap between teacher needs and the opportunities offered them could be explained by schools also serving as brokers rather than sites of professional development.

The information gathered in the snapshot schools would support this explanation. Teachers reported that there did not seem to be a clear link between what was offered and the demand from individuals. Further, teachers felt that professional development was largely left to individuals and their own wish to develop. As one NQT reported,

*“everyone in the maths department can do what they want.”*

Thus, schools appear primarily to broker CPD for individuals, or groups of individuals, rather than see their role as professional developers of the entire staff.

The second likely explanation for the narrow range of CPD opportunities available to teachers may be due to school-level conditions and individual perceptions of CPD that serve as barriers to provision. For example, teachers in snapshot schools reported familiar reasons such as time and budget constraints as barriers to CPD provision in their schools. Others reported older colleagues who were less interested in professional development. Both of these types of barrier will be explored further in our second access issue.

**Issue 11: Both school-level conditions and teacher perceptions serve as barriers to CPD participation.**

Two types of barrier to CPD opportunity for teachers in England emerged in the State of the Nation study. Teachers reported on both the survey and during the school snapshots that some school-level conditions were associated with fewer opportunities for CPD. Teachers also reported that individual perceptions of CPD can also decrease demand for CPD, and this results in fewer opportunities being offered to teachers in their school. Each of these types of barrier to access is discussed in this section.

School-level barriers

**Teachers in certain school contexts have fewer CPD opportunities than teachers in other school contexts, and these school-level conditions could be seen as barriers to professional development opportunity.**

These school-level conditions include the school sector, the achievement band of the school, and insufficient school CPD budgets.

**Differences in CPD opportunities by school sector**

| CPD opportunity  | Percentage of primary teachers offered the opportunity (out of 656) | Percentage of secondary teachers offered the opportunity (out of 467) |
|--|---|---|
| In-school workshops*                                   | 90%   | 84%   |
| Non-university accredited courses                      | 26%   | 25%   |
| University courses*                                    | 17%   | 22%   |
| Out-of-school workshops*                               | 75%   | 62%   |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives*                    | 60%   | 49%   |
| Conferences  | 43%   | 44%   |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers* | 59%   | 65%   |
| Curriculum committees or task forces*                  | 26%   | 39%   |
| Teacher study groups*                                  | 16%   | 23%   |
| Independent study                                      | 24%   | 36%   |

**Table 21: CPD opportunities offered to primary and secondary teachers**

\* Opportunities indicate those where significant differences ( $sig = < .05$ ) exist between opportunities offered to primary and secondary teachers

There are many statistically significant differences in the CPD opportunities offered to primary and secondary school teachers. Primary school teachers are offered opportunities to take part in in-school workshops ( $sig = .004$ ), out-of-school workshops ( $sig = .000$ ) and teacher networks ( $sig = .000$ ) more often than secondary school teachers. Secondary school teachers are offered opportunities to take part in university courses ( $sig = .031$ ), mentoring ( $sig = .054$ ), curriculum committees ( $sig = .000$ ), teacher study groups ( $sig = .001$ ) and independent study ( $sig = .000$ ) more often than primary teachers. **The overall pattern that emerges is that secondary teachers have more varied opportunities for CPD than primary teachers.**

**Differences in CPD opportunities by achievement band of school**

| Percentage of teachers by school achievement band offered CPD |  |
|---|--|
|---|--|

| CPD opportunity  | opportunities |                 |             |                  |              |
|--|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|
|  | Lowest band   | 2nd lowest band | Middle band | 2nd highest band | Highest band |
| In-school workshops*                                   | 95%           | 91%             | 85%         | 84%              | 88%          |
| Non-university accredited courses                      | 21%           | 23%             | 27%         | 23%              | 28%          |
| University courses                                     | 20%           | 18%             | 23%         | 13%              | 18%          |
| Out-of-school workshops                                | 71%           | 71%             | 69%         | 65%              | 76%          |
| Teacher networks or collaboratives                     | 54%           | 62%             | 53%         | 52%              | 58%          |
| Conferences*   | 38%           | 40%             | 48%         | 38%              | 52%          |
| Mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing peers* | 50%           | 62%             | 62%         | 69%              | 62%          |
| Curriculum committees or task forces                   | 24%           | 29%             | 27%         | 33%              | 36%          |
| Teacher study groups                                   | 13%           | 22%             | 19%         | 17%              | 19%          |
| Independent study                                      | 26%           | 27%             | 32%         | 30%              | 30%          |

**Table 22: CPD opportunities offered to teachers by school achievement band**

\* Opportunities indicate those where significant differences ( $sig = < .05$ ) exist between opportunities offered to teachers by school achievement band.

There are some statistically significant differences in the CPD offered to teachers in schools in different achievement bands. Teachers in the two lowest achievement bands are offered in-school workshops ( $sig = .005$ ) more often than teachers in schools in other achievement bands. Teachers in the highest achievement band schools are offered the opportunity to attend conferences ( $sig = .018$ ) more often than teachers in other achievement bands. And teachers in the lowest achievement band are offered the opportunity to take part in mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observing activities ( $sig = .016$ ) far less often than teachers in other achievement bands.

These differences in CPD opportunities provided to teachers in schools in different achievement bands are echoed in the school snapshot data. Teachers in schools under special measures reported that they had little choice over their CPD. As a result, these teachers expressed very little ownership of their CPD and felt this was a barrier to effective take-up. Similarly, these teachers reported that 'non-priority' areas – ones that were not literacy, numeracy or science – were wholly excluded from CPD provision.

**Thus, teachers in low performing schools report more constrained CPD opportunities than teachers in higher performing schools.**

While data on school budgets was not part of the analysis for this study, teachers report that CPD budgets are sometimes insufficient to meet the need for professional development in their schools. Budget constraints were frequently cited by teachers as reasons for a lack of take-up. These budget constraints affected the amount available for teachers to attend courses, the amount of available supply cover for classes, and the time that teachers could contribute to development activities that occurred outside the normal working day.

Further, because of budget constraints, teachers reported that school-development needs were, rightly, given priority over individual development needs. **Teachers in the State of the Nation study often circumscribed requests for professional development because of restricted school finances to support activities.**

#### Perceptual barriers

Three types of individual teacher perceptions can be identified as barriers to CPD in the State of the Nation study. Older teachers are reported to be less interested in professional development, but often given preference in CPD opportunities. Teachers constrain their demand for CPD in response to perceived school conditions. And teachers report that the quality of the CPD offered to them can put them off taking part. Each of these perceptions is discussed below.

**Older, more experienced teachers have less demand for CPD, but also have the greatest access to it.** As the survey data indicate, as teachers gain more experience, they have more CPD offered to them. Related to this, as experience rises, so too does participation in most instances. However, teachers with 20+ years are less likely than teachers with less experience to take part in non-university accredited courses, teacher mentoring, coaching and independent study.

The survey results were confirmed by teachers in snapshot schools who reported older teachers being uninterested in development opportunities and also holding negative views about the benefits of CPD. Unfortunately, snapshot teachers also report that these older teachers have significant influence over the opportunities provided in schools because they have the 'ear' of senior leadership.

Teachers may not demand CPD if they feel there are budget constraints in the school. Staff reported that they would do more but 'you don't because the budget doesn't allow'. In this context, teachers felt that asking for CPD was a moral as much as a professional decision, and that requests should be for activities with 'strict relevance' which guaranteed a high impact.

Relatedly, teachers constrained their demand for CPD if they believed there weren't enough good quality supply teachers available to cover their classes. So teachers see financial resources, professional responsibilities, and time away from their students as significant barriers to participation. Therefore,

**teacher demand for CPD represents teachers' perceptions of constraints on availability and not necessarily their need for development.**

Finally, **teachers reported that the quality of CPD offered to them put them off taking part.** Teachers in the snapshot schools reported significant variability in some of the offerings. They also described a 'PowerPoint problem' where presenters read from slides. Some teachers also referred to a 'spin-out problem' where content that should have merited a couple of hours was used to fill an entire day. A 'bandwagon' approach to CPD was also cited as a barrier to take-up.

## ***Conclusions and recommendations: CPD access***

Recommendations are summarised for each issue identified in section 5.

**Issue 10:** *Teachers are offered a narrow range of CPD opportunities which vary significantly by experience, career stage and leadership responsibility.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) Schools and teachers should be encouraged to take part in a range of CPD types and activities, especially those that are classroom-based, research-informed, and collaborative.
- b) Schools should be sensitised to providing equal opportunities for CPD regardless of career stage, leadership opportunities or teaching experience.
- c) CPD activities should be planned to coincide with career stage development. This may necessitate cooperation between networks of schools to meet the needs of career stages where few teachers may be present in one school – for example, newly qualified teachers (NQTs).

**Issue 11:** *Both school-level conditions and teacher perceptions serve as barriers to CPD participation.*

*Recommendations:*

- a) The need for CPD from schools and teachers may vary by context. But we need to make sure there is equal opportunity to CPD across school conditions and across teachers so that provision varies due to a better match with need than with opportunity.
- b) Help schools to identify better quality CPD activities for staff.
- c) Help schools understand the elements and conditions of effective CPD.
- d) Identify ways to better determine teacher needs and demand for CPD that do not rely on informal perceptions of need.

## ***Appendices note***

Please see the appendices of the strand reports for the materials that influenced and enabled this project, including:

- CPD - a discussion by the researchers (Survey report appendix 1)
- TDA's effective CPD characteristics (Survey report appendix 4)
- Information on the development and analysis of the survey (Survey report, appendices 2, 3, 7 and 8)
- Information on the qualitative data gathering exercises (Qualitative report, appendices 1-6)
- The teacher and leader surveys (Survey report, appendices 5 and 6)

## **References**

Bolam, R and Weindling, D, 2006, Synthesis of Research and Evaluation Projects Concerned with Capacity-Building Through Teachers' Professional Development, General Teaching Council for England, London

Centre for the Use of Research & Evidence in Education (CUREE), 2008, Qualitative Study of School-Level Strategies for Teachers' CPD, General Teaching Council for England, London

Cordingley, P et al (CPD Review Group), 2005a, The Impact of Collaborative Continuing Professional Development (CPD) on Classroom Teaching and Learning. Review: What do Teacher Impact Data Tell Us About Collaborative CPD?, EPPI-Centre, London

Cordingley, P et al (CPD Review Group), 2005b, 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?, EPPI-Centre, London

Cordingley, P, Bell, M, Isham, C, Evans, D and Firth, A, 2007, What do Specialists Do in CPD Programmes for which there is Evidence of Positive Outcomes for Pupils and Teachers?, EPPI-Centre, London

DfEE, 1998, Teachers: Meeting the Challenge of Change, The Stationery Office, London

Goodall, J, Day, C, Lindsay, G, Muijs, D and Harris, A, 2005, Evaluating the Impact of Continuing Professional Development (CPD), Department for Education and Skills, London

Hargreaves, D H, 2003, Working Laterally: How Innovation Networks Make an Education Epidemic, DEMOS, London

Harris, A, Teacher Leadership as Distributed Leadership: Heresy, Fantasy or Possibility?, *School Leadership and Management*, 23(3), August 2003, p313–24

Henry, G T and Opfer, V Darleen, 2003, Responses to High Stakes Accountability in the South, The Spencer Foundation, Chicago, IL

Hopkins, D, Harris, A, Singleton, C and Watts, R, 2001, Creating the Conditions for Teaching and Learning, David Fulton Publishers, London

Lawless, K A and Pellegrino, J W, Professional Development in Integrating Technology into Teaching and Learning: Knowns, Unknowns, and Ways to Pursue Better Questions and Answers, *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 2007, p575–614

- Mahony, P, Menter, I and Hextall, I, The Emotional Impact of Performance-Related Pay on Teachers in England, *British Educational Research Journal* 30(3), June 2004, p435–456
- McIntyre, D, Pedder, D and Rudduck, J, Pupil Voice: Comfortable and Uncomfortable Learnings for Teachers, *Research Papers in Education*, 20(2), 2005 p149–168
- Ofsted, 2006, *The Logical Chain: Continuing Professional Development in Effective Schools*, Ofsted, London
- Opfer, V Darleen, Henry, G T and Mashburn, A J, The District Effect: Systemic Responses to High Stakes Accountability Policies in Six Southern States, *American Journal of Education*, 114(2), 2008, p299–332
- Pedder, D, Organisational Conditions that Foster Successful Classroom Promotion of Learning How to Learn, *Research Papers in Education*, 21(2), 2006, p171–200
- Pedder, D, Profiling Teachers' Professional Learning Practices and Values: Differences Between and Within Schools, *The Curriculum Journal*, 18(3), 2007, p231–252
- Pedder, D, James, M, and MacBeath, J, How Teachers Value and Practise Professional Learning, *Research Papers in Education*, 20(3), 2005, p209–243
- Pedder, D and MacBeath, J, Organisational Learning Approaches to School Leadership and Management: Teachers' Values and Perceptions of Practice, School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 19(2), 2008, p207–224
- Storey, A, A Leap of Faith? Performance Pay for Teachers, *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(5), August 2000, p509–523, ISSN 0268-0939
- Storey, A, From Performance Management to Capacity-Building: An Escape from the Cul de Sac?, *The Curriculum Journal*, 15(3), November 2004, p207–218, ISSN 0958-5176 (print) / ISSN 1469-3704 (online)
- Storey, A, Cultural Shifts in Teaching: New Workforce, New Professionalism?, *The Curriculum Journal*, 18(3), September 2007, p253–270, ISSN 0958-5176 (print) / ISSN 1469-3704 (online) / 07/030253-18
- Teacher Training Agency (TTA), 2005, *The Teacher Training Agency's Role in the Future of Continuing Professional Development: Response to the Secretary of State*, TTA, London
- Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), 2007, *Impact Evaluation of CPD*, TDA, London (online at [www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/i/impact\\_evaluation.pdf](http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/i/impact_evaluation.pdf) (checked 7 Nov 2008))

Wilson, S M and Berne, J, Teacher Learning and the Acquisition of Professional Knowledge: An Examination of Research on Contemporary Professional Development, in Iran-Nejad, A and Pearson, P D (eds), Review of Research in Education, 24, 1999, p173–209, American Educational Research Association Washington, DC