



EVALUATION FOR THE GENERAL TEACHING COUNCIL WALES

OF THE

PHASE 3 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PILOT PROJECTS

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by:
Professor Roy James, CBE
Professor David Egan
July 2004

CONTENTS

1. Main Findings	3
2. Introduction and Methodology	7
3. The Participants and Their Activities	11
4. Questionnaire Analysis	16
5. Activity A: Bursaries	21
6. Activity A: International Visits	26
7. Activity A: Sabbaticals	32
8. Activity A: Teacher Research Scholarships	35
9. Activity B: Professional Networks	39
10. Activity C: The Whole Staff Initiative	46
11. Overall Evaluation	53
12. Recommendations	59

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Participants and their Activities	61
Appendix 2: Analyses of Questionnaire Returns	75
Appendix 3: Bibliography	93

1. MAIN FINDINGS

General

- 1.1** Teachers and their schools have appreciated the wide range of continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities provided by GTCW funding and the relatively easy access to that funding compared to other forms of CPD. In most cases, the funding enabled professional development activities to take place which would not have taken place otherwise. These activities largely reflected the priorities of individual teachers and individual schools. Teachers appreciated the worth placed on them as individuals and on their professionalism, and valued the opportunity to take responsibility for their own professional development.
- 1.2** The participation rate in Phase 3 has been very impressive: over a quarter of all registered teachers and over 70% of the schools in Wales. Relative to the gender balance within the profession in Wales, male teachers are proportionately under-represented overall and particularly as participants in Bursary activities; female teachers are under-represented as participants in Teacher Research Scholarships (TRS). Secondary school teachers are under-represented overall, but the proportion of secondary schools with at least one participant (96%) is higher than that of primary schools (65%).
- 1.3** There continues to be variation in the take-up of professional development project (PDP) opportunities between local education authorities (LEAs). The general picture is one of lower participation in one category being counterbalanced by higher participation in another but, in a few LEAs, participation is low in all categories.

Benefits to teachers

- 1.4** A very high proportion of participants, their headteachers and their mentors (where applicable) considered that the professional development activities had been instrumental in enhancing personal and professional effectiveness. The evidence assembled from school visits by the evaluation team and the participants' reports confirmed to a large extent that both the individually initiated activities and the more

collaborative activities of the Professional Networks (PN) and Whole Staff Initiative (WSI) were effective in this respect.

- 1.5 In some schools, GTCW funded activities have become embedded in their performance management policies, but this is far from being universal practice.

Benefits to pupils and schools

- 1.6 The great majority of those consulted considered that the PDP had also been of considerable benefit to pupils and schools, and that they would over the medium term contribute to the raising of standards. There was, indeed, evidence of immediate gains in many schools: improved curriculum planning; more varied and stimulating teaching and learning approaches; more effective use of Information Communication Technology (ICT); and, in some cases, improved pupil behaviour. Again it was apparent that individual and collaborative activity had contributed to effective outcomes. The prospect that these gains would be sustained over the medium and longer term is generally good.

- 1.7 There were some PDP activities which had not led, and were not likely to lead, to any significant gain to the school. These activities were characterised by one or more of the following:

- poor planning and / or co-ordination;
- imprecise objectives / lack of focus;
- failure to reflect on and effectively disseminate the outcomes.

- 1.8 The activities that were most effective in facilitating positive change in schools:

- were related to a school development plan, school improvement initiative, departmental action plan or post-inspection action plan;
- had clear objectives, a sharp focus and well-defined outcomes; and
- were subject to detailed feedback and discussion post-activity.

Value for Money

- 1.9** The Bursaries and Sabbaticals provided very good value for money in terms of enhancing the professional skills, knowledge and understanding of the participants and securing improvements in schools.
- 1.10** The majority of International Visits (IV) have yielded tangible benefits to the individual and the school and, in some cases, to the educational system in Wales. However, while all have widened participants' horizons and contributed to their personal fulfilment, it is difficult to discern, in a minority, what direct benefits will accrue to the schools. Questions over value for money also arise in relation to a large number of teachers visiting the same locations for the same purpose. The criteria for IVs will need to be tightened if maximum benefit is to be derived from them and value for money assured.
- 1.11** Some work of high quality continues to be done within the Teacher Research Scholarships (TRS), but there has been a noticeable decline in the overall standard of the projects this year compared to the previous two phases of funding, when they were also one of the funding categories with significant weaknesses. As with IVs, funding criteria will need to be tightened to ensure value for money.
- 1.12** Most of the networks provide good value for money. In the strongest examples they have led to the creation of learning communities where high levels of professional dialogue have been stimulated and which are likely to have permanency. With few exceptions, the networks have provided lasting benefits for both the participants and their schools.
- 1.13** The majority of Whole Staff Initiatives (WSI) have been successful in providing clear benefits for the teachers involved in terms of improvements in their teaching and increases in confidence and morale. In most cases, they have also been an effective agent for school improvement. In a minority of cases, WSI have not achieved their potential and have not provided value for money.

Final Reports

1.14 The quality of the final reports varies considerably. The best are appropriately reflective and analytic, indicate clearly the benefits to the teacher and to the school and specify the follow-up action that has ensued. The least effective are sketchy or ramblingly descriptive, lacking in analysis and reflection and are unconvincing as to the benefits derived.

Role of Mentors, Tutors, Coordinators and Consultants

1.15 Generally participants expressed appreciation of the support that they had received. Co-ordinators on PN and WSI had in most cases contributed considerably to the success of the activity as had mentors on Sabbaticals. There was greater unevenness and inconsistency in the quantity and quality of support provided to TRS participants by mentors/tutors and this as reflected in the quality of the outcomes. In most cases, organising agencies for IV provided an efficient service, but the programme did not always fully reflect the original objectives.

Overall Evaluation

1.16 The Phase 3 PDPP have provided unique funding opportunities for teachers and schools which, overall, have been very successful in:

- promoting good quality individually initiated and collaborative forms of CPD in the schools of Wales and fostering a positive climate for CPD to flourish;
- enhancing the personal effectiveness and professional competencies of teachers;
- securing improvements in planning and provision in schools.

1.17 There is also evidence to indicate that the volume, nature and quality of the activities are having positive effects on the wider development of the education system in Wales.

1.18 There were, however, weaknesses in the planning and execution of, and follow-up to some of the activities, especially in two funded categories: IV and TRS. To ensure that the impact of the activities upon teachers, schools and pupils is more consistently beneficial and thus obtain the best value for money it is necessary to:

- apply stricter criteria and improved quality assurance criteria for funding;
- improve the quality of reporting and dissemination.

2 INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 In June 2003, Tribal PPI was appointed by the General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW) to undertake an evaluation of the Phase 3 Professional Development Pilot Projects (PDPP) being offered to teachers in Wales. Tribal PPI had previously undertaken an evaluation of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 pilot projects

2.2 The six Phase 3 pilot projects in the three activity areas are:

Activity A - individually initiated activities (IIA)

- Professional Development Bursary (PDB)
- International Visits and Exchanges (IV)
- Teacher Sabbaticals (TS)
- Teacher Research Scholarship (TRS)

Activity B

- Professional Networks (PN)

Activity C

- Whole Staff Initiative (WSI)

2.3 In relation to Activity A, the brief of the evaluation is to identify the:

- impact of individually focused and controlled professional development activity on teachers' professional effectiveness;
- actual or anticipated impact of participants' involvement on their schools, including the impact on raising standards over the short, medium and longer term; and
- relative impact, effectiveness and value for money of individually identified and controlled professional development activity by comparison with school and LEA controlled and funded activity, for example, the Grant for Education Support and Training (GEST).

- 2.4** With respect to the PDB and individual members of PN, the evaluation is required to consider the process whereby these projects are embedded within the performance management cycle, pointing to any successes, strengths and weaknesses of this system.
- 2.5** With particular reference to Activity B, the brief of the evaluation is to consider the:
- impact of participating in a PN on individual teacher's professional development, effectiveness and the actual, or anticipated, impact on the participants' schools;
 - relative value for money provided by PN in respect of the professional development of individual teachers and the impact on the participants' schools.
- 2.6** With particular reference to Activity C, the evaluation is required to consider the:
- impact of participating in a WSI on the individual teacher's professional development, individual teacher's effectiveness and the actual, or anticipated, impact on school improvement;
 - relative value for money provided by WSI in respect of the professional development of individual teachers and school improvement outcomes.
- 2.7** For all the projects, the evaluation is required to consider the:
- effectiveness and value for money of the Council's six PDPPs in relation to promotion of the philosophy of continuing professional development (CPD), take-up of funding opportunities and administration of the project;
 - activities undertaken and the value for money provided by tutors and consultants supporting projects.

2.8 The methodology of the evaluation has four main prongs:

- the analysis of participant data as provided by the GTCW;
- the analysis of evaluation questionnaire responses from scheme participants, headteachers/line managers, network co-ordinators and the mentors of teachers participating on the research scholarship and sabbatical projects;
- face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with an agreed sample of participants, headteachers/line managers, mentors and co-ordinators; and
- the scrutiny of the reports of their activities produced by the participants for the GTCW.

2.9 In all 3,213 completed questionnaires were analysed:

- 1992 from IIA participants (1765 PDBs, 180 IVs, 42 TRSs and 5 TSs);
- 211 from participants' headteachers or line managers;
- 14 from TRS mentors and 4 from TS mentors;
- 762 from Network participants;
- 103 from Network co-ordinators;
- 131 from WSI co-ordinators.

2.10 Members of the evaluation team, between them, conducted 478 semi-structured interviews, using common aide-memoirs which ensured consistency of approach across the team while allowing sufficient flexibility to pursue matters of particular interest as they arose. The distribution of the interviews across the activities was as follows:

- 113 IIA participants and their headteachers/line managers (39 PDBs, 32 IVs, 30 TRSs, 12 TSs);
- mentors (7 TRSs, 3 TSs);
- 10 Network co-ordinators and 72 Network participants;

- 21 WSI headteachers and/or co-ordinators and 120 WSI participants.

2.10 In selecting the sample for interviewing account was taken of the:

- age, experience, seniority, phase, specialism and gender of the participants;
- location, size, status and medium of instruction of the schools; and
- the nature of the PN.

2.12 Members of the evaluation team, between them, scrutinised the 876 (326 IIA, 117 Network and 433 WSI) project reports received from the GTCW. Additionally, opportunities were taken to read reports presented by participants during school visits.

2.13 Chapters 3 and 4 are largely based on the statistical analysis of the participants' data and the questionnaire returns respectively. The more qualitative evaluations in chapters 5, 6 and 7 draw on the whole range of evidence:

- the statistical analysis of the questionnaire returns;
- the comments made on the questionnaires;
- the information and documentation received and the views expressed during school visits;
- the end of activity reports; and
- the consultants' evaluation of the above.

2.14 As indicated above, Tribal PPI has in the last two years produced evaluation reports on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the pilot scheme. Chapter 7 reviews the scheme over the three years and also looks at the scheme in the context of general developments in CPD.

3. THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR ACTIVITIES

- 3.1** The quantitative analysis that follows is based upon information supplied by the Council on teachers who participated in the Phase 3 of the GTCW Professional Pilot Projects. This chapter seeks to identify the main characteristics of the participants and their activities and the salient issues that arise; a detailed statistical analysis is given in Appendix 1.
- 3.2** The total number of participants in the individually initiated activities (IIA), (3118) and the PN (1524) were respectively 12% and 33% higher than the corresponding figures for the Phase 2 projects. Assuming that every teacher in the school was involved, an estimated 4726 teachers from 208 schools participated in the WSI activities – an increase of 23% on Phase 2. In all, therefore, 9,368 teachers have benefited to some extent from the Phase 3 funding. This represents over a quarter of the total number of teachers registered with GTCW in March 2003 and over a third of those eligible for funding.
- 3.3** In all, teachers from 1345 schools – approximately 70% of the total number of schools in Wales – participated in Phase 3 activities. A sector analysis shows that there were participants from 96% of secondary schools; 65% of primary schools and 74% of special schools. These are significantly high proportions for a pilot scheme and, taken with the estimate of the total number of teachers involved in paragraph 2.2 above, indicates that these opportunities have been received enthusiastically by teachers in Wales
- 3.4** The IIA participants were drawn from 986 schools – just over half the schools in Wales. Teachers from 45% of primary schools, 81% of secondary schools and 65% of special schools were involved.
- 3.5** A total of 816 schools – just over two-fifths of the total in Wales - participated in 162 PN. Again the highest percentage participation rate was from secondary schools - 69% - compared with 39% of primary schools and 35% of special schools.
- 3.6** Of the 208 schools involved in WSI, the majority, 153, are primary schools. This compares with 49 secondary schools and 4 special schools. However, as a

percentage of the total number of schools in Wales in each phase, primary schools are again under-represented: a 10% participation rate compared with 22% for secondary schools.

- 3.7** Thus, in each broad category, primary *schools* are proportionately under-represented. On the other hand, primary *teachers* are proportionately over-represented. (See 3.9 below)

Applicants by gender (See Tables 3 to 5)

- 3.8** Of the participants for the IIAs, 81% were female and 19% male. The corresponding figures for participants in the PN were 76% and 24% respectively. These figures compare with 73% female and 27% male teachers registered with the GTCW in March 2003. There is thus a proportional under-representation of male teachers on both the IIAs and the PN though very slight in the latter case. A more detailed analysis shows that this under-representation applies largely to the Bursaries and the International Visits; male teachers are actually proportionately over-represented on the Research Scholarships and the Sabbaticals. Males are under-represented in each phase for the IIAs, and slightly under-represented in the primary and secondary sectors in the Networks; they are proportionately over-represented in the special sector, but too much should not be read into this as the numbers involved are low.

Applicants by Phase (See Tables 6 and 7)

- 3.9** Secondary school teachers are proportionally under-represented and primary school teachers over-represented amongst both the IIA and PN participants. Secondary teachers comprise 27% and 26% of the respective total participants compared with 40% of the total in-service teachers on the GTCW register. The corresponding figures for primary teachers are 68%, 71% and 40%. An analysis by category of activity shows that the greatest imbalances are for PDB and IV. Special school teachers are relatively well represented in IIA activities but under-represented in PN activities

Applicants by Years Service (See Tables 8 to 11)

- 3.10** Comparison of the number of years' service of participants with the number of years since QTS of teachers registered by GTCW in March 2003 suggests that those with 6-20 years experience may be well represented in the IIA and PN categories and that those with 0-5 and 26+ years experience may be under-represented. This is not a 'like with like' comparison and therefore does not allow firm conclusions to be drawn. It does, however, provide a hypothesis that is worthy of further investigation.
- 3.11** The most popular mode of funding for those with 0-10 years experience are the PDB and the TRS, while those with 26+ years experience tend to favour IV and TS.
- 3.12** Two-thirds of IIA applicants have been in their schools for 10 years or less, with 43% having spent 5 years or less in their current post. This may be a reflection of the average time that teachers stay at a school. 31% of TS participants have been at their school for 16-20 years - the same proportion as has been at their school for 0-5 years.

Applicants by Role (See Tables 12 to 14)

- 3.13** An analysis of the percentage of IIA and PN participants of different status within the participating schools shows that heads of department/curriculum leaders are the most populous category and comprise almost half the total. There is a slightly different pattern for primary and secondary schools, with a higher proportion of participation from headteachers and deputy headteachers in the former. This may be because almost all deputy headteachers and many headteachers in this sector are also responsible for a class.

Applicants by LEA (See Tables 15 and 16)

- 3.14** A comparison of the percentage of teachers undertaking the IIA activities from each LEA in Wales with the percentage of teachers from each LEA on the GTCW register shows that teachers from Caerphilly, Monmouth, Vale of Glamorgan and Rhondda Cynon Taff are well represented, and that teachers from Anglesey, Conwy, Flintshire and Newport are under-represented.

- 3.15** A similar comparison for teachers involved in PN gives Pembrokeshire, Flintshire, Swansea, and Newport as the well represented LEAs and Blaenau Gwent, Bridgend, Cardiff, Conwy, Denbighshire, Gwynedd and Powys as the under-represented LEAs.
- 3.16** For most authorities, the trend is for good representation in one category to be counterbalanced by lower participation in the other. However, representation from Anglesey, Blaenau Gwent, Conwy, Gwynedd and Powys is below the 'norm' and participation from Pembrokeshire and Vale of Glamorgan is above par for both categories. The greatest proportional increase in representation as compared to Phase 2 has been in Pembrokeshire. It is worth noting that low rates of participation are recorded in Conwy and Gwynedd for the second successive year.
- 3.17** Cardiff, with 34 had the highest number of WSIs, followed by Caerphilly with 26 and Rhondda Cynon Taff with 22. Anglesey and Blaenau Gwent, with two each, had the least number of WSIs

Areas of Activity (See Tables 17 and 18)

- 3.18** The PDB, with 89% of the total, attracted most participants within the IIAs; 9% took part in IV; 2% undertook TRS; and less than 0.4% opted for a TS. Cardiff, Bridgend, Rhondda Cynon Taff, Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire are well above the norm for participants on IV as are Cardiff and Swansea for TRS. Blaenau Gwent is the only LEA with no participant on an IV. An analysis of the areas participants chose for their activities shows that the most popular areas for:
- **IIAs** were Early Years; ICT; English; Management Role Studies; Thinking Skills and Teaching and Learning Strategies; and Science.
 - **Networks** were English; ICT; Science; Mathematics; Transition and Liaison; Thinking Skills and Teaching and Learning Strategies; and Personal, Social and Health Education.
 - **WSIs** were Thinking Skills and Teaching and Learning Methodologies; ICT; Behaviour Management; Literacy; and Assessment, Recording and Reporting. The first of these was by far the most popular choice.

- All the main subject areas are included within the IIAs, with English being the most popular. Vocational courses are under-represented.

4. THE VIEWS OF PARTICIPANTS BASED UPON QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

4.1 The evaluation pro-forma and questionnaires sought information from participants, headteachers, line-managers network co-ordinators and participants' mentors on:

- the application process;
- the planning of the activities;
- the benefits to participants;
- the benefits to participants' schools;
- opportunities for disseminating the outcomes of the activities; and
- suggestions for improvements to the projects.

4.2 The responses to the six projects are very similar and few significant differences emerge from the various sources of information. To avoid repetition, the following account is therefore a distillation of the main findings, which refers to individual projects or sources only where relevant. The full statistical analysis is given in Appendix 2.

The Application Process (See Tables 19, 20)

4.3 There are high levels of satisfaction, overall, with the application process. Over 90% of the respondents across all categories indicated that they found the application process easy or very easy.

4.4 However, it would seem that some categories of participants found the application process difficult:

- those working in very small institutions – 43% of participants in PRUs and 27% of participants from nursery schools;
- 33% of special schools involved in WSI;
- 12% of TRS applicants;
- 18% of PN co-ordinators.

4.5 In the last case, an analysis of the co-ordinators comments suggests that the difficulty was often more to do with setting up the PN than with the application process itself, but the need for each member to complete an application form, rather than allow a group application, was regarded as unnecessarily bureaucratic by some.

The planning of the activities (See Tables 21, 22)

4.6 The activities of virtually all IIA and PN participants were linked with one or more of the following (the first figure refers to IIA participants and the second to PN participants):

- participant's personal action plan (54%/47%);
- a performance management objective (40%/31%)
- a school development plan (45%/ 48%);
- a departmental action plan (22%/23%); and
- an action plan on an aspect of school improvement (9%/13%).

4.7 Links with the school development plan were more frequent in primary schools than in secondary schools and links with a departmental action plan more prevalent in the latter.

4.8 91% of the WSIs (89% primary, 97% secondary) were related to the School Development Plan and 29% (27% primary, 37% secondary) were a follow-up to an Estyn report.

4.9 Respondents indicated that 29% of IIA and 21% of WSI, but only 6% of the PN would have taken place if GTCW funding had not been available. The costs would have been met largely through schools' budgets or borne by the participants or, in some cases, through GEST (now Better Schools) funding

Benefits to participants (See Tables 27, 28)

4.10 This is discussed fully in the following chapters. It is sufficient to note here that over 95% of participants, headteachers, co-ordinators and mentors considered the activities to be effective or very effective in improving teachers' professional skills,

knowledge and understanding. A slightly higher percentage of IIA and Network participants (56%) than WSI participants (47%) deemed their activity to be 'very effective'. In each category, the percentage of participants who considered the activity to be very effective was lower than the percentage of headteachers/coordinators/mentors who held this view. The percentage of 'very effective' responses was lower than for Phase Two.

Benefits to schools (See Tables 29, 30)

4.11 This is also discussed fully in the following chapters. Participants and their headteachers/line managers were asked to indicate how effective the initiative had been in improving or fostering:

- classroom practice/management;
- pupil learning;
- school management; and
- school improvement.

4.12 A high proportion of responders considered the activities were, or had the potential to be, effective or very effective in securing improvement in each of the above aspects. The greatest effect was considered to be on pupil learning and classroom practice followed closely by school improvement. This is to be expected, as only a minority of activities were focussed on school management.

4.13 86% of IIA participants considered their activities to be effective or very effective in improving pupils' learning compared with 92% for PN and 93% for WSI participants. The figures for classroom practice are very similar. In each category, the proportion of 'effective' responses from participants was higher than 'very effective' responses.

4.14 The headteachers' views were consistently even more positive than those of the participants across the three categories and the four aspects. The highest 'satisfaction' rate was a 96% 'effective' or 'very effective' rating for WSI in relation to pupil learning and classroom practice.

4.15 95% of PN participants and co-ordinators claimed that their activity had been effective or very effective in strengthening collaboration between schools and in spreading good practice, with over two-thirds regarding it as very effective in this respect.

Opportunities to share the outcomes (See Tables 31, 32, 33, 34)

4.16 4.14 Over 90% of those responding to this question indicated that there either had been, or would be, opportunities for the teacher to give feedback to staff and colleagues and, in a few instances, also to governors. In the main, feedback was given through whole staff meetings (largely primary schools) departmental meetings (largely secondary schools) and INSET days. Where the activity had been very specific in nature, feedback tended to be limited to colleagues in the same area of expertise, for example, early years teachers and support staff. Over a quarter of IIA and Network participants indicated that they had opportunities to share their experiences with teachers outside their school/network and almost a half of the WSI headteachers stated that they had opportunities to share their experiences with other schools. Surprisingly, 19% of Network participants indicated that there had not been opportunities to share experiences within their Network.

Suggestions for improvement

4.17 As can be deduced from the above analyses, suggestions for improvements are made in the context of high satisfaction rates for each of the schemes.

4.18 The main suggestions for improvement, listed below, are very similar to the suggestions made by Phase 2 participants:

- reducing further the temporary financial burdens on schools and individual teachers through more 'up front' and staged payments;
- giving more flexibility on how funds can be allocated, especially in PN and WSIs, to allow virement from one financial area to the other and for a greater proportion to be spent on the resources and materials necessary to facilitate professional development;
- providing exemplars of successful applications;
- providing for bids to be made online;

- reduce the time for processing applications;
- simplifying instructions for claiming payment;
- reducing the administrative burden on network co-ordinators in particular; allow for group applications for networks;
- cutting down further on the amount of paperwork; less emphasis on report writing;
- providing a template for reports to make them easier to write;
- aligning funding to the academic year to make it easier to fit the activities within the school development planning cycle;
- funding for some activities, in particular WSIs, Networks and TRS, over a longer time scale to allow sufficient time for the work to be completed successfully (at present the activities are, in effect, largely restricted to two terms);
- funding for follow-up activities to allow for progressive reinforcement and development of the initial activity;
- allow for bids to be re-negotiated if the activity gathers momentum and becomes larger in scope than was originally envisaged;
- funding supply cover at the actual rate paid, not at average rates; many schools are unable to find suitably experienced and qualified supply teachers at the rates paid by GCTW; this problem is most acute in the case of TS when supply teachers are required for an extended period.

5 ACTIVITY A: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BURSARIES (PDB)

Nature and range of activity

- 5.1** A total of 2763 teachers received PDB funding. Of these 81% were female and 68% were primary/nursery teachers.
- 5.2** As in previous years, Phase 3 activities funded through Bursaries were, in most cases, directly concerned with participants' current or impending roles and responsibilities. The great majority involved various types of self-generated, small-scale study with a view to broadening and enhancing teachers' understanding of subject and/or developing leadership and management skills at a wide range of levels. A number of teachers used the support to help them pursue post-graduate award-bearing courses, usually working towards a master's degree. Bursaries for individual teachers are, in some cases, used to supplement or complement WSI or PN projects in the school.
- 5.3** They were undertaken by a variety of means, including:
- attendance at courses/conferences/exhibitions/centres of excellence;
 - release from the classroom for periods of up to three or four days for personal study and research;
 - meetings and working with colleagues;
 - visits to classes in progress in their own and other schools, including schools in another phase; and
 - research or visits to develop, up-date or evaluate resources for teaching and learning.

Benefits to Teachers

- 5.4** The main benefits to teachers of the Bursaries were:
- a boost to teachers' morale through increased confidence, and a rekindling of enjoyment, interest and enthusiasm in their work;
 - support for teachers to gain additional qualifications, thus helping to meet their personal/professional development needs and aspirations;

- time to gather information and evidence, create learning materials, trial resources and approaches and reflect on current and new approaches – activities that would otherwise have to be carried out in their own time and would not be done so soon, as well or as thoroughly;
- an enhancement of professional competence: broadening and extending subject knowledge; the further development of pedagogic skills; developing a greater understanding of how pupils learn; improving assessment and monitoring strategies;
- the development and enhancement of leadership, management and presentation skills; increased confidence in disseminating information, sharing ideas, leading INSET and managing support staff; broadened understanding of existing roles and responsibilities; greater involvement in whole-school issues; and
- opportunities to work closely with colleagues within their school and in other schools and the establishing of informal networks with fellow professionals within and across LEA boundaries.

Benefits to Schools and Pupils

5.5 The main benefits to the schools and the pupils can be summarised as follows:

- teachers have become more reflective and analytical as classroom practitioners;
- improved schemes of work and programmes of study;
- improved (including a greater variety of) approaches to learning and teaching – for example in early years provision, modern languages, PSE, science and technology;
- good prospects that the above will impact positively on pupil experience and achievement; although this can only be judged properly over a period of time, there is some evidence of short-term gains in terms of pupil motivation and increased participation in classes;
- improved school policies and procedures especially in primary schools;
- the dissemination of good practice;
- a direct and positive effect on the general culture within schools as staff engage in regular discussion on matters arising from participants' activities;
- a raised profile for CPD;
- greater commitment to improvement and change arising from teacher ownership of CPD; and

- improved co-operation within schools and between schools; the development of teamwork.

Role of mentors, tutors and consultants; performance management.

5.6 There are no designated mentors, as such, for activities funded by Bursaries. In practice, teachers often get a great deal of help and encouragement from their headteachers/line managers/team leaders in framing their application and considering appropriate activities and outcomes. In many schools, the GTCW funding is considered a key element in supporting appropriate personal continuing professional development (CPD) for staff. The activities are included in participants' performance objectives, in line with the school's performance management policy. Successful application, completion and reporting of the activity are made part of the CPD objective. The final reports on the activity are seen as evidence for inclusion in personal development portfolios. Despite this being a GTCW expectation for all Bursaries, the questionnaire returns indicate that the activities are linked to a performance management objective in less than 40% of the schools.

Comparison with other forms of CPD

5.7 GTCW funded bursaries differ from other forms of CPD in that:

- teachers have become aware of the importance of taking personal responsibility for their own professional development;
- there is a recognition of teachers as professionals with their own personal development needs separate to the needs of the school;
- teachers are able to exercise greater control over, and ownership of, their own CPD;
- they provide greater flexibility to undertake a range of activities that are directly linked to individual and school development needs, which would not otherwise be possible;
- they enable schools to support the individual to undertake further personal staff development which would not otherwise be funded; they provide opportunities for personal action plans/ targets to be addressed;
- they provide greater opportunities to visit other staff and schools;

- the need for a written evaluation of the activities to be undertaken leads to greater accountability.

Strengths

5.8 The evidence of the questionnaires and the school visits points to major strengths in the pilot schemes. These include:

- a simple, clear application process with advice easily accessed;
- the availability of funding for a range of worthwhile activities which would, in most cases, not otherwise have taken place;
- the benefits they are capable of offering individual teachers, as set out above;
- the potential they offer for the transfer of these benefits to pupils, fellow teachers and the school as a whole;
- the potential for collaborative activity, involving participation of other teachers in the work and wide dissemination of findings, so as to maximise the above attributes;
- flexibility: the bursaries, can be arranged to fit in with school and individual needs;
- value for money - a cost-effective means of encouraging further professional development.

Weaknesses

5.9 As in previous years, the strengths of the PDBs far outweigh the weaknesses. The following concerns should, therefore, be considered in the context of the overwhelmingly positive response outlined above:

- the CPD element is sometimes not clearly enough defined, for example, in reviewing and revising policies and schemes of work; the extra dimension that the support enables is not always sufficiently clear;
- the danger that GTCW bursaries, though often highly valuable to teachers and schools, are used to make up for shortcomings in 'normal' school provision;
- on occasion, the planning of the activity is insufficiently focused to ensure worthwhile outcomes;

- though there are many very good examples, especially in primary schools, of the outcomes of the activities being disseminated fully within participants' schools and sometimes further afield, this is by no means universal practice;
- the expectation that activities funded by Bursaries should be embedded within the performance management system has not been universally met.

6 Activity A: International Visits and Exchanges (IV)

6.1 In all, 275 teachers were funded to undertake IVs. Of these three-quarters were female and just over two-thirds were primary/nursery school teachers.

Range and Scope of the Activities

6.2 The participants on International Visits seek to widen their educational and cultural horizons by visiting schools or other suitable organisations or institutions to extend their subject knowledge, or to view or experience good practice, different methodologies or new approaches. Countries visited included: the USA, New Zealand, Australia, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Zambia, Kenya, Botswana, Lesotho, Indonesia and India. While a number of participants made their visits individually (often using links previously established), in pairs or small groups, most were part of a larger group organised by an LEA, teacher association or an organisation specialising in international exchanges

6.3 The main areas of activity were Early Years, Science, Technology, Languages, Bilingualism, Geography, SEN, Sustainable Development, Cultural Diversity and Leadership and Management.

6.4 The following examples, which are by no means exhaustive, give a flavour of the range of activities undertaken:

- group visits to Italy and New Zealand to study approaches to Early Years education;
- group visit to Ottawa, Canada to study approaches to bilingualism;
- group visits to Lesotho to learn about the educational system, the language, the traditions and lifestyle of that country;
- visits by a group of teachers from one LEA to Botswana to study the concepts of sustainable development and global citizenship;
- group visit to Houston, Texas to explore school leadership issues;
- group visit from one LEA to Houston, Texas to make school visits and attend an international conference on 'Consistency Management and Co-operative Discipline';

- an LEA organised group visit to New South Wales to develop international links between schools and individual professional skills in teaching, learning and management;
- visit to Denmark by three headteachers to continue an established discourse on leadership issues with Headteachers from two other countries;
- attendance by individual language teachers at courses in Spain, France and Germany;
- visit by an individual teacher to a school in Spain to study, in conjunction with the school, environmental issues in the area;
- visit by an individual teacher to Brussels to study the work of the European Union;
- attendance by an individual teacher at an European Conference in Dublin;
- visit by an individual teacher to Mumbai in India to look at strategies for teaching mathematics and science.

Benefits to Teachers

6.5 Many of the benefits listed for Bursaries apply to IVs also. The main benefits specific to IVs are:

- the 'widening of horizons' through first hand experience of aspects of education in other countries;
- opportunities to consider and reflect on their own methodology, practices and curriculum structures as they observe, examine and analyse practices in other countries;
- getting fresh perspectives and new insights from looking at aspects of education in an unfamiliar context;
- the establishment of continuing links with schools and education experts in other countries;
- obtaining original resources, which will enhance teaching and learning, from other countries – for example, videos, audio tapes, photographs, texts and artefacts;
- the updating and enhancement of knowledge, skills and expertise in curriculum subjects and in aspects of education – for example, in modern foreign languages, science, technology, geography, sustainable development, global citizenship and European studies;

- being able to relate aspects of educational policies in Wales to developments in other countries – for example, The Foundation Phase, bilingualism, sustainable development and personal social and health education.

Benefits to Schools and Pupils

6.6 The benefits to individual teachers listed above are substantial and, when the activities are focused and structured with specific outcomes in mind, translate into tangible and sustainable benefits for schools and pupils. Where the aims of the activity are more general, the direct benefits to schools are more difficult to discern. Some schools visited operated an educational system so different from the participants' own that little useful adaptable information could be gained.

6.7 For many of the participants, the visits merely confirmed that strategies, which they were already putting in place, or had put in place, were the correct ones to have chosen.

6.8 The benefits arising from the visits where there has been follow-up and dissemination of ideas and strategies are summarised below:

- improved, more exciting learning experiences and environments;
- more up-to-date, authentic and exciting learning materials and resources;
- improved pupil motivation, creativity and understanding as a result of the above;
- personal links established between pupils in Welsh schools and pupils in other parts of the world;
- wider and more purposeful use of ICT to maintain these links;
- the reappraisal of leadership and management strategies with the aim of maximising the potential of staff and pupils;
- a greater recognition and appreciation of the strengths of participants' own schools and of the opportunities to build on existing foundations.

Role of mentors/tutors/consultants

6.9 In most cases, the organising agency was able to ensure a well-organised visit and provided opportunities for teachers to come together with foreign hosts and with each

other to consider issues arising and implications for their own practice. However, teachers involved in visits organised by one major organisation commented that pre-course briefing sessions were not effective and failed to add value to the programme. In another case, the programme arranged by the agency did not fully reflect the original objectives set out in the application.

Comparisons with other forms of CPD

6.10 The GTCW IV funding is unique in that it offers a wide range of personal and professional development opportunities for teachers in Wales in diverse cultural and educational contexts which can provide new insights and fresh perspectives on their own situation. Most of the visits undertaken would not have taken place without GTCW funding. The pilot scheme has allowed a number of teachers to plan and make visits together and, although this raises value for money questions, the shared experience and links made by teachers from different schools around Wales should help to build a bank of knowledge, strategies, resources and interactive networks within Wales and beyond.

Strengths

6.11 The main strengths of the IVs are:

- a potentially powerful source of professional development which is unlikely to be funded by other means;
- a widening of horizons for both teachers and pupils;
- fresh ideas and new perspectives arising from exposure to different environments, cultures and educational systems;
- the opportunity for a group of professionals to work together in an exciting environment and to establish continuing networks.

Weaknesses

6.12 There are also substantial weaknesses in the current scheme:

- the criteria for funding IVs are too open ended;

- some projects lack a clear focus; they are of doubtful value to the school, and do not provide value for money;
- some visits provided little scope for in-depth study and so the experiences shared and knowledge gained were somewhat piecemeal and superficial;
- insufficient preparation and follow-up/dissemination to maximise the benefits of the visit;
- too much time allocated to social/cultural/recreational activities during short visits;
- some reports, especially those which were in the form of a diary of events, give a clear impression that the emphasis was on personal experience rather than on in-depth reflection on educational issues.

Issues Arising

6.13 It must be stressed that the weaknesses outlined above apply only to a minority of IVs and that the majority of visits have yielded tangible benefits to the individual and the school and, in some cases, to the educational system in Wales. However, a number of value for money issues arise which are particularly relevant at a time when the budget for continuing professional development is being curtailed. The potential conflict between the concept of personal/professional entitlement and value for money manifests itself clearly in the context of IVs.

6.14 If IVs are to provide value for money, it is essential that GTCW should consider carefully the range and nature of activities to be funded and set rigorously applied criteria for funding which require applicants to indicate clearly

- their educational and personal objectives and how these are to be attained;
- evidence of the suitability of the host country /school /institution/ organisation to the realisation of these objectives;
- the preparation for and follow-up to the visit, including plans for dissemination within and, where appropriate, beyond their school.

6.15 Consideration needs to be given to the wider dissemination of participants' experiences, especially in areas which impinge on government policy. Current dissemination policies are clearly not working effectively as teachers are often unaware of visits made by colleagues from neighbouring schools.

- 6.16** The practice of funding a large group from one particular area to visit the same conference and schools needs to be reconsidered. A more cost-effective way would be to fund a smaller group of teachers who could disseminate the findings to their colleagues when they return, thus releasing a considerable sum of money for other activities.
- 6.17** With the growth of group visits organised by various agencies, ways need to be considered of holding these agencies accountable if the objectives of the visit are not met.

7 ACTIVITY A: TEACHER SABBATICALS

7.1 Thirteen teachers availed themselves of Sabbatical funding in Phase 3. Eight of these were from primary, 4 from secondary and 1 from special schools.

Range and nature of activities.

7.2 The placements and areas of study were:

- Education Department of the BBC – resources for RE and PSE; recording techniques; marketing.
- National Grid for Learning, Wales – ICT
- Caerphilly CC - ICT
- Pembrokeshire County Council – ICT/humanities/ talented and gifted pupils.
- National Botanical Garden of Wales – environmental studies.
- National Botanical Gardens of Wales – horticulture (school has a garden).
- Cardiff University, Wlplan course - Welsh Language.
- Bangor University – Intensive Welsh language course.
- Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, Swansea – Art/SEN
- National Museum of Wales – Art, History, Geography, Cwricwlwm Cymraeg.
- Working with LEA adviser – History.
- UWIC - developing PSE modules to foster creative literacy and thinking skills.
- UWIC - Physical Education.
- Cardiff Steiner Centre - Early Years.

7.3 As can be seen, most are directly related to teaching and learning but, in one or two cases, the activities are more oriented towards personal development. Most are concerned with researching, developing, trialling and refining new teaching materials and methods.

Benefits to teachers

7.4 It is clear from the interviews and the reports that all participants gained in terms of professional skills, knowledge and understanding. The specific benefits varied

according to the nature of the activity undertaken. The following is an attempt to extract factors that were common to most of the activities:

- teachers' knowledge and skills were considerably enhanced in areas of interest to them and of value to their schools;
- the activity has equipped the teachers to become leaders/advisers in the areas they had investigated;
- teachers' confidence has been enhanced and their understanding broadened;
- each of the activities was personally, as well as professionally, fulfilling; teachers were refreshed by the experience;
- teachers gained an increased appreciation of the availability and effective use of resources, especially ICT resources, in supporting teaching and learning;
- in a number of instances, teachers enhanced their ICT skills; and
- valuable links have been established with the host organisation.

Benefits to schools and pupils

7.5 The teachers returned to schools with an enhanced knowledge and understanding of the range of materials and resources, including ICT resources, available to promote effective learning. This was translated into innovative classroom practices and a wider variety of learning experiences for pupils.

Activities of Mentors/Tutors/Consultants

7.6 In almost every case, participants received effective support from their mentors in planning, organising and carrying out their activities. In most instances, there was regular contact between the participant and the mentor throughout the activity.

Comparisons with other forms of CPD

7.7 Though there are a number of bodies, which arrange short-term placements in Wales, there are few opportunities for extended periods of study. None of the Sabbaticals would have taken place without GTCW funding. The comments on Bursaries are also relevant here.

Strengths

7.8 The same strengths apply to this category as to Bursaries. However, the opportunity for an extended period of study has enabled individuals to explore their chosen field in greater depth and/or to consult with a broader range of teachers and others with expertise in the field. They have also been given greater time to reflect and to consider how the benefits of their experience can be maximised for the benefit of the school.

Weaknesses

7.9 There have been weaknesses in the planning and organisation of the project in some instances. In one or two cases, the professional aspects are weak and there has been little benefit to the participants' schools.

8. Activity A: TEACHER RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIPS

The activities

8.1 There were 67 TRS in Phase 3. Approximately half of these were linked to a group application associated with the effects of NASA space exploration programmes on learning and teaching, involving participants in initial visits to NASA headquarters in the USA. Other topics reflected broad and diverse interests in primary and secondary education including, for example, work on:

- interactive whiteboards;
- behavioural strategies;
- learning strategies;
- early years education.

Benefits for teachers

8.2 At the level of personal professional development the TRS have had many positive features. These include the:

- **time** they provide for teachers to, for example, access educational research, familiarise themselves with resources for learning and teaching, update professional knowledge, undertake problem-solving investigations, explore innovative pedagogy, complete important elements of higher degree studies and, particularly, to engage in reflection;
- **personal skills** such as confidence-building, motivation and inspiration that can be achieved through participation in the research activity itself and the presentation of its findings;
- **professional advancement** achieved through training in research methods, working with other researchers, receiving accreditation for work undertaken and developing new or enhanced expertise.

Benefits for schools and pupils

8.3 These are not as strong in the Phase 3 TRS as has been the case in previous years. This results from particular shortcomings in the group application indicated in Paragraph 8.1. When, however, other projects did produce positive impacts upon schools and pupils, the following features could be identified:

- strong links to raising pupil motivation and achievement;
- contributions to specific whole-school objectives and overall school improvement;
- discernible short-term effects that changed previous practice and pupil experience;
- involvement of pupils so that outcomes were influenced and strengthened by their views; and
- improvements and enhancements in learning and teaching resources.

Role of mentors/tutors

8.4 In the minority of cases where projects have been judged to be of high quality, the role of good support from tutors/mentors has been recognised to be of considerable significance. In nearly all of these examples, higher education tutors were involved and it is apparent that the support they provided was considerably in excess of that formally accessed through transfers in funding. Conversely, one of the major reasons for the shortcomings identified in the group application was the poor quality of tutoring/mentoring provided. In other cases, including examples of where tutors/mentors came from higher education institutions and LEAs, weaknesses included:

- teachers having limited, or no, contact and support;
- a lack of appropriate research background/qualifications in mentors/tutors, despite the fact that up to £625 was being paid for mentoring support;
- unevenness and inconsistency in the amount of support received.

In some of these instances, it is clear that the TRS did not activate the support that they indicated they would access in their applications.

Comparisons with other forms of CPD

8.5 There are no other national funded opportunities for teacher research, although a growing number of, largely secondary, schools are promoting research groups and designating teachers to take lead roles in this area. Currently, however, the TRS provide a unique opportunity.

Strengths

8.6 As has been indicated earlier, there are significant weaknesses in a majority of TRS in this phase of the funding. In projects where the quality of work is good, however, the following strengths are apparent:

- the development of personal and professional skills by teachers;
- new learning and teaching approaches that offer good prospects for increasing motivation and achievement;
- collaboration with research partners at school and LEA level;
- studies linked to wider developments such as whole-school projects, LEA initiatives, higher degree study;
- work that has clearly arisen out of an identified classroom/school-based need;
- research is used to test and replicate good practice;
- a critical standpoint is adopted by the researcher.

Weaknesses

8.7 The following shortcomings, which are particularly concentrated in the group application, have been identified:

- many of the researchers have worked in isolation from mentors/tutors and members of the school/LEA community;
- there has been insufficient focus on potential benefits of the work for schools and pupils;
- limited and sometimes non-existent dissemination of findings;
- generally low quality of mentor/tutor support;

- some studies that are extracted from higher degree dissertations are not ‘fit for purpose’;
- a lack of research orientation and methodology;
- poor quality reports that rarely follow the guidelines established by GTCW.

8.8 The group application projects drew upon learning and teaching resources collected by the teachers through funded international travel. As the materials are widely available in Wales, the value for money aspect of this element of the research is also seen to be a major weakness.

Issues arising

8.9 Work of high quality continues to be done within the TRS, but there has been a noticeable decline in the overall standard of the projects this year compared to the previous two phases of funding. When good results have emerged, the following contributory factors can be identified:

- the study is appropriately conceived and tightly focused;
- it has arisen out of an identified school [pupil/teacher] need;
- high quality mentoring/support is provided by individuals who have appropriate research qualifications and experience;
- a robust research methodology is devised;
- the research is located within an existing corpus of knowledge and seeks to replicate/apply/extend findings;
- strong collaborative activity is undertaken with research partners and colleagues at school and LEA level; and
- findings are well presented and thoroughly disseminated.

8.10 Some of the weaknesses in the Phase 3 TRS are identical to those identified in the previous two evaluations, including:

- an unsuitable definition of educational action research;
- a lack of criteria for success;
- poor research design and methodology;

- unsatisfactory mentoring arrangements;
- poor report writing;
- weak dissemination of findings.

8.11 It is likely, therefore, that some applications were insufficiently robust as they stood to merit funding. These are, therefore, areas that continue to require the attention of the GTCW if better quality outcomes, representing good value for money, are to be achieved.

8.12 As has been indicated on a number of occasions above, a significant element of the weaknesses apparent in TRS in Phase 3 are associated with the funded group application. These projects did not involve robust educational action research. They were closer in their conception to International Visits, but even then their value for money may have been open to question. The projects have provided teachers with an experience from which they undoubtedly gained at least worthwhile, and sometimes inspirational, insights. These generally did not, however, arise from issues or needs that teachers and their schools identified and that were likely to produce benefits for them.

8.13 An issue that has arisen over the three years of the TRS is the funding of projects as part of higher degree study. Some of the best quality work is produced in this context. This probably results from the fact that teachers are in the process of acquiring the research skills and experience that will assist their TRS work and the availability [although this is clearly uneven and not always of an appropriate standard] of tutor support. It also contributes, however, to the situation where some TRS do not represent independent, 'fit for purpose', studies, but are extracted from appropriate parts of a dissertation. GTCW are thereby funding some teachers for a type of activity [that all teachers can attempt to gain support for through the Bursary funding] that is inconsistent with the main purpose of the TRS.

8.14 The limitations of funding, and follow-up funding, are also considerations that have arisen over the three years of the pilot projects. It is again felt that some of the better projects are constrained by the funding ceiling and the timescales involved. This could be seen to have a particular effect on dissemination, which could be more strongly built-in to a longer timescale.

9. Activity B: PROFESSIONAL NETWORKS

The activities

9.1 162 PN were funded [compared to 139 in Phase 2 of funding], involving 816 schools [45% of the total in Wales] and 1524 teachers. Of the participating teachers, 1076 worked in primary, 396 in secondary and 18 in special schools.

9.2 The following categorisation can be offered of the type of PN that were funded:

- the largest number [circa 30% of the total] were focused on cross-curricular issues, particularly ICT and literacy;
- the next largest group [circa 26%] were those dealing with subject developments and pedagogy, with mathematics and science in primary schools being prominent amongst these;
- a further sizeable number [11%] were concerned with transition between Key Stages 2 and 3, with most of these projects focusing upon core subject links;
- smaller groupings looked at learning developments, general learning and teaching strategies, the introduction of the Foundation Phase, CPD, behaviour management, leadership and management and a series of individual projects [for example those dealing with Schools Councils, Eco Schools and Teacher Governors].

Benefits for teachers

9.3 The great majority of PN have offered considerable benefits to the participating teachers. These include the:

- sharing of experience, expertise and good practice from teacher to teacher, school to school and, in some cases, from LEA to LEA;
- time for teachers to undertake the above and to update their knowledge and understanding, acquire new skills, innovate and build confidence;
- opportunity to become more familiar with phases of education other than those they currently work in;
- experience, in the best cases, of participation in high level reflection on, and evaluation of, professional practice;

- undertaking GTCW funded CPD provision for the first time.

9.4 Taken together these benefits represent the practitioner-centred type of professional development that teachers and other professionals rate the most highly. In the best examples PN have led to the creation of learning communities where high levels of professional dialogue have been stimulated and which are likely to have permanency. In some cases, this has been particularly effective in breaking down the previous isolation of teachers working, for example, in small primary schools, in rural schools, in small secondary school departments and the Welsh-medium sector.

Benefits to schools and pupils

9.5 Again the short-term impact of the majority of PN on schools and pupils has been impressive and there appear to be good prospects that these gains can be sustained in the medium to longer term. The discernible impacts are in areas such as the:

- progress made in pupil's achievement, motivation, interest and in specific domains such as thinking skills;
- adoption by teachers of new, often innovative and more consistent, classroom practices and resources, that, in some cases, has been targeted at removing previously identified shortcomings;
- work undertaken by some PN in evaluating earlier funded initiatives to identify their effect and to use them as a catalyst for further improvement;
- facilitation of improved continuity and progression for pupils across key stages and school transfer;
- opportunities provided to address current priorities in educational policy such as the introduction of the Foundation Phase, KS2/KS3 transition and the relative under-achievement of boys;
- involvement of pupils in initiatives, adding value to outcomes.

Performance management cycle

9.6 In some cases the possible benefits of work undertaken as part of PN activity, such as the acquisition of improved observational and feedback skills, are recognised by participants. In general, however, the GTCW expectation that PN activities be reflected within the performance management system has not been understood, or,

presumably, acted upon by either Headteachers, Co-ordinators or individual teachers. This expectation was clearly set out in GTCW application information, but has not been adopted by successful applicants and their schools.

Role of consultants

9.7 A variety of individuals have acted as consultants to PN including:

- LEA Advisors;
- higher education tutors;
- private consultancy firms or individuals;
- national / regional organisations.

9.8 Generally consultants have given good support to PN and the success of projects has often been commensurate with the quality of assistance provided. The extent of support has varied between PN but has usually represented good value for money. This has been particularly true of LEA support, which has generally been well in excess of that covered by GTCW funding. Many consultants intend to continue working with PN in future.

Comparisons with other forms of CPD

9.9 The general view of schools and teachers is that no other funding sources exist that would allow the type of collaborative activity involved in PN to take place. It is also their view that the processes involved in obtaining this funding are far less complicated than that associated with the Assembly Government's GEST [Better Schools] Funding.

9.10 This is, therefore, unique funding that makes possible collaborative activity that is often of high quality and directly related to the needs of pupils, teachers and schools.

9.11 Whilst, as indicated above in relation to the role of consultants, the scale of the funding is not always thought to be sufficient, it is of a size that enables schools to gain support that individually they would not be able to afford. It also enables them to

move forward more quickly and to target areas for development to a greater extent than otherwise would be possible.

Strengths

9.12 As has been indicated earlier, the large majority of the PN funded in Phase 3 have produced worthwhile results, with many of these being of extremely high quality. Whilst some projects have produced relatively weak outcomes, the number and extent of such shortcomings is significantly less than in the first year of funding for networks.

9.13 The strengths of successful PN include:

- collaborative endeavour, including links between schools [within and across LEAs] formed not necessarily on traditional cluster lines, but on the basis of common interest and a desire to work together, leading to strong feelings of ownership and identification by teachers;
- gains achieved in learning and teaching;
- clear and realistic planning;
- strong and successful leadership from a Co-ordinator who manages the network, ensures it is task orientated, meets timescales, achieves its objectives within flexible parameters and produces a high quality report demonstrating and celebrating success;
- an action research focus that tests successful practice and educational research through replication, applicability and adjustment;
- an emphasis within the purposes of the PN on dissemination of outcomes that will achieve high visibility, such as presentations at the Wales Education Event, exhibitions, circulation of materials/report to each school in the LEA, presentations at an LEA Conference etc.

Weaknesses

9.14 As is pointed out above, shortcomings existed in some PN that either prevented them from achieving the potential they appeared to have, or led to weak outcomes.

9.15 The weaknesses apparent in some PN included:

- limited dissemination of outcomes;
- a narrow focus on the potential benefits for those involved in the network and insufficient attention to possible benefits for pupils and schools;
- poorly planned and unrealistic projects that did not, therefore, achieve their objectives within the timescale;
- poor and sometimes very poor, reports that did not follow or meet GTCW requirements, making it difficult to evaluate the extent of successful outcomes and that in some cases, clearly do not do justice to the work undertaken;
- objectives that GEST/NOF funding should already have established as practice within schools.

9.16 Whilst it is clear that some of the above failings have resulted from weaknesses in coordination and a lack of involvement by teachers in the activity they had initially committed themselves to, it is also to be wondered if some of these proposals were robust enough to merit PN funding. There are instances where the objectives are so limited in relation to the scope of the projects and the number of individuals involved [including groups of head and deputy-head teachers] that bursary funding may have been more appropriate. In other cases, the unrealistically wide scope of the projects and the lack of realistic planning possibly contributed to limited or unsuccessful outcomes.

Issues arising

9.17 The second year of funding for these projects has generally produced good CPD activity, some of which is outstanding and already is receiving a high profile at LEA and national level. It is clear that improved coordination and the effective use of consultants have been significant factors and that, in particular, LEAs have played a crucially supportive role.

9.18 It is also apparent that the action research infused within these projects is generally of a higher quality than that emanating from the Teacher Research Scholarships.

- 9.19** The quality of report writing is the area where the greatest variation in outcome is apparent. Some reports are of publishable quality and merit wide dissemination; but there are a small, but significant, number that do not meet GTCW requirements and may not have merited the final release of funding.
- 9.20** Dissemination of outcomes continues to be an issue. In some cases imaginative and effective approaches have been employed. This has been far from universal, however, and there are instances where dissemination has been limited. This raises issues relating to value for money and impact.
- 9.21** There also continue to be questions relating to sustainability. Whilst the specific activity funded by GTCW may have been completed, many successful PN have considerable potential for further development. If they are to continue, however, it is likely that this will be at a lower level of activity than GTCW funding has made possible. Again issues relating to long-term value for money arise.

10. Activity C: THE WHOLE STAFF INITIATIVE

The activities

10.1 208 schools were funded for WSI, an increase of 79 from the previous year and a figure that represents approximately one-tenth all the schools in Wales. Of these 153 were primary, 49 secondary, 2 nursery and 4 special schools.

10.2 The following categorisation of WSI indicates the types of activity that were undertaken by schools:

- the largest number [34%] were focused on cross-curricular projects, particularly key skills, the use of ICT and literacy;
- a further significant grouping [27%] were those concerned with approaches to learning, including accelerated learning and thinking skills;
- smaller groupings included projects dealing with general learning and teaching issues, CPD policies, assessment, behaviour management and curriculum subject areas.

Benefits for teachers

10.3 The majority of WSI have been successful, providing clear benefits for the teachers involved, contributing to improvements in their teaching and increases in confidence and morale. These include the:

- opportunity to work collaboratively with other colleagues, including those who they might not usually work so closely with on a day-to-day basis. This has been particularly the case in larger primary and in secondary schools. The gains to be made from team working of this kind have probably been as great as the individual benefits experienced by teachers;
- way in which this has improved understanding of whole-school policies and practices. This again appears to have been a particular feature of WSI in larger schools;
- ‘teacher-to-teacher’ nature of the work-based CPD involved. This is generally regarded by teachers as one of the most effective forms of INSET and has [see below] usually been valued even more highly than the input of expert consultants.

This has been achieved through best practice being shared between teachers in the same school, through teachers from elsewhere coming to WSI schools and by visits to other schools;

- challenge that has often been presented to teachers to examine their own practice and through their first-hand experience of methods that are proving successful for other teachers, to become prepared to innovate;
- opportunity to develop leadership skills, where, for example, teachers have participated in projects that have developed their role as subject leaders in primary schools, or have undertaken the coordination of a WSI or, for the first time, have become providers of CPD, through sharing their practice;
- facility which the WSI have provided to engage more fully with, for example, pupil data or a corpus of educational research and to use this evidence to drive school improvement;
- gain, in some cases, academic or professional accreditation for work undertaken.

Benefits for schools and pupils

10.4 The transfer of benefits experienced by the individual teacher, to the school as a whole and vice versa, is intended to be one of the distinguishing features of WSI in comparison to the other PDP. It is, therefore, unsurprising that many of the benefits, set out above, accruing to teachers participating in successful WSI, also impact upon schools as a whole. This is particularly the case in relation to collaborative activity in general and especially the occurrence of this in larger schools. This has had positive effects on team building, distributed leadership, sharing good practice and the creation of a more open professional culture.

10.5 Other discrete benefits for schools that have carried out effective WSI include:

- improvements in whole-school planning and its synchronisation with subject, departmental and faculty plans;
- more effective implementation of existing plans and policies through greater familiarisation and ownership;
- the creation of a culture where teachers, having seen at first hand that such approaches can be effective, are more confident about innovation. This is likely to

have been the case particularly in relation to projects focused upon new approaches to learning;

- discernible and positive impacts upon pupils. These have been observed in the short-term in instances where, for example, lessons are made more interesting through the increased confidence of teachers in using ICT. Whilst not all WSI can be assessed in this short-term way, there are good prospects that longer-term gains will result. This may particularly be the case for projects that have sought to enhance pupils' learning skills, where deeper benefits may accrue.

Role of consultants

10.6 These have generally been seen to be effective and good value for money. Schools usually decided to utilise outside expertise in a targeted way and for specific purposes, rather than employing consultants to be continuously involved with a WSI. Examples of this include training events on the use of whiteboards, whole-school INSET to introduce staff to new approaches to learning and classroom observation as part of a review of current learning and teaching strategies. Whilst such inputs have usually been well regarded and sometimes have been seen to be invaluable, as has been noted above, most teachers do not rank this above 'teacher-to-teacher' CPD.

Comparisons with other forms of CPD

10.7 It is unlikely that successful WSI would either have taken place at all [this is the case for smaller schools] or to the same scale. The extent of this funding for most primary and smaller secondary schools, compared to that available from the GEST [Better Schools] Fund, is considerable and allows significant school improvement initiatives to be tackled that offer the prospects of a concentrated effect on teachers and pupils.

10.8 Schools also believe that the funding enables them to prepare for/react to new educational policies in a way that is more flexible and suited to their own needs than GEST [Better Schools] funding, which, by comparison, they find it more time consuming to access. Given that GEST [Better Schools] funding is often targeted at the educational priorities of the Assembly Government, the possibility of there being overlaps in funding clearly arises here.

10.9 Whilst the above might be a matter of interpretation, what is clear is that schools responded very positively to the opportunity that WSI provide for them to initiate, frame and carry out within a reasonable time-frame, a project that can, therefore, be strongly matched to their specific needs and purposes. This is seen to be work-based professional learning of a type that allows good ownership for teachers and schools.

Strengths

10.10 The evaluation of Phase 2 of the PDP noted that the WSI category provided the widest range in quality, with the majority having modest outcomes and a small number achieving poor quality and value for money. In Phase 3, whilst there is still variability in quality, with a minority of projects that have not fulfilled their potential and a small number that have not offered value for money, there has been considerable overall improvement in their effectiveness. The majority of WSI in Phase 3 have achieved significant and valuable outcomes and in some cases, outstanding individual and whole-school CPD has taken place.

10.11 Successful WSI often include some combination of the following strengths:

- projects that are well planned to involve all teachers and in a way that generally reflects, but is not dominated by, major whole-school priorities. This balance ensures that individual teachers, as well as the school collectively, gain from the work, as is the intention of this type of PDP. There has been a noticeable improvement in this aspect of the WSI compared to the first year of funding, with projects now having a better focus more strongly related to an identified need within the school;
- strong coordination and leadership, both from a designated Co-ordinator who is senior enough within the school to provide the skills and experience needed and from the school Senior Management Team;
- again, if the benefit is to be for individuals as well as the school as an entity, it is important that the involvement of the Senior Management Team is a supportive but not a controlling one;
- a strong focus on targeted improvements in learning and teaching, so that the school community as a whole can see that this type of CPD funding can make a significant difference to the quality of education;

- inclusive approaches that in some way attempt to involve pupils, teaching assistants, parents and governors in the work being undertaken;
- strong collaboration between teachers. As has been pointed out above in relation to benefits to teachers and schools, this is one of the major contributions that the WSI is making. In many cases, further areas for collaboration have been identified and are now being pursued. The best WSI have resulted in the creation of learning communities of teachers that are transforming the professional culture within their schools; and
- action research that, as is the case with many PN, has been of a higher quality in the best WSI than that generally present within TRS.

Weaknesses

10.12 As has been pointed out above there continue to be a minority of WSI that do not appear to have fulfilled their potential and a small number that have not achieved value for money. The weaknesses displayed, in some combination, by such projects are indicated below in 10.14 and 10.15

10.13 Whilst there are some outstanding examples, a generic shortcoming of WSI projects continues to be the disappointing quality of many of the reports produced. These often do not meet the requirements of the GTCW. They almost certainly do not do justice to the work undertaken and suggest that the schools have not properly evaluated its effect. They also make it very difficult for the GTCW and external evaluators to establish the quality of the work and its value for money. Schools often criticise the report writing requirements as being burdensome and bureaucratic. Given, however, the substantial funding involved in WSI and the need for a suitable basis for disseminating and evaluating outcomes to be in place, the overall quality of report writing continues to be a matter of concern.

10.14 The weaknesses of WSI that do not appear to have achieved the potential set out in the funding application include:

- poorly developed planning and coordination of projects. In some cases the timescales established to plan, carry out, evaluate and sustain the WSI have been far too

ambitious. It appears that in some instances, there has been far too much planning and preparation of projects and comparatively little action;

- a lack of direct impact on learning and teaching in the school. Whilst it is not always possible to easily discern such effects in the short-term, nevertheless, in these cases the prospects for significant impact seem negligible;
- some staff receiving greater benefit from the WSI than others and, in a small number of cases, some teachers appearing not to have been affected at all. This has particularly occurred when some teachers have received large elements of training and have then 'cascaded' this to others;
- failure to involve all staff in the thinking behind the initiative and convince them of the benefits that will accrue to them and the pupils.

10.15 In the cases of those that do not appear to have achieved value for money, the suitability of these projects for funding seems to be the key issue. WSI focused on, for example, reviewing schemes of work, developing assessment policies and monitoring learning and teaching, could be said to be dealing with the day-to-day work of schools. These projects are also often a response to an identification of need established in preparing for a school inspection, or as an action points following one. This again can be seen to be part of a regular cycle of development experienced by all schools. It could be argued that all schools are centrally funded for these activities and that the WSI was, therefore, not strictly an initiative. In such cases where the school is using different funding streams to pursue the same end it becomes difficult for them and those evaluating their work, to establish any discrete and additional effect emanating from WSI funding.

10.16 Some schools have not been persuaded that good quality reporting of their WSI is essential to justify the funding involved, for evaluation purposes, including their own, to recognise outcomes and to make possible dissemination to other teachers and schools. The production of exemplar reports may be one way of approaching this, so might allocating a specific amount of money for evaluation and reporting of work done, so that schools could specifically 'buy' that time, rather than seeing it as an 'add on'.

10.17 There appear to be many instances where WSI projects have potential to impact upon the performance management system - indeed one project focused on

performance management. The frequent use of peer observation within WSI is the clearest example of this.

- 10.18** The way in which some schools use WSI funding in combination with other funding streams and to supplement initiatives already underway, appears to require further consideration. There is an extent to which schools may be ‘chasing funding’ rather than undertaking initiatives that arise from additional identified needs and that will benefit all staff as well as the school collectively.
- 10.19** This further raises the issue of how all schools can gain the considerable benefits from WSI that some have already, thereby achieving the greatest value for money. If the WSI are to be seen as a cost-effective way of providing individual CPD, as well as addressing school improvement, this is a crucial issue. For this to be achieved, the effect of WSI activity may need to be conceived as being more long term, leading to a deeper and more sustainable effect that has the potential to change the school and affect all staff. The creation of the learning communities that have arisen naturally in the best instances of WSI may be the best way of pursuing this objective. This may also require partnership activity involving LEAs and University Schools of Education, to achieve the synergy that can promote such professional communities.

11. OVERALL EVALUATION

Introduction

11.1 As a basis for the drawing up of recommendations relating to the future of the PDP, this section of the report considers the:

- overall strengths, weaknesses and issues identified in the evaluation of Phase 3 of the funding;
- conclusions arrived at in the evaluations undertaken of Phases 1 and 2 of the funding;
- wider context for teacher CPD as reflected in recent research and evaluation studies.

11.2 In this respect it should be noted that many of the recommendations made in the Phase 2 evaluation, remain issues requiring consideration. It should, therefore, be borne in mind that GTCW were unable to act upon these recommendations prior to the beginning of the Phase 3 funding round.

Phase 3 PDP Funding

11.3 The strengths evident in PDP in Phase 3 can be identified as:

- **personal** – the sheer enjoyment that the majority of participants have experienced in undertaking their projects, leading to a widening of horizons, challenges to existing practice, gains in confidence and motivation and perhaps most fulfilling of all, the opportunity to reflect;
- **professional** – the opportunity to participate in work-based, flexible and largely self-driven CPD, leading to gains in knowledge, understanding and skills, the chance to engage in action research, to collaborate [particularly in PN and WSI] with other colleagues and, when projects have been based on identified needs and with planned targets for impact, the potential for gains to be transferred to schools and pupils;
- **systemic** – the capacity for school-based CPD to support improvement aimed at existing practice and new policy developments, in a way that generally offers good value for money [although much more in some categories of funding than others] and

in the best cases, creates strong learning communities within schools producing work of sometimes exceptional quality that deserves much wider dissemination.

11.4 Whilst there continues to be far greater strengths than weaknesses in Phase 3 PDP, if the fullest value for money is to be achieved there is a need to:

- strengthen the criteria for funding and quality assurance of applications so as to ensure that the CPD, rather than the personal, element is explicit and uppermost, appropriate project planning is in place, proposed activities add value to current school practice and requirements and clear definitions and standards for TRS, IV and WSI are in place;
- improve the consistency of impact that all appropriately funded projects have upon teachers, schools and pupils;
- achieve much better reporting and dissemination of work;
- sustain high quality and promising work over a longer period of time so that its full potential can be realised.

Phases 1 and 2 PDP Funding

11.5 The Phase 1 and 2 evaluation reports pointed to strengths and weaknesses very similar to those indicated in 11.3 and 11.4 above. The support given by individual teachers and their schools for the PDP was seen as a clear indication that they have been well received, particularly as they had introduced a source of funding allowing their needs to be better represented within CPD activity. In the best practice this had led to a step-change in attitudes to CPD amongst teachers and in schools, with the spread of innovative, evidence-informed practice and the growth of work-based learning communities. Some categories of funding, however, had produced higher quality and greater value for money outcomes than others. The TRS had been the most problematic of the categories in this respect and in Phase 2 similar shortcomings were noted in IV, PN and WSI. These weaknesses pointed to a need for more rigorous quality assurance procedures to be established by GTCW, including tighter criteria for funding, and for greater consistency to be achieved in the transfer of gains from individual CPD activity into wider benefits for schools and pupils. Shortcomings in report writing and in the dissemination of outcomes were also noted. The positive effect that support from external consultants/tutors could

have on outcomes and the issue of how promising and high quality work might be sustained, became stronger issues in Phase 2 as a result of the wider range of PDP offered.

The Wider Context

- 11.6** In order to set a wider context for the findings emerging out of the evaluation of the GTCW PDP funding, a number of recent official reports, academic studies, other evaluations and interesting developments in practice in this area are reviewed below.
- 11.7** In 2002 research undertaken for GTCW [Egan and Simmonds 2002] indicated that CPD was much more strongly established within the practice of other professions in the UK and that it was also far more innovative and less traditional [centre-based and deliverer-led] than in teaching.
- 11.8** Research undertaken by the Professional Associations Research Network at the University of Bristol [Friedman, Davis and Philips 2001] as well as confirming the findings of Egan and Simmonds, pointed to the extent to which, across all professions, CPD was a contested area. The areas of debate they pointed to were those concerned with the definition, purpose, impact and value of CPD.
- 11.9** A study by the National Foundation for Educational Research [Brown, Edmonds and Lee 2001] focusing on the support that schools and LEAs gave to teacher CPD, reported that the most effective outcomes were achieved when teachers were able to choose and direct their own CPD and received good support from their schools and LEAs. In this sense individual activity needed to be set within a wider collaborative and supportive context.
- 11.10** HMI in England [OFSTED 2002] have suggested, however, that such good practice is extremely limited and that teachers generally experienced CPD through traditional course attendance that was not specific to their needs and preferred learning styles and with little planning and support for individual CPD from their schools.
- 11.11** The most extensive review of research literature on the impact of CPD that has been undertaken was recently published by the EPPI Centre at the University of London.

This was based on work jointly undertaken with the GTC in England, the National Union of Teachers and the Centre for User Research and Evaluation in Education [EPPI 2003]. It focused on the impact that collaborative CPD could have on classroom learning and teaching, drawing upon 72 major studies carried out across the world. It points to evidence of links between collaborative CPD and improvements in learning and teaching, which in many cases were substantial. The study also implies that distinctions between individual and collaborative CPD can be more abstract than real: successful collaborative CPD 'started with teachers expressed learning needs, took account of different starting points for individual teachers at every level and involved activities to develop and sustain teacher ownership'.

11.12 Evaluations have also recently appeared of CPD initiatives focused on teacher research and networking funded by the Teacher Training Agency [Cordingley 2003 and McNamara 2002]. These have pointed to the need for collaborative endeavour between teachers, LEAs and Higher Education institutions if the 'complex and technically demanding' challenges of undertaking research and interpreting its findings are to be overcome by teachers. They also point to the crucial distinction that needs to be made between the action research that teachers can usefully do on their own practice ['evidence informed'] and the more widescale and demanding task of researching what others do and have found ['research informed'], that can also be expressed as being the difference between 'using' and 'doing' research.

11.13 All of the above studies point to the difficulty of evaluating the impact of CPD. One of the most useful and well-respected models that has been developed to this end, is that of two researchers based at the National Foundation for Educational Research [Harland and Kinder 1997]. This provides a framework or taxonomy for impact at three levels that can be simplified as follows:

- 1st Order Outcomes: **values congruence** [the adoption of good practice] + deeper **knowledge and skills**.
- 2nd Order Outcomes: increased **motivation + affective + institutional**.
- 3rd Order Outcomes: **provisionary** [resources, schemes of work etc] + **information + awareness**.

For long-term impact it is suggested that 1st order outcomes are essential and that without them the impact of CPD is short-term and transitory.

11.14 The context of current overall developments in CPD policies within the devolved UK is also worthy of note. Expressed simply these are:

- In England the governmental policy set out in 'Learning and Teaching' in March 2001, the initiatives pursued by the National College for School Leadership in creating networked learning communities [both of these have clearly influenced the funding opportunities offered by GTCW] and the recent development of the Teacher Learning Academy in some areas of England by the GTC, with the involvement of LEAs and Universities.
- In Scotland the development of a compulsory framework for teacher CPD and, through the joint activity of the Scottish Executive, the GTC and the Universities, the provision of a Chartered Teacher qualification. The GTC is also beginning a teacher researcher programme supported by the appointment of a Research Fellow.
- In Northern Ireland there are no current initiative led developments for CPD, which has traditionally been associated with the Universities, as part of the continuum of initial teacher education and training into professional development.
- In Wales, the Assembly Government has provided the funding for the GTCW programme and offers support for other forms of CPD through the Better Schools Fund and the Headship Development programme.

Issues for Consideration

11.15 The analysis offered above can be seen to suggest a number of issues that are worthy of consideration in relation to the future of the GTCW PDP programme. These are dealt with in the paragraphs below.

11.16 The funding by the Assembly Government of the GTCW programme can be seen to have made a distinctive and successful contribution to changing the low status of CPD activity within the teaching profession in Wales. The Harland and Kinder taxonomy would suggest, however, that in a minority of cases, but with more prominence in particular funded categories, that outcomes are not of 1st order

significance. This is particularly the case in relation to a significant minority of TRS and IV.

- 11.17** In order to ensure that good value for money is being achieved the GTCW will need to consider changes to its quality assurance procedures.
- 11.18** In order for teachers and schools to achieve the maximum possible impact from their projects, the GTCW should consider partnership working with the wider educational community in Wales (particularly LEAs and Universities) to increase support capacity. This could be considered as part of the wider strategy for CPD in Wales being developed by the Assembly Government and might take into account similar developments taking place elsewhere in the UK.
- 11.19** The philosophy of individual entitlement that has underpinned the GTCW PDP funding might be revisited as part of a wider review of the funding opportunities currently available. The work in particular of the EPPI review pointed to above, suggests that it may not always be useful to distinguish too sharply between individual and collaborative CPD. In Phase 2 and 3 funding the GTCW refined its initial philosophy through the introduction of PN and WSI. The evaluations of those programmes have pointed to high quality, value-for-money, outcomes emanating from both individually-focused and collaborative PDP.
- 11.20** The concept of action research adopted by the GTCW in the TRS has not been effective in relation to outcomes. In addition, as GTCW recognise, educational research is involved in all the PDP and in fact, the quality achieved in other categories is often greater than that in the TRS. This suggests that the whole nature of educational action research, including the appropriateness of it having a separate funding category rather than being infused into all the PDP, should be reviewed.
- 11.21** In order to consider the overall effect that this significant and unique funding has had on teacher CPD in Wales including the mid-to-long term impact that it will have had on improvements in learning and teaching, further studies could, in due course, be usefully considered. This might include the development of a model designed to evaluate impact, based upon that put forward by Harland and Kinder.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 The Assembly Government should continue to provide funding for GTCW to offer the PDP entitlement to teachers in Wales. The benefits accruing from this programme suggest that, resources permitting, similar levels of funding to those in place in Phases 2 and 3 will be needed to support that entitlement, in order for a significant number of teachers and schools in Wales to benefit from these opportunities.

[Main Findings 1.1; 1.4; 1.6; 1.9-1.13; 1.16; 1.17]

12.2 The Assembly Government, as part of the overall funding, should provide GTCW with the means to improve staffing levels so that the quality assurance of applications, the support given to participants and the dissemination of outcomes across the education sector in Wales may be further improved and, thereby, better value for money achieved.

[Main Findings 1.7; 1.8; 1.9; 1.13; 1.15; 1.18]

12.3 The Assembly Government should clearly define the role and place of the GTCW PDP programme within its overall strategy for CPD. [Main Finding 1.5; 1.8]

12.4 The Assembly Government and the GTCW should keep under review the current funding philosophy and categories, in particular the:

- nature of educational action research and how this can be infused into all the funding categories;
- need for more rigorous criteria and guidance in relation to achieving quality outcomes from IV and TRS;
- means of sustaining over a longer period of time activities that are judged to have considerable further potential;
- ways in which the impact of PDP funding upon teachers, schools and pupils can be better measured and evaluated on a longitudinal basis;
- means whereby effective dissemination of outcomes relating to improvements in learning, teaching and schooling can be disseminated.

The views of key stakeholders, such as the teacher associations, LEAs, higher education institutions, Estyn and ACCAC should be sought on these matters. [Main Findings 1.4; 1.6; 1.7; 1.10; 1.11; 1.18]

12.5 GTCW should improve its quality assurance of applications to ensure that they:

- rigorously meet the criteria for funding within the category applied for;
- offer good prospects of effective outcomes in terms of benefits to individual teachers and their pupils;
- include proposals for appropriate dissemination of findings.

[Main Findings 1.7; 1.10; 1.11; 1.13; 1.15; 1.18]

12.6 GTCW should consider how the overall quality of report writing can be improved so that:

- teachers/schools can demonstrate that the impact of the PDP has been evaluated;
- the Council and external evaluators have a basis for establishing the quality of outcomes and value for money;
- there is a stronger basis for disseminating findings within the school and across the profession.

[Main Finding 1.14]

12.7 GTCW should liaise more closely with LEAs, higher education institutions, private training and consultancy organisations/individuals to ensure that the widest possible human/organisational resources are available to support teachers and schools in undertaking PDP and that thereby, the highest possible quality of outcomes are promoted.

[Main Findings 1.7; 1.15; 1.18]

APPENDIX 1:

THE PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR ACTIVITIES

Table 1: Number of Participants

		Number	Percent
II A	Bursary	2763	88.8
	International Visits	275	8.8
	Research Scholarships	67	2.1
	Sabbatical	13	.4
IIA Total		3118	100.0
Network Total		1524	100.0
Estimated No of WSI Participants		4726	100.0
Total No of participants		9368	100.0
No of Teachers on GTCW Register (March 2003)*		36,662	

* This figure is higher than the no. of teachers eligible for funding which is estimated by GTCW officials as 30,000

Table 2: Number of Schools Participating

	IIA		Network		WSI	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Nursery	11	1.1	10	1.2	2	.9
Other	37	3.7	11	1.3	0	.0
Primary	719	72.9	622	76.2	153	73.6
PRU	6	.6	1	.1	0	.0
Secondary	185	18.8	157	19.3	49	23.6
Special	28	2.8	15	1.8	4	1.9
Total	986	100.0	816	100.0	208	100.0

Number of Network Projects: **162**

The total number of schools participating in CPD, Networks and Whole Staff Initiative Projects: **1345**

PARTICIPANTS BY GENDER

Table 3: Participants by Gender

	IIA		Network		GTCW Register
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
Female	2537	81.4	1165	76.4	72.6
Male	581	18.6	359	23.5	27.4
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0	100.0

Table 4: Category and Participants' Gender

		Participants' Gender		Total	
		Female	Male		
IIA Category	Bursary	Count	2281	482	2763
		% within Category	82.5%	17.4%	100.0%
	International Visits	Count	205	70	275
		% within Category	74.5%	25.4%	100.0%
	Research Scholarship	Count	44	23	67
		% within Category	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
	Sabbatical	Count	7	6	13
		% within Category	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
IIA Total	Count	2537	581	3118	
	% within Category	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%	
Network Total	Count	1165	359	1524	
	% within Category	76.4%	23.5%	100.0%	

Table 5: Phase and Participants' Gender

			Participants' Gender					
			IIA			Network		
			Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Phase	Nursery	Count % within Phase	18 100.0%	0 .0%	18 100.0%	17 100.0%	0 .0%	17 100.0%
	Other	Count % within Phase	70 92.1%	6 7.9%	76 100.0%	13 100.0%	0 .0%	13 100.0%
	Primary	Count % within Phase	1832 86.7%	280 13.3%	2112 100.0%	869 80.8%	207 19.2%	1076 100.0%
	PRU	Count % within Phase	5 62.5%	3 37.5%	8 100.0%	1 100.0%	0 .0%	1 100.0%
	Secondary	Count % within Phase	546 66.0%	281 34.0%	827 100.0%	251 63.4%	145 36.6%	396 100.0%
	Special	Count % within Phase	2 100.0%	0 .0%	2 100.0%	11 61.1%	7 38.9%	18 100.0%
	Not Specified	Count % within Phase	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	3 100.0%	0 .0%	3 100.0%
Total		Count % within Phase	2537 81.4%	581 18.6%	3118 100.0%	1165 76.4%	359 23.5%	1524 100.0%

PARTICIPANTS BY PHASE

Table 6: Applicants by Phase

	<i>IIA</i>		<i>Network</i>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Nursery	18	.6	17	1.1
Other	76	2.4	13	.9
Primary	2112	67.7	1076	70.5
PRU	8	.3	1	.1
Secondary	827	26.5	396	26.0
Special	77	2.5	18	1.2
Not Specified	0	.0	3	.2
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0

Table 7: Participants by Phase and Category

IIA Category		Phase							Total
		Nursery	Other	Primary	PRU	Secondary	Special	Not specified	
Bursary	Count	14	60	1885	7	733	64	0	2763
	% within Category	.5%	2.2%	68.2%	.3%	26.5%	2.3%	.0%	100.0%
International Visits	Count	4	15	180	1	66	9	0	275
	% within Category	1.5%	5.5%	65.5%	.4%	24.0%	23.2%	.0%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Count	0	1	39	0	24	3	0	67
	% within Category	.0%	1.5%	58.2%	.0%	35.8%	4.5%	.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Count	0	0	8	0	4	1	0	13
	% within Category	.0%	.0%	61.5%	.0%	30.8%	7.7%	.0%	100.0%
IIA Total	Count	18	76	2112	8	827	77	0	3118
	% within Category	.6%	2.4%	67.7%	.3%	26.5%	2.5%	.0%	100.0%
Network Total	Count	17	13	1076	1	396	18	3	1524
	% within Category	1.1	.9	70.5	.1	26.0	1.2	.2	100.0%

PARTICIPANTS BY YEARS OF SERVICE

Table 8: Length of Service

	IIA		Network		GTCW Register*
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
0 - 5	643	20.6	239	15.7	22.3
6 -10	708	22.7	323	21.2	15.3
11 - 15	460	14.7	197	12.9	8.8
16 - 20	331	10.6	138	9.0	7.0
21 - 25	372	11.9	191	12.5	11.4
26+	580	18.6	241	15.8	35.2
Not specified	24	.8	195	12.8	.0
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0	100.0

* The percentage of teachers registered with GTCW in March 2003 by number of years since QTS. This cannot be equated with length of service

Table 9: Length of Service and Category

IIA Category		Number of Years as Teacher						Not specified	Total
		0 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21 – 25	26+		
Bursary	Count	573	651	423	288	316	488	24	2763
	% within Category	20.7%	23.6%	15.3%	10.4%	11.4%	17.6%	.9%	100.0%
International Visits	Count	50	36	30	36	41	82	0	275
	% within Category	18.2%	13.0%	10.9%	13.0%	14.9%	29.8%	.0%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Count	20	20	5	6	10	6	0	67
	% within Category	29.9%	29.9%	7.5%	8.9%	14.9%	8.9%	.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Count	0	1	2	1	5	4	0	13
	% within Category	.0%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	38.5%	30.8%	.0%	100.0%
IIA Total	Count	643	708	460	331	372	580	24	3118
	% within Category	20.6%	22.7%	14.8%	10.6%	11.9%	18.6%	.8%	100.0%
Network Total	Count	239	323	197	138	191	241	195	1524
	% within Category	15.7	21.2	12.9	9.0	12.5	15.8	12.8	100.0%

Table 10: Number of Years in School

	IIA		Network	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 - 5	1330	42.6	542	35.6
6 -10	726	23.3	319	20.9
11 - 15	525	16.8	244	16.0
16 - 20	248	7.9	115	7.5
21 - 25	114	3.6	65	4.3
26+	125	4.0	45	2.9
Not specified	50	1.6	194	12.7
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0

Table 11: Number of Years at School by Category

IIA Category		Number of Years at School							Total
		0 – 5	6 – 10	11 – 15	16 – 20	21 – 25	26+	Not specified	
Bursary	Count	1162	650	475	211	105	113	47	2763
	% within Category	41.0%	23.5%	17.2%	7.6%	3.8%	4.0%	1.7%	100.0%
International Visits	Count	130	55	40	29	9	9	3	275
	% within Category	47.2%	20.0%	14.5%	10.5%	3.3%	3.3%	1.0%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Count	34	19	8	4	0	2	0	67
	% within Category	50.7%	28.3%	11.9%	5.9%	.0%	2.9%	.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Count	4	2	2	4	0	1	0	13
	% within Category	30.7%	15.4%	15.4%	30.7%	.0%	7.7%	.0%	100.0%
IIA Total	Count	1330	726	525	248	114	125	50	3118
	% within Category	42.6%	23.3%	16.8%	7.9%	3.6%	4.0%	1.6%	100.0%
Network Total	Count	542	319	244	115	65	45	194	1524
	% within Category	35.6	20.9	16.0	7.5	4.3	2.9	12.7	100.0%

PARTICIPANTS BY ROLE

Table 12: Participants by Post

Post	IIA		Network	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Deputy Headteacher (DH)	219	7.0	166	10.9
Head of Dept / Curriculum Leader (HD/CL)	1580	50.7	805	52.9
Headteacher (HT)	210	6.7	157	10.3
Peripatetic Teacher (Peri)	17	.5	5	.4
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	56	1.8	6	.4
Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	122	3.9	59	3.9
Senior Management Team (SMT)	49	1.6	28	1.8
Special Needs (SN)	2	.1	1	.1
Standard National Scale (SNS)	792	25.4	269	17.7
Supply	41	1.3	0	0
Other	30	0.9	8	.5
Not specified	0	.0	20	1.3
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100

Table 13: IIA Participants by Role and Phase

Post		IIA Phase						IIA Total
		Nursery	Other	Primary	PRU	Secondary	Special	
Deputy Headteacher (DHT)	Count	0	0	189	0	24	6	219
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	86.3%	.0%	11.0%	2.8%	100.0%
Head of Dept / Curriculum Leader (HD/CL)	Count	1	6	1154	1	371	47	1580
	% within Phase	.0%	.4%	73.0%	.0%	23.5%	2.9%	100.0%
Headteacher (HT)	Count	6	0	185	0	16	3	210
	% within Phase	2.9%	.0%	88.1%	.0%	7.6%	1.5%	100.0%
Peripatetic Teacher (PERI)	Count	0	17	0	0	0	0	17
	% within Phase	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	Count	0	4	36	1	12	3	56
	% within Phase	.0%	7.1%	64.3%	1.8%	21.4%	5.4%	100.0%
Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	Count	0	0	108	0	14	0	122
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	88.5%	.0%	11.5%	.0%	100.0%
Senior Management Team (SMT)	Count	0	0	27	0	20	2	49
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	55.1%	.0%	40.8%	4.1%	100.0%
Special Needs (SN)	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Standard National Scale (SNS)	Count	10	5	399	2	362	14	792
	% within Phase	1.3%	.6%	50.4%	.3%	45.7%	1.8%	100.0%
Supply	Count	0	36	3	0	1	1	41
	% within Phase	.0%	87.8%	7.3%	.0%	2.4%	2.4%	100.0%
Other	Count	1	8	10	4	7	0	30
	% within Phase	3.3%	26.7%	33.3%	13.3%	23.3%	.0%	100.0%
IIA Total	Count	18	76	2112	8	827	77	3118
	% within Phase	.6%	2.4%	67.7%	.3%	26.5%	2.5%	100.0%

Table 14: Network Participants by Role and Phase

Post		Network Phase							Network Total
		Not Specified	Nursery	Other	Primary	PRU	Secondary	Special	
Not Specified	Count	0	0	2	15	0	3	0	20
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	10.0%	75.0%	.0%	15.0%	.0%	100.0%
Deputy Headteacher (DHT)	Count	0	0	0	154	0	10	2	166
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	92.8%	.0%	6.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Head of Dept / Curriculum Leader (HD/CL)	Count	0	5	1	596	0	191	12	805
	% within Phase	.0%	.6%	.1%	74.0%	.0%	23.7%	1.5%	100.0%
Headteacher (HT)	Count	0	10	0	144	0	3	0	157
	% within Phase	.0%	6.4%	.0%	91.7%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	100.0%
Peripatetic Teacher (PERI)	Count	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
	% within Phase	75.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	Count	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	6
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Special Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCO)	Count	0	0	0	46	0	13	0	59
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	78.0%	.0%	22.0%	.0%	100.0%
Senior Management Team (SMT)	Count	0	0	0	12	0	15	1	28
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	42.9%	.0%	53.6%	3.6%	100.0%
Special Needs (SN)	Count	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Standard National Scale (SNS)	Count	0	2	2	105	0	158	2	269
	% within Phase	.0%	.7%	.7%	39.1%	.0%	58.7%	.7%	100.0%
Other	Count	0	0	6	1	0	1	0	8
	% within Phase	.0%	.0%	75.0%	12.5%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	100.0%
Network Total	Count	3	17	13	1076	1	396	18	1524
	% within Phase	.2%	1.1%	.9%	70.6%	.1%	26.0%	1.2%	100.0%

PARTICIPANTS BY LEA

Table 15: Participants by LEA

	IIA		Network		GTCW Register
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
Anglesey	51	1.6	28	1.8	2.2
Blaenau Gwent	53	1.7	24	1.6	2.2
Bridgend	202	6.5	29	1.9	4.5
Caerphilly	298	9.6	97	6.4	5.8
Cardiff	367	11.8	105	6.9	10.8
Carmarthen	157	5.0	116	7.6	6.1
Ceredigion	84	2.7	45	3.0	2.7
Conwy	46	1.5	19	1.2	3.5
Denbighshire	108	3.5	19	1.2	3.3
Flintshire	87	2.8	120	7.9	5.0
Gwynedd	105	3.4	40	2.6	4.1
Merthyr Tydfil	59	1.9	44	2.9	2.2
Monmouthshire	101	3.2	41	2.7	2.5
Neath Port Talbot	129	4.1	66	4.3	4.7
Newport	58	1.9	131	8.6	4.6
Pembrokeshire	133	4.3	94	6.2	4.1
Powys	116	3.7	30	2.0	4.6
Rhondda Cynon Taff	351	11.3	117	7.7	8.2
Supply / Peripatetic teachers	16	.5	0	.0	.0
Swansea	210	6.7	157	10.3	7.4
Torfaen	75	2.4	88	5.8	3.2
Vale of Glamorgan	198	6.4	80	5.2	4.4
Wrexham	114	3.7	34	2.2	3.9
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0	100.0

Table 16: Whole Staff Initiative Project by LEA

	Number	Percent
Anglesey	2	1.0
Blaenau Gwent	2	1.0
Bridgend	6	2.9
Caerphilly	26	12.5
Cardiff	34	16.3
Carmarthen	9	4.3
Ceredigion	4	1.9
Conwy	4	1.9
Denbighshire	3	1.4
Flintshire	3	1.4
Gwynedd	6	2.9
Merthyr Tydfil	5	2.4
Monmouthshire	9	4.3
Neath Port Talbot	5	2.4
Newport	7	3.4
Pembrokeshire	4	1.9
Powys	7	3.4
Rhondda Cynon Taff	22	10.6
Swansea	18	8.7
Torfaen	10	4.8
Vale of Glamorgan	16	7.7
Wrexham	6	2.9
Total	208	100.0

AREAS OF ACTIVITY

Table 17: Project Category by LEA

LEA Name	Number of Project Categories					Network Total
	IIA					
	Bursary	International Visits	Research Scholarship	Sabbatical	IIA Total	
Anglesey	42	9	0	0	51	28
Blaenau Gwent	53	0	0	0	53	24
Bridgend	166	27	8	1	202	29
Caerphilly	284	12	2	0	298	97
Cardiff	308	42	14	3	367	105
Carmarthen	132	21	3	1	157	116
Ceredigion	76	6	2	0	84	45
Conwy	42	3	1	0	46	19
Denbighshire	94	13	1	0	108	19
Flintshire	80	3	4	0	87	120
Gwynedd	101	4	0	0	105	40
Merthyr Tydfil	43	16	0	0	59	44
Monmouthshire	99	1	1	0	101	41
Neath Port Talbot	109	17	1	2	129	66
Newport	50	5	3	0	58	131
Pembrokeshire	106	25	1	1	133	94
Powys	103	10	3	0	116	30
Rhondda Cynon Taff	323	25	2	1	351	117
Supply / Peripatetic teachers	13	3	0	0	16	0
Swansea	180	16	12	2	210	157
Torfaen	65	6	4	0	75	88
Vale of Glamorgan	186	7	3	2	198	80
Wrexham	108	4	2	0	114	34
Total	2763	275	67	13	3118	1524

Table 18: All Activity Areas

	IIA		Network		WSI	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Category not Provided	1	.0	4	.3	6	2.9
Alternative Curriculum	1	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Art	78	2.5	24	1.6	0	.0
Assessment Recording and Reporting	70	2.2	31	2.0	11	5.3
Basic Skills	2	.1	10	.7	0	.0
Behaviour Management	52	1.7	5	.3	14	6.7
Continuous Professional Development	1	.0	15	1.0	1	.5
Cross Curriculum	26	.8	57	3.7	7	3.4
Curriculum Cymraeg	5	.2	0	.0	1	.5
Design and Technology	95	3.0	51	3.3	1	.5
Early Years	281	9.0	92	6.0	5	2.4
Economics	1	.0	0	.0	0	.0
English	254	8.1	187	12.3	7	3.4
English As an Additional Language	3	.1	1	.1	0	.0
Ethnic Minority Achievement	9	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Extra Curricular	13	.4	5	.3	0	.0
General Studies	9	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Geography	101	3.2	33	2.2	0	.0
GNVQ	5	.2	0	.0	0	.0
History	88	2.8	60	3.9	0	.0
Humanities	5	.2	0	.0	0	.0
Information and Communication Technology	263	8.4	172	11.3	31	14.9
Information Technology	0	.0	1	.1	0	.0
Key Skills	14	.4	0	.0	9	4.3
Languages	7	.2	0	.0	0	.0
Leadership	98	3.1	26	1.7	4	1.9
Literacy	8	.3	0	.0	12	5.8
Management Role Skills	247	7.9	41	2.7	6	2.9
Mathematics	167	5.4	135	8.9	5	2.4
Modern Foreign Languages	49	1.6	0	.0	0	.0
Monitoring & Evaluation	29	.9	27	1.8	3	1.4
Music	73	2.3	5	.3	1	.5
Numeracy	1	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Performance Management	3	.1	14	.9	0	.0
Personal, Social and Health Education	96	3.1	90	5.9	3	1.5
Physical Education	69	2.2	7	.5	1	.5
Physical Education / Special Needs	1	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Religious Education	74	2.4	26	1.7	0	.0
Research Skills Development	4	.1	0	.0	0	.0
Science	202	6.5	136	8.9	1	.5
Special Educational Needs	86	2.8	22	1.4	1	.5
Special Education Needs Plus	108	3.5	29	1.9	0	.0

Evaluation of the GTCW Phase 3 Pilot Professional Development Projects – Final Report

Thinking Skills and Teaching and Learning Methodologies	245	7.9	93	6.1	66	31.7
Teaching Strategy and Methodology	20	.6	0	.0	0	.0
Transition and Learning	42	1.3	101	6.6	10	4.8
Welsh as a First Language	46	1.5	24	1.6	1	.5
Welsh as a Second Language	46	1.5	0	.0	0	.0
Welsh Bacallaureate	0	.0	0	.0	1	.5
Welsh Language	20	.6	0	.0	0	.0
Total	3118	100.0	1524	100.0	208	100

APPENDIX 2:

ANALYSES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

APPLICATION PROCESS

Table 19: How easy did you find the application process?

	IIA Participants		WSI: Headteachers		Network Participants		Network Coordinator	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Easy	582	29.2	50	38.2	199	26.1	31	30.1
Easy	1201	60.3	75	57.3	504	66.1	56	54.4
Difficult	150	7.5	5	3.8	55	7.2	14	13.6
Very Difficult	31	1.6	0	.0	4	.5	2	1.9
Not Completed	28	1.4	1	.8	0	.0	0	.0
Total	1992	100.0	131	100.0	762	100.0	103	100.0

Table 20: How easy did you find the application process?

IIA Categories		Responses					Total
		Very Easy	Easy	Difficult	Very Difficult	Not Completed	
Bursary	Number	511	1067	134	25	25	1762
	% within category	29.0%	60.6%	7.6%	1.4%	1.4%	100.0%
International Visits	Number	56	108	10	3	3	180
	% within category	31.1%	60.0%	5.6%	1.7%	1.7%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Number	13	23	6	3	0	45
	% within category	28.9%	51.1%	13.3%	6.7%	.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	2	3	0	0	0	5
	% within category	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	582	1201	150	31	28	1992
	% within category	29.2%	60.3%	7.5%	1.6%	1.4%	100.0%

REASONS FOR APPLICATION

Table 21: Which of the following were your reasons for applying?

	IIA Participants				Network Participants			
	Number		Percent		Number		Percent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A Performance Management Objective	788	1204	39.6	60.4	233	529	30.6	69.4
A Departmental Action Plan	447	1545	22.4	77.6	172	590	22.6	77.4
A Personal Action Plan	1071	921	53.8	46.2	359	403	47.1	52.9
The School Development Plan	893	1099	44.8	55.2	364	398	47.8	52.2
Other	179	1813	9.0	91.0	101	661	13.3	86.7

Table 22: Which of the following were your reasons for applying?

IIA Categories		Responses									
		A Performance Management Objective		A Departmental Action Plan		A Personal Action Plan		The School Development Plan		Other	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Bursary	Number	1032	730	1355	407	828	934	964	798	1621	141
	% within category	58.6%	41.4%	76.9%	23.1%	47.0%	53.0%	54.7%	45.3%	92.0%	8.0%
International Visits	Number	138	42	145	35	80	100	104	76	152	28
	% within category	76.7%	23.3%	80.6%	19.4%	44.4%	55.6%	57.8%	42.2%	84.4%	15.6%
Research Scholarship	Number	29	16	42	3	11	34	29	16	36	9
	% within category	64.4%	35.6%	93.3%	6.7%	24.4%	75.6%	64.4%	35.6%	80.0%	20.0%
Sabbatical	Number	5	0	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	1
	% within category	100.0%	.0%	60.0%	40.0%	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%	80.0%	20.0%
Total	Number	1204	788	1545	447	921	1071	1099	893	1813	179
	% within category	60.4%	39.6%	77.6%	22.4%	46.2%	53.8%	55.2%	44.8%	91.0%	9.0%

Table 23: Would your participation in your CPD project / initiative have taken place without funding from the GTCW?

	IIA Participants		WSI: Headteacher		Network Participants	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No	1406	70.6	103	78.6	713	93.6
Yes	586	29.4	28	21.4	49	6.4
Total	1992	100.0	131	100.0	762	100.0

Table 24: Would your participation in your CPD project / initiative have taken place without funding from the GTCW?

IIA Categories		Responses		Total
		No	Yes	
Bursary	Number	1197	565	1762
	% within category	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
International Visits	Number	168	12	180
	% within category	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Number	36	9	45
	% within category	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	5	0	5
	% within category	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	1406	586	1992
	% within category	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%

Table 25: If your answer is 'Yes' please indicate below what the alternative funding source would have been:

	IIA Participants				WSI: Headteacher				Network Participants			
	Number		Percent		Number		Percent		Number		Percent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
GEST	120	1872	6.0	94.0	23	108	17.6	82.4	28	734	3.7	96.3
School Budget	176	1816	8.8	91.2	23	108	17.6	82.4	28	734	3.7	96.3
Own Time / Money	437	1555	21.9	78.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	19	743	2.5	97.5
Staff non – contact time	NA	NA	NA	NA	16	115	12.2	87.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other	28	1964	1.4	98.6	11	120	8.4	91.6	3	759	.4	99.6

NA: This category was not given on the questionnaire

Table 26: If your answer is 'Yes' please indicate below what the alternative funding source would have been:

IIA Categories		Responses							
		GEST		School Budget		Own Time / Money		Other	
		No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Bursary	Number	1645	117	1590	172	1345	417	1736	26
	% within category	93.4%	6.6%	90.2%	9.8%	76.3%	23.7%	98.5%	1.5%
International Visits	Number	179	1	178	2	168	12	178	2
	% within category	99.4%	.6%	98.9%	1.1%	93.3%	6.7%	98.9%	1.1%
Research Scholarship	Number	43	2	43	2	37	8	45	0
	% within category	95.6%	4.4%	95.6%	4.4%	82.2%	17.8%	100.0%	.0%
Sabbatical	Number	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0
	% within category	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%
Total	Number	1872	120	1816	176	1555	437	1964	28
	% within category	94.0%	6.0%	91.2%	8.8%	78.1%	21.9%	98.6%	1.4%

IMPACT

Table 27: How effective do you consider your CPD project / the Initiative / the Professional Network / the Teacher Sabbatical / Research Scholarship to have been in enhancing the professional knowledge, skills and expertise?

	IIA Participants		Headteacher / Line Manager		WSI: Participant		WSI: Headteacher		Network Participants		Network Coordinator		Teacher Research Mentors		Sabbatical Mentors	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Effective	1118	56.1	148	70.1	188	42.3	77	58.8	427	56.0	67	65.0	11	78.6	3	75.0
Effective	785	39.4	54	25.6	233	52.5	48	36.6	310	40.7	32	31.1	1	7.1	1	25.0
Ineffective	6	.3	1	.5	13	2.9	0	.0	8	1.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Very Ineffective	51	2.6	3	1.4	4	.9	0	.0	8	1.0	1	1.0	0	.0	0	.0
Not Completed	32	1.6	5	2.4	6	1.4	6	4.6	9	1.2	3	2.9	2	14.2	0	.0
Total	1992	100.0	211	100.0	444	100.0	131	100.0	762	100.0	103	100.0	14	100.0	4	100.0

Table 28: How effective do you consider your CPD project / the Initiative / the Professional Network / the Teacher Sabbatical / Research Scholarship to have been in enhancing the professional knowledge, skills and expertise?

IIA Category		Responses					Total
		Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	
Bursary	Number	960	725	3	45	29	1762
	% within category	54.5%	41.1%	.2%	2.6%	1.6%	100.0%
International Visits	Number	122	48	3	4	3	180
	% within category	67.8%	26.7%	1.7%	2.2%	1.7%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Number	32	11	0	2	0	45
	% within category	71.1%	24.4%	.0%	4.4%	.0%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	4	1	0	0	0	5
	% within category	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	1118	785	6	51	32	1992
	% within category	56.1%	39.4%	.3%	2.6%	1.6%	100.0%

Table 29: How effective do you consider the initiative has been in improving-

Frequency	IIA Participants					Headteacher / Line Manager					WSI: Participants					WSI: Headteacher					Network Participants				
	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed
Classroom Practice / Management	694	1014	53	43	188	115	80	3	3	10	174	234	11	5	20	65	61	0	0	5	280	409	17	7	49
Pupil Learning	712	993	57	44	186	111	86	2	3	9	169	239	14	2	20	50	75	0	0	6	303	403	13	5	38
School Management	404	865	237	59	427	69	81	18	3	40	68	209	45	4	118	39	68	10	1	13	128	364	95	28	147
School Improvement	597	984	88	38	285	105	82	5	2	17	123	205	22	3	91	59	67	0	0	5	216	444	25	10	67
Other	157	85	4	8	1738	54	13	0	1	143	44	28	5	3	364	24	10	0	0	97	87	53	2	2	618

Table 30: How effective do you consider the initiative has been in improving-

Percentages	IIA Participants					Headteacher / Line Manager					WSI: Participants					WSI: Headteacher					Network Participants				
	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed
Classroom Practice / Management	34.8	50.9	2.7	2.2	9.4	54.5	37.9	1.4	1.4	4.7	39.2	52.7	2.5	1.1	4.5	49.6	46.6	.0	.0	3.8	36.7	53.7	2.2	.9	6.4
Pupil Learning	35.7	49.8	2.9	2.2	9.3	52.6	40.8	.9	1.4	4.3	38.1	53.8	3.2	.5	4.5	38.2	57.3	.0	.0	4.6	39.8	52.9	1.7	.7	5.0
School Management	20.3	43.4	11.9	3.0	21.5	32.7	38.4	8.5	1.4	19.0	15.3	47.1	10.1	.9	26.6	29.8	51.9	7.6	.8	9.9	16.8	47.8	12.5	3.7	19.3
School Improvement	30.0	49.4	4.4	1.9	14.3	49.8	38.9	2.4	.9	8.1	27.7	46.2	5.0	.7	20.5	45.0	51.1	.0	.0	3.8	28.3	58.3	3.3	1.3	8.8
Other	7.9	4.3	.2	.4	87.2	25.6	6.2	.0	.5	67.8	9.9	6.3	1.1	.7	82.0	18.3	7.6	.0	.0	74.0	11.4	7.0	.3	.3	81.1

OUTCOMES

Table 31: Have there been opportunities for you / the network to share your experiences and disseminate your findings with:

	IIA Participants				WSI: Headteacher				Network Participants				Network Coordinators			
	Number		Percent		Number		Percent		Number		Percent		Number		Percent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Members of your department / network	846	1146	42.5	57.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	619	143	81.2	18.8	89	14	86.4	13.6
Other teachers in your school	1487	505	74.6	25.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	505	257	66.3	33.7	NA	NA	NA	NA
With the LEA(s)	NA	NA	NA	NA	47	84	35.9	64.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	59	44	57.3	42.7
Teachers outside your school / Network	555	1437	27.9	72.1	62	69	47.3	52.7	204	558	26.8	73.2	68	35	66.0	34.0
Other	655	1337	32.9	67.1	44	87	33.6	66.4	131	631	17.2	82.8	28	75	27.2	72.8

Table 32: Have there been opportunities for you / the network to share your experiences and disseminate your findings with:

IIA Categories		Responses							
		Members of your department / Network		Other teachers in your school		Teachers outside your school		Other	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Bursary	Number	1038	724	465	1297	1330	432	1205	557
	% within category	58.9%	41.1%	26.4%	73.6%	75.5%	24.5%	68.4%	31.6%
International Visits	Number	88	92	33	147	90	90	102	78
	% within category	48.9%	51.1%	18.3%	81.7%	50.0%	50.0%	56.7%	43.3%
Research Scholarship	Number	18	27	5	40	15	30	28	17
	% within category	40.0%	60.0%	11.1%	88.9%	33.3%	66.7%	62.2%	37.8%
Sabbatical	Number	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
	% within category	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Total	Number	1146	846	505	1487	1437	555	1337	655
	% within category	57.5%	42.5%	25.4%	74.6%	72.1%	27.9%	67.1%	32.9%

Table 33: Have you used the report submitted to the GTCW as a means of disseminating your experiences and findings?

	IIA Participants		Network Participant	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No	1310	65.8	434	57.0
Yes	682	34.2	328	43.0
Total	1992	100.0	762	100.0

Table 34: Have you used the report submitted to the GTCW as a means of disseminating your experiences and findings?

IIA Category		Responses		Total
		No	Yes	
Bursary	Number	1223	539	1762
	% within category	69.4%	30.6%	100.0%
International Visits	Number	70	110	180
	% within category	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%
Research Scholarship	Number	15	30	45
	% within category	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	2	3	5
	% within category	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	1310	682	1992
	% within category	65.8%	34.2%	100.0%

MENTORING

Table 35: How effective did you find support given to you by your tutor/mentor (RS & S participants)?

	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Effective	18	36.0	36.0
Effective	20	40.0	76.0
Ineffective	3	6.0	82.0
Very Ineffective	2	4.0	86.0
Not Completed	7	14.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	

Table 36: How effective did you find support given to you by your tutor/mentor (RS & S participants)?

IIA Category		Responses					Total
		Very Effective	Effective	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Completed	
Research Scholarship	Number	15	19	3	2	6	45
	% within category	33.3%	42.2%	6.7%	4.4%	13.3%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	3	1	0	0	1	5
	% within category	60.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	18	20	3	2	7	50
	% within category	36.0%	40.0%	6.0%	4.0%	14.0%	100.0%

Table 37: Do you feel confident about your ability to undertake further research (RS & S participants)?

	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	6	12.0	12.0
Yes	44	88.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	

Table 38: Do you feel confident about your ability to undertake further research (RS & S participants)?

IIA Category		Responses		Total
		No	Yes	
Research Scholarship	Number	6	39	45
	% within category	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
Sabbatical	Number	0	5	5
	% within category	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Number	6	44	50
	% within category	12.0%	88.0%	100.0%

APPENDIX 3: BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, S, Edmonds, S and Lee, B (2001)
Continuing Professional Development: LEA and School Support for Teachers
National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Cordingley, P (2003).
'Research and Evidence-Based Practice: Focusing on Practice and Practitioners' in Anderson, L and Bennett, N. Developing Educational Leadership'
Sage Publications.
- Egan, D and James, R (2002).
An Evaluation for the General Teaching Council for Wales of the Professional Development Pilot Projects 2001-2002.
General Teaching Council for Wales.
- Egan, D and James, R (2003).
Final Report of the Evaluation of the General Teaching Council for Wales Phase 2 Professional Development Pilot Projects 2002/2003.
General Teaching Council for Wales.
- Egan, D and Simmonds, C (2002).
Continuing Professional Development in Selected Professions in the UK and in the Teaching Profession in Selected Countries. General Teaching Council for Wales.
- Evidence for Policy and Practice Information (EPPI) and Co-ordinating Centre (2003).
The Impact of Collaborative CPD on Classroom Teaching and Learning.
University of London.
- Friedman, A, Davis, K and Philips, M (2001).
Continuing Professional Development in the UK: Attitudes and Experiences of Practitioners.
Professional Associations Research Network, University of Bristol.
- Harland, J and Kidner, K (1997).
'Teachers' Continuing Professional Development: framing a model of outcomes';
British Journal of In-Service Education, 23,1.
- McNamara, O (2002).
Becoming An Evidence-Based Practitioner.
Routledge Falmer.
- Office for Standards in Education (2002).
Continuing Professional Development in Schools.
OFSTED