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Developing a CPD framework for PPD Impact: The Southwest ESCalate project

Abstract

The Training and Development Agency (TDA) for schools in England introduced a new funding scheme for qualified teachers called Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD), which is made competitively available through Higher Education (HE) accredited partnerships. As a condition of funding for this PPD scheme the TDA requires all HE providers/partnerships in England to produce an annual report on Impact-related field evidences drawn from teachers’ practice in schools linked to the PPD programme of accredited CPD. Impact is currently a widely debated and contentious term that is understood to relate to diverse evidences of school improvement such as pupil learning, teacher quality and institutional gains etc.

Impact evidence case studies and their framework methodology and reporting instruments will be compared and contrasted across several partnership universities operating in the southwest of England funded through an ESCalate development grant. The project aims to build upon and develop a framework model for impact related to the research outcomes from accredited PPD activity. The conceptual framework developed in Harland and Kinder’s (1997) seminal work on CPD outcomes is linked to the Soulsby and Swain (TDA, 2003) report on accredited CPD to the TDA. This literature along with the southwest’s diverse approaches to evaluating and reporting CPD impact is considered in terms of how this might inform the future development of PPD Impact methodology.

This integration of postgraduate in-service training opportunities with practice based, impact-led teacher research evidence will be of interest to both UK and international colleagues and government agencies working in the area of professional development.
The need for CPD Impact Evidences

In 2005 the Training and Development Agency (TDA) for schools in England launched a new Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) programme in order to fund English Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to provide Master’s (M) level CPD courses for qualified teachers residing in England. However, this PPD funding came with significant strings attached! In order to bid for PPD funding each HEI CPD provider has to satisfy seven TDA major funding criteria that steers both the academic and vocational instructional design and delivery of such CPD programmes. These seven PPD funding criteria may be summarised as indicated in Table 1 with the identified implications for HEI providers of accredited CPD. The TDA also states HEI contractual terms as follows:

*It is a condition of funding that operational data for funded programmes and a summary impact report be passed to the TDA at the end of each academic year.*

*In submitting this application the lead applicant agrees that, should the application be successful, they will be responsible for submitting operational data and an impact evaluation report annually to the TDA.*

Various financial penalties exist if any of these contractual funding terms or specified enrolment and completion targets is not met by HEI providers.

A key requirement of the seven criteria for PPD funding is that each of the institutions running courses subsidized\(^1\) by this programme would be required to submit an annual report evaluating the impact of HEI accredited CPD provision on the programmes participants are engaged within as well as the effects on the pupils and the schools in which they teach. This *impact evaluation* reporting requirement is still required in the 2008-11 criterion for PPD funding for those HEI’s who intend to apply for an allocation of places for the next triennial bidding round. Thus, the funding requirement of criterion 2 outlined in Table 1 has major resource implications for HEIs, because these Impact evidences need to be obtained and quality assured as part of both the vocational and academic design and delivery of their accredited CPD programmes that are only partly funded through the TDA’s PPD scheme.

\(^1\) At the time of print (November 2007) this funding was only £1,380 per full-time annual equivalent (FTE) enrolment, or roughly about just over a third of the true economic costing for delivering traditional on-campus provision at most universities in England, i.e. not work-based in schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PPD Funding Criteria</th>
<th>Associated TDA Questions</th>
<th>Implications for HEI Accredited CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Applications should make clear how provision will have as its main objective the improvement of children and young people's outcomes through the improvement of participants' attributes, knowledge, understanding and skills.</td>
<td>1.1 How will provision improve the attributes, knowledge, understanding and skills of participants? 1.2 1.2 How will the provision contribute to the improvement of children and young people's outcomes? 1.3 1.3 How will the provision help to embed improved practice in schools?</td>
<td>CPD accredited programmes need to be designed so as to enable direct professional learning improvement of participants and indirectly their own caseloads of learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Applications should make clear how the impact of the provision on children and young people and on participants will be evaluated and how it will be subject to rigorous internal and external quality assurance.</td>
<td>2.1 How will you evaluate the impact of this programme on participants, children and young people? 2.2 How will considerations of impact underpin the provision? 2.3 Please explain the internal and external mechanisms that will be used to quality assure this provision.</td>
<td>Impact evidences need to be obtained and quality assured as part of both the vocational and academic design and delivery of HEI CPD programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Applications should make clear how the provision will develop participants' research and problem-solving skills through the critical evaluation of evidence and research from a range of sources, including academic research and other data.</td>
<td>3.1 How will the provision develop participants' research methodology and problem solving skills? 3.2 How will the provision ensure that a critical engagement with, and evaluation of, a range of sources underpins the participants’ study? Please include examples of the range of evidence/research with which participants will engage. 3.3 How will participants be supported and encouraged to disseminate the outcomes of their study?</td>
<td>This implies a link-up between master’s level academic criteria and the embedding of critical professional development research skills as a means of enabling real-life professional learning evidences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Applications should make clear a. How the needs of schools and their workforce in the region(s) where the provision will be offered have been identified in partnership. b. How ongoing review and development of the provision and the continued involvement of stakeholders is ensured.</td>
<td>4.1 How have you identified the needs (including numbers) for the provision? Please give details of all sources, including the nature of the contribution of individual partners, schools and stakeholders. 4.2 How have partners, schools and other stakeholders been involved in planning to address these needs? Please give details of the nature of their contributions. 4.3 How will partners, schools and other stakeholders continue to be involved in planning, reviewing and developing the provision in order to meet existing, emerging and future needs?</td>
<td>The HEI CPD programme needs to be oriented around the concept of a field delivery partnership with accredited CPD activity taking place with the locus of the community of schools via validated field work experience from local stakeholder needs analysis etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cont. ..//..
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PPD Funding Criteria</th>
<th>Associated TDA Questions</th>
<th>Implications for HEI Accredited CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Applications should make clear how barriers to participation in postgraduate professional development have been identified and how the provision will address these barriers in order to improve access.</td>
<td>5.1 How have barriers to participation in your provision been identified (please include examples of the types of barrier as well as any information on whom you have consulted to identify barriers as appropriate)?&lt;br&gt;5.2 How will your provision address these barriers to participation in order to improve access?&lt;br&gt;5.3 How will you ensure that barriers to participation continue to be identified and addressed over the three years of the funding round?</td>
<td>Barriers include not only academic qualifications and traditional issues of access onto accredited HEI postgraduate CPD programmes, but also the negative perceptions of academia by some teachers as identified in Soulsby &amp; Swain’s (2003) TDA (formerly TTA) report on accredited CPD provision. Other participant barriers include funding issues, time-management, physical location, relevance etc. This implies that HEI CPD provision needs to take into account the major adult education issues that normal school teachers face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Applications should make clear how provision will lead to recognised qualifications at M Level or above and will relate to professional standards and, where appropriate, other national and local initiatives.</td>
<td>6.1 Explain how the structures of your provision allow for an award at M-level or above. Give details (where appropriate) of any pathways through interim awards – i.e. postgraduate certificate, postgraduate diploma, full masters.&lt;br&gt;6.2 Explain how provision for participants will relate to the Professional Standards for Teachers.&lt;br&gt;6.3 What scope is there within the proposed provision to make links to other national and local initiatives? Include details of existing links where appropriate.</td>
<td>This ties the design of HEI CPD provision into the TDA national agenda of teachers’ professional standards and major national initiatives such as the Every Child Matters agenda and the introduction of Secondary Diplomas, NCSL etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The application will show how provision delivers postgraduate professional development which meets priority areas identified by the TDA. Please note that you only need to answer both questions if you intend to address national AND school/local priorities (as indicated in part 2 of the application).</td>
<td>7.1 Explain how the proposed provision will address those national priorities that you have selected in part 2 of the application.&lt;br&gt;7.2 Describe the structures and processes that will enable you to identify and address school and/or local priorities.</td>
<td>Requires HEI CPD providers to benchmark academic provision against identified TDA PPD priority areas, e.g. SEN/inclusion and specific subject areas such as ICT, science etc. and how these may fit into other local priorities that also need to be identified and declared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The TDA’s PPD funding criteria for the triennial bid 2008 – 2011 and implications for HEI CPD providers
The TDA does, however, give guidance to support the writing of applicant’s responses to this impact evaluation criterion. The TDA guidance states that:

‘The TDA understands that PPD can have a positive impact in a variety of ways. This can include impact on values and attitudes, self-confidence and motivation, knowledge, performance, risk-taking and on a participant’s ability to reflect. These are all valid examples of impact. The TDA does expect, however, that providers will relate such areas of impact to tangible improvements in professional practice which make an observable difference to children and young people’s outcomes.’ (TDA (2007b), PPD Application Form, Guidance, Criterion 2).

The TDA clarifies upon what is meant by ‘children and young people’s outcomes’ by reference and linkage to the five outcome targets of the Every Child Matters national policy initiative for children’s services in general as expressed in the UK government’s Children Act of 2004 (DfES, 2004).

These five governmental target outcomes relate to:

✓ Physical and mental health and well-being
✓ Protection from harm and neglect
✓ Education, training and recreation
✓ The contribution made by them to society
✓ Social and economic well-being

The guidance goes on to explain that ‘attainment and performance is key, but the TDA is interested in impact in relation to all the outcomes above’. In making the above statement it appears that the TDA accepts that impact can be obtained across a wide range of sources and that both qualitative and quantitative data are valid as diverse evidence of impact, however, there is still much debate in the sector as to what actually constitutes impact as well as to how impact data can be gathered and measured (Coombs, Lewis & Denning, 2007).

The issue of assessing the impact of professional development programmes in schools is multidimensional and, despite much discussion within the sector over recent decades, this issue still proves to be highly problematic. A number of authors e.g,
Flecknoe (2000 & 2003), Lee & Glover (1995), have noted the difficulties of measuring the impact of professional development. Various typologies have been proposed by Joyce & Showers (1980), Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) and Harland and Kinder (1997) to try to frame the effects of professional development and therefore build some definition of impact in relation to the continuing professional development (CPD) of the teaching profession.

Consequently, CPD programme related impact was defined by Coombs and Denning (2005) as such:

- That impact means an improvement in learning for the learner.
- That the learners include all the social players and stakeholders engaged in the learning process.
- That we have identified the learners as being pupils/students, teachers and their peers, school leaders and the wider workforce including parents and governors.
- That impact embodies the concept of school improvement within a learning organisation.

This paper outlines the various attempts to resolve the issue of appropriate impact research methodology through a unique project conducted by the UK’s South West Regional Group for Professional Development (SWRGPD). The SWRGPD obtained a small ESCalate development grant in 2007 as part of a small-scale funded project whose aim is to begin to develop a systematic approach towards the gathering of impact field research data across the South West region of England and consider an appropriate range of methodologies and data collection processes.

**The ESCalate South West Impact Project**

In January 2007 the SWRGPD began an ESCalate funded project entitled: ‘Developing a systematic approach towards impact field research’. The project has three key objectives and outcomes:

1. To develop a framework model for impact related research outcomes from accredited PPD activity, building upon the framework developed in
Harland and Kinder's (1997) seminal work. This work will also be linked to Soulsby and Swain's (TDA, 2003) report on accredited CPD to the TDA (formerly TTA) as well as other sources such as recent Ofsted (2004) reports [HMI 1765] on school improvement-led CPD and Robinson & Sebba's report on defining the PPD framework to the TDA (TDA, 2005). We intend to disseminate any significant project findings via the UCET SIG on Impact, using diverse examples of best practice drawn from across members of the SWRGPD.

2. Through the coordination and identification of the rich diversity of approaches towards developing impact-led educational field research that will be informed by EPPI reviews (Cordingley et al, 2005) and Ofsted (2005) surveys on Impact and the relationship to developing the school's self-evaluation form (Coombs & Denning, 2005). Impact on school leadership will also be investigated, informed by such works as Reeves et al (2003) and linked to CPD NCSL initiatives in partnership with the Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE), such as networked research (http://www.ncsl.org.uk/networked/networked-research.cfm). We intend to also contribute and develop a systematic approach and set of standard research instruments to holistically define impact that can be adopted nationally through UCET and also disseminated by ESCalate.

3. As part of this research project, the SWRGPD will evaluate the various techniques and approaches towards obtaining impact led field research from the teaching profession. Thus, tools, techniques and various field case studies exemplifying impact evidence will be collected and reviewed across the SWRGPD PPD partnerships. The intention is to achieve this objective over the next year in conjunction with a key milestone focus upon reviewing and interpreting SWRGPD members' annual TDA impact returns for November 2006.

This research agenda involved an analysis of the first PPD annual impact evaluation reports provided by each of the South West HEIs funded by the TDA through the PPD
programme in the 2005/6 academic year. These were disseminated and shared through the SWRGPD network.

The overall evaluation research process for this project involved three distinct stages. Firstly, provider reports from each of the institutions in the SWRGPD funded by the PPD programme were benchmarked against the TDAs (2007a) ‘Summary report of national responses’ produced in March 2007. The aim of this analysis was to identify areas of best practice within the region and to identify items from the national analysis which needed to be addressed within the region.

The second stage of the evaluation looked at the Harland and Kinder (1997) framework for assessment of impact and benchmarked each of the provider reports against this model to once again assess those areas of best practice that could be utilized in the third phase of the evaluation, which would be to develop a framework of tools which could be used to gather impact data about the PPD programme at both a regional and national level. From this background research of CPD literature the project developed the following framework model illustrated in figure (1) for CPD that relates CPD programme outcomes to various orders of pedagogical impact linked essentially to participant change of practice (Coombs, Lewis & Denning, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing level of Impact</th>
<th>CPD Order</th>
<th>CPD outcome types linked to Impact as Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Order</td>
<td>Provisionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Order</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Order</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Congruence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various HEI provider reports were compared for their diversity of impact evaluation processes and compared and contrasted. This led to a project interim report in June 2007 that disseminated a table of provider practices against various sources of impact as identified from the provider PPD annual impact evaluation reports from November.
2006. This findings table has been extended (see Table 2) to includes a qualitative analysis of identifying and articulating various categories of impact evaluation such that a ‘toolkit’ of various CPD methodologies and practices can be identified from which to design and embed impact evidence into provider PPD programmes.

Currently, the evaluation is moving into its third and final phase that involves dissemination of the findings and articulating any new framework that connects impact evaluation research methodology to CPD programme design. The initial stages of this evaluation project have identified a variety of diverse and enterprising ways, both locally and nationally, in which the impact of PPD on participants is being measured and evaluated by HEI providers.

Comparing Impact Evidences across Southwest Providers of Postgraduate Professional Development – Initial Findings

The ESCalate impact research project has produced significant findings across 4 key PPD provider partnerships that are comprehensively mapped in Table 2. These findings suggest a number of interesting ideas towards a better understanding of the concept of CPD impact. Firstly, we have identified in Table 2 a whole new variety of impact evidence modes, covering categories such as: Formative Impact; Summative Impact; Impact for Learning; Partner Impact; Learner Impact; Provider Impact; Latent Impact; Organisational Impact; and, Impact Knowledge Transfer. Secondly, underpinning the ability to deliver and record these impact baseline evidence types is the necessary provider support infrastructure that represents the Impact QA academic support systems that need to be put in place.

A key finding from Table 2 is the CPD concept of a taxonomy that classifies diverse impact evidence base types, e.g. Impact for Learning and links to summative and formative impact evidence. Following on from this is the distinctive concept and ontological assumptions connected to formative versus summative impact evidence and how this connects to the design and implementation of diverse CPD activities. Thus, formative impact suggests a relationship between self evaluation CPD processes and a new Impact-for-Learning agenda, which sees impact as a pro-active CPD force.
for change and therefore dynamically built into the instructional design of HEI CPD activity.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

What the project has not yet managed to clarify is how, within all the constraints, objective, reliable and valid evidence of positive impacts on children’s and young people’s outcomes can be systematically revealed. The reactions of learners to changed practices (using ‘pupil voice’ and ‘participant voice’) is one vehicle for collecting impact evidence that providers are already using. It would be valuable to know more about the specific mechanisms being deployed for this kind of research, and to move towards more systematic ways in which it is done, through, for example, learner-centred questionnaires or interviews that are based on rigorous research in this field such as that by McCombs and Whisler (1997). If a key imperative of TDA PPD is observable outcomes among learners, it is recommended that the TDA should commission work in this area that then helps all providers to develop transparent procedures they can usefully apply to their programmes. One approach might be the adoption by all providers of standardised ways of eliciting this data from learners using an agreed impact protocol that would achieve this goal. Such a protocol would also assist in determining the relative effectiveness of different PPD programmes.

In addition to pupil voice, however ‘heard’, there is of course the use of assessment data in establishing the nature and extent of impacts on learners’ outcomes. Unfortunately, this approach can be particularly problematic. Practice oriented professional development is, by definition, concerned with change, (though it may also be concerned with adaptation or consolidation, or with extension of existing practice), so that the effects of change (or adaptation or extension) need to be assessed or evaluated against what might have been the case without change. A positivist approach to research suggests the need for control groups in order to identify the specific effects attributable to change. But such an approach encounters profound methodological, ethical and moral factors that also need to be considered. These include issues such as pupils’ equity of entitlement and the variables of practitioners’ (PPD participants’) individual differences.
Table 3: A Taxonomy of Impact Evaluation Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Evidence Mode</th>
<th>Research Instruments</th>
<th>Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative Impact</td>
<td>Real-life assessment tools such as school leadership documents (SIPs/SDPs) and self evaluation forms (SEFs) for Ofsted (2005) and performance management.</td>
<td>Impact as real-life formative assessment or impact as organizational situated learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact-for-Learning</td>
<td>Evidence drawn from CPD assignments and projects where impact is related to on-the-job change.</td>
<td>Action research and enquiry through content-free modules enable this kind of CPD activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Impact</td>
<td>Usually related to end-of-module evaluation instruments/forms and interviews.</td>
<td>Impact is assumed as an outcome product rather than as an integrative process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Impact</td>
<td>Student voice captured through observations, interviews and other forms of survey as well as CPD developed new learning products.</td>
<td>Assumes a real-time CPD activity is taking place within the classroom and can gain on-the-job evidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Impact</td>
<td>Interview of key stakeholders from partnership school.</td>
<td>Case study approach towards field evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Impact</td>
<td>Bespoke feedback of PPD programme through partnership team meetings etc.</td>
<td>In-house evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Impact</td>
<td>Follow-up interviews, focus groups and surveys of former PPD participants.</td>
<td>Develops a system for collecting longitudinal impact evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Impact</td>
<td>Tailored content-free CPD projects carried out within the school as learning organization.</td>
<td>Action research/enquiry for institutional change. Useful for middle and senior leadership CPD projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>Dissemination of a variety of impact evidence.</td>
<td>Second-order impact benefits achieved by wider dissemination in the public domain of best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Profession Impact</td>
<td>Impact evidence that glean evidence of impact PPD completion/engagement upon teacher retention.</td>
<td>Influences and informs TDA policy for retention, recruitment and promotion of teachers linked to CPD PPD activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact QA Support</td>
<td>Investing PPD funds on strategic personnel to support Impact QA requirements</td>
<td>The idea that each provider needs a dedicated impact evaluation researcher as a key team member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, it is recommended that a more interpretivist research paradigm is adopted that concentrates on local school improvement projects, qualitative data and takes into account local human ethics and encourages/validates a more participative/inclusive
approach to CPD activity within educational situations. Such an approach doesn’t try to avoid the positivist interpretation of the Hawthorne Effect, but indeed celebrates it as teacher empowerment to effect local educational change and improvement to teaching and learning (Coombs & Smith, 2003). The project findings suggest a new taxonomy of classifying different types of impact evidence and also suggest a diverse range of CPD research methodologies and approaches, i.e. the notion of a CPD toolkit from which to develop impact evidence as a form of integrative practice (Coombs & Harris, 2006), which has been summarized in Table 3. The key CPD policy recommendations from this project are as follows:

1. That the whole issue of the role that learner assessment data might play in evaluating PPD impact is fully examined.
2. That the efficacy of the assessment of the five outcomes as defined by the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda needs to be much more fully understood than it is at present.
3. That there is a full professional and academic discussion about any movement towards direct linkage of PPD to the assessment of the ECM outcomes and what research paradigms are commensurate toward evaluating CPD impact.
4. That the TDA conceptual framework for evaluating impact shifts to accommodate the wider benefits and methodologies suggested in the higher-order taxonomy provided in Table 3.

It is hoped that this paper has made a useful contribution to the conceptual thinking and framework assumptions underpinning teacher quality and accredited continuing professional development and how this relates to improved practice through a better understanding of impact and how providers can both engineer and evaluate it. And that this project’s findings will assist in the future evolution and informed design rationale of the TDA’s PPD programme for the benefit of all ‘learners’ working within Children’s Services and the school system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Impact Evidences</th>
<th>TDA report</th>
<th>Provider 1</th>
<th>Provider 2</th>
<th>Provider 3</th>
<th>Provider 4</th>
<th>Impact CPD Toolkit Implications &amp; Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs analysis (SIP's and LA targets)</td>
<td>Small number of providers: ‘seek to identify the potential impact of PPD provision from its inception and therefore had access to more diverse and rich sources of evidence, e.g., through explicit links with performance management or SIP targets’</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are negotiated for each module. Questionnaires ask teachers directly whether the module had enabled them to achieve the learning outcomes</td>
<td>MA students assignments relate to LA priorities and assignments to SIP’s Teachers provide evidence of relationship of study to PM targets</td>
<td>Many schools have integrated the PPD programme with the school development plan and self evaluation processes</td>
<td>Benefits of a needs analysis process have been highlighted both by module participants and published literature</td>
<td>Formative Impact – Impact as real-life formative assessment, or, impact as organizational situated learning. This is where impact has been built into CPD processes such as SIPs/SDPs and a school-based needs analysis links individual teachers’ CPD work to the Self Evaluation Form (SEF) required for Ofsted. Thus, impact is engineered through CPD activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments, including presentations, directed tasks and dissertation modules</td>
<td>Most providers: ‘scrutiny of participants’ assignments’</td>
<td>Provide evidence as to how provision has enhanced the knowledge, understanding and practice of new teachers including the research and reflective skills required for action enquiry.</td>
<td>Oral presentations including the requirement for evidence of impact on professional practice used. Directed tasks include the impact of suggested interventions or strategies on pupil learning experiences</td>
<td>Assignment submission sheets and assessment and feedback sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact for Learning – Evidence of impact related to on-the-job CPD provision, i.e. impact as an instructional design remit built into assignment assessment tasks. Thus, an assessment for learning pedagogy is motivated through impact for learning CPD tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact statements</td>
<td>As part of the assessed outcome students are required to complete an impact statement</td>
<td>Teachers and school impact reports</td>
<td>Completed at the end of each PPD activity</td>
<td>Summative Impact – standard end of activity reporting. This ontological default assumption of impact is also exhibited through the current TDA impact reporting template.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of module evaluations by students</strong></td>
<td>'Most providers: 'look for evidence of impact through end of module questionnaires' 'including questions about the anticipated benefits from the PPD to teaching and pupils learning; one also included questions about obstacles'</td>
<td>✓ Mid-term and summative student evaluations</td>
<td>✓ Students are required to provide evidence of the ways in which the programme has enhanced their ability to enrich the pupil experience. Students are also required to complete an impact evidence form at the end of each module.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ Summative Impact – this time through tutor evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of module evaluations by tutors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from local authorities</td>
<td>Most providers: 'consultation with stakeholders' Some providers: 'extend post PPD interviews to a sample of the participants line managers' A couple 'included the requirement that a line manager should countersign each teacher's proposal for a school-based project'</td>
<td>Feedback from local head teachers, LA reps. Involvement of local teachers and head teachers in teaching on the PPD programme</td>
<td>LA reps are asked to provide feedback via questionnaires. Rep’s also attend termly meetings</td>
<td>This data is gathered on an informal basis by discussion with key personnel</td>
<td>Partner Impact – e.g. through Local Authority partners via interview gathering data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from key personnel in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>HT’s of students currently on the programme are asked for impact evidence. Key teachers in partnership schools are asked for impact evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner Impact – interview of key players from partnership schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil voice</td>
<td>Some providers: 'indications of a growing interest in seeking evidence of impact through pupil voice'</td>
<td>Specific projects relate to pupil voice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>One project has investigated the use of pupil voice</td>
<td>Learner Impact – pupil voice evidence gained from sources such as interviews and pupil written work as CPD pedagogical outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Case Studies</td>
<td>Schools that have large numbers of PPD participants are invited to contribute to case study research to identify impact: these aim to assist schools in improvement targets as well as yielding evidence of impact'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Via LA marketing and tutor dissemination in relevant publications</td>
<td>Partner Impact – large case study evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent assessment following the end of the course</td>
<td>Some providers: ‘some say that they already used or plan to use further questionnaires to participants, and sometimes to stakeholders to gather evidence of impact up to 6 months or more’ Some providers: ‘follow a sample of students with an interview to collect more detailed information about PPD’</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers and head teachers</td>
<td>Latent Impact – Obtained from deferred follow-up interviews of subsequent impact upon participant practice some time after completion of CPD activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPD Course Committee meetings</td>
<td>Several providers</td>
<td>All data is fed into the relevant committees to inform further development and improvement</td>
<td>Provider Impact – Participant feedback that leads to a change in provider CPD practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD planning as a central part of the design of the PPD programme</td>
<td>Increasing number: ‘incorporation of shell content-free modules that allow the provider to validate research/enquiry projects tailored to the specific needs and priorities of the participants school’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Impact – where tailored content-free CPD projects based upon organizational needs has delivered impact evidence in the form of institutional change via action research/enquiry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination events</td>
<td>Annual celebration evenings for MA completers allows for dissemination of good practice. Dissertation abstracts are also posted on LA websites</td>
<td>Attempts have been made to disseminate findings from pupil research although this needs to be investigated further.</td>
<td>Impact Knowledge Transfer – where impact evidences are disseminated to wider audiences thereby creating a second order effect of impact through such knowledge transfer and exchange.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seminar series</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Reports from students on research in schools and impact on pupil learning</td>
<td><strong>Impact Knowledge Transfer</strong> - Impact Evidence in the form of seminar reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific research into MA programmes</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Specific research projects have evaluated the impact of the MA programme</td>
<td><strong>Provider Impact</strong> – bespoke impact evaluation of the PPD accredited programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Published papers</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Evidence of impact on practice in published papers</td>
<td><strong>Impact Knowledge Transfer</strong> – published papers, reports and articles put into the public domain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External examiners reports</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>‘comment favourably on the quality of teaching, learning and assessment’</td>
<td><strong>Impact Knowledge Transfer</strong> – via HEI external examiner reports as part of the QA system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completion and retention rate statistics</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Evidence of completion and progression</td>
<td><strong>Impact on the Teaching Profession</strong> – evidence relating to effects upon teacher completion vis-à-vis retention rates etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support from tutor's or research assistants funded by collaboration funds

Some providers have employed research assistants to gather evidence of impact.

Funds have been used to appoint a research officer.

Funds have been utilized to support a project manager to oversee the PPD programme.

Impact QA Academic Support Systems

Research assistants and CPD QA Project Managers that have helped to coordinate, collate and analyse provider impact evidence.

General Notes & Feedback

Please enter some thoughts and ideas for how a diverse and relevant CPD Impact Toolkit can be developed across providers.

1. Idea of a taxonomy of diverse Impact evidence base types, e.g. Impact for Learning and links to summative and formative impact evidence.
2. Relationship of Impact to lever CPD areas connected to teacher professional standards, self and institutional targets, ECM agenda etc.
3. CPD module design and rethinking consequent to feedback of impact field evidence.
4. Relationship between self evaluation CPD processes and a new Impact-for-Learning agenda, which sees impact as a pro-active CPD force for change.
5. A new concept of what and who are the ‘learners’ that impact evaluation might be designed to benefit.
6. Review and mapping of new TDA teacher standards relative to CPD policy and associated impact design criteria.
7. The idea of articulating Critical, Personal and Professional Development (CPPD) for PPD as distinct to other more uncritical vocational CPD tasks and agendas. Thus, CPPD as a means of engineering individual change management (ICM) within the workplace.
8. Idea of qualitative ‘voices’ as qualitative data evidence of impact, linked to discourses of practice.
9. The idea of developing a research tool for auditing and recording learner dispositions – Effective Learning Inventory etc.
10. Giving greater definition and research methodology to defining effective needs analysis of client learners, e.g. through better profiling
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