

# Evaluation of the Ipswich Opportunity Area Workforce Development Programme

Final report



# Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. The Workforce Development Programme.....	2
3. Evaluation methodology.....	5
4. Key findings .....	9
5. Summary and conclusions.....	21
Annex A: Staff Satisfaction Surveys.....	A-1

---

**Contact:**

**Maya Agur**

**Tel: 020 7391 4111**

**email: magur@sqw.co.uk**

**Approved by:**

**Marian Morris**

**Director**

**Date: 14/01/2021**

---

**Disclaimer**

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for, and should not be relied upon by, any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Whilst SQW has used reasonable care and skill throughout, it is unable to warrant either the accuracy or completeness of information supplied by the client or third parties, and it does not accept responsibility for any legal, commercial or other consequences that arise from its use.

---

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1** The Ipswich Opportunity Area Workforce Development Programme was launched in 2018 and has been running for three years, due to finish in 2021. The Programme provided funding to educational settings to access professional development and was intended to encourage networking, peer support, and the sharing of learning between educational settings in all phases in Ipswich. The Opportunity Area Programme worked with the Teacher Development Trust to support and enable settings to audit, evaluate and develop a tailored plan for their continuous professional development (CPD).
- 1.2** In 2019 the Ipswich Opportunity Area (IOA) Programme commissioned SQW to conduct an independent evaluation of the Workforce Development Programme. The aim of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the IOA process of supporting schools to identify teacher development needs and the provision of funding to support those needs was associated with improvements (or likely future improvements) in teacher satisfaction, teacher retention and educational outcomes.
- 1.3** The evaluation ran between April 2019 and December 2020, and included a series of qualitative interviews with a range of stakeholders (including the delivery partners and the Department for Education (DfE), detailed case-studies with a sample of schools and the design and delivery of two short online surveys (one for school leaders on the impact of COVID-19 and one for teaching staff on staff satisfaction). This report provides a summary of the findings from this evaluation. The structure of the subsequent sections of the report is as follows:
- Section 2: An overview of the Workforce Development Programme.
  - Section 3: A summary of the evaluation methodology, including the challenges faced and the mitigating measures implemented.
  - Section 4: A summary of the key findings from the evaluation, covering the outcomes of the Programme, what worked less well, the impact of COVID-19 and reflections and key learning.
  - Section 5: Conclusions from the evaluation findings and recommendations for the IOA for future implementation of similar interventions.
- 1.4** The findings from the Staff Satisfaction Survey is provided in Annex A, although due to the small number of respondents in the follow-up wave of the survey, we recommend reviewing the data from the survey as indicative and illustrative only.

## 2. The Workforce Development Programme

### Background and context

- 2.1** Ipswich was one of 12 areas in England designated as an Opportunity Area by the DfE in 2017 to tackle entrenched disadvantage<sup>1</sup> in education. As noted in the DfE Command Paper,<sup>2</sup> young people from disadvantaged backgrounds in Ipswich achieved poorer outcomes in education when compared with their counterparts across England. In addition, Ipswich was identified as one of the most concerning ‘cold spots’ in the Social Mobility Index<sup>3</sup>, offering little opportunity for young people to attain the education and skills they needed to achieve good outcomes as an adult. This issue was recognised in Ipswich’s City Deal<sup>4</sup>, which noted that low skill levels in the area was a barrier to wider economic growth.
- 2.2** Nationally, Opportunity Areas were given additional government funding as part of the social mobility agenda, totalling £72m over three years (2017-20). Funding was allocated to each Area to deliver a comprehensive package of locally tailored initiatives designed to fulfil young people’s potential through improving education, as envisioned in Ipswich’s plan.

**‘Our vision is for all young people in Ipswich to be happy, confident, ambitious, and flexible lifelong learners. We want to ensure that every young person in Ipswich can fulfil their potential and access the opportunities available to them, regardless of their background’.**

**Ipswich Opportunity Area**

- 2.3** The IOA aimed to deliver on their vision through four priorities<sup>5</sup>:
- **Priority 1:** Ensure all children in Ipswich are prepared to learn for life by developing key behaviours such as resilience and self-regulation.
  - **Priority 2:** Strengthen the teaching profession in Ipswich by providing world-class support and development.

<sup>1</sup> Department for Education (2017) Unlocking Talent, Fulfilling Potential: A plan for improving social mobility through education Online; Available: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/667690/Social\\_Mobility\\_Action\\_Plan\\_-\\_for\\_printing.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/667690/Social_Mobility_Action_Plan_-_for_printing.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Department for Education (2017) Social Mobility: Ipswich Opportunity Area 2017-20, A local plan to deliver opportunities for children and young people in Ipswich

<sup>3</sup> Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission (2016) The Social Mobility Index

<sup>4</sup> Greater Ipswich Councils (2013) Greater Ipswich City Deal

<sup>5</sup> Department for Education (2017) Social Mobility: Ipswich Opportunity Area 2017-20, A local plan to deliver opportunities for children and young people in Ipswich

- **Priority 3:** Improve attainment for disadvantaged pupils by embedding evidence-based practice in the teaching of English and maths.
- **Priority 4:** Inspire and equip young people with the skills and guidance they need to pursue an ambitious career pathway.

In 2019, the Government announced it was extending the Opportunity Area Programme for a further year, with an additional £18m of funding shared between the Opportunity Areas<sup>6</sup>.

## The Workforce Development Programme (IOA Priority 2)

- 2.4** The local Opportunity Area's delivery plan<sup>7</sup> outlined the need for an improved focus on strengthening the teaching profession in Ipswich. It stated that education providers in Ipswich struggled to recruit and retain high quality staff, while colleges noted additional challenges in recruiting and retaining high quality subject leaders, particularly in English and STEM subjects. In addition, the plan reported that teacher vacancy rates were higher than the national average, particularly in secondary schools.
- 2.5** The Opportunity Area therefore aimed to provide '*world-class support and development opportunities*' for teachers in Ipswich, including high quality career and professional development (Priority 2 of the delivery plan). Developing the workforce through CPD has long been seen as central to school improvement and pupil outcomes, requiring senior leadership support, dedicated time, and the chance for teachers to become reflective practitioners, with access to expert support and opportunities to collaborate with peers. Teachers face substantial barriers to accessing high quality CPD, however, including capacity (given timetable and other commitments), the perceived quality of existing training and the costs associated with training<sup>8</sup>.
- 2.6** The IOA aspired to address these challenges by establishing the Workforce Development Programme. The Workforce Development Programme aimed to ensure every educational professional in Ipswich could access high quality CPD so that:
- they could become more skilled practitioners (leading to improved outcomes for pupils, measured through progress and attainment)
  - they would be able to lead fulfilling careers within Ipswich
  - Ipswich would be seen as a destination of teaching excellence and a place where education professionals are valued and developed<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Department for Education (2019) £18m extension to Opportunity Area Programme. *Article*

<sup>7</sup> Department for Education (2017) Social Mobility: Ipswich Opportunity Area 2017-20, A local plan to deliver opportunities for children and young people in Ipswich

<sup>8</sup> Department for Education (2015) A world-class teaching profession: Government consultation response

<sup>9</sup> Ipswich Opportunity Area (2018) Summer Term Newsletter: Edition 2

## Programme delivery

- 2.7** The Programme was originally planned to run for two years (between 2018 and 20), though following the restrictions imposed by the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in 2020, was extended to a third year to run until the end of the 2020-21 academic year. Through the Programme, around £1.15m was allocated in workforce development grants to support individual education settings across Ipswich to develop bespoke development plans tailored to their own needs and requirements. To deliver the Programme, the Opportunity Area partnered with the Teacher Development Trust (TDT)<sup>10</sup>. The TDT supported each setting (schools and colleges) to audit the development needs of their staff. The audit included a digital survey of staff and a more intensive CPD audit visit, which included feedback from interviews with staff. Following the audit, TDT supported each setting to develop a CPD plan which met the needs of their staff.
- 2.8** To enable settings to carry out their workforce development plans, each setting was allocated £1,000 per FTE teacher from the Opportunity Area. This was augmented with additional support facilitated by the Opportunity Area and TDT. Engagement events were largely delivered through joint sessions led by the TDT and provided the opportunity for settings to network, access peer support and share robust research evidence of effective CPD. The TDT also offered additional one-to-one support to 18 schools, who were nominated by the Opportunity Area after being identified as schools that would benefit from additional support.
- 2.9** Overall, 43 schools in Ipswich applied for and were supported through the Workforce Development Programme.

## CPD activity

- 2.10** According to the ‘Training Needs Analysis Evidence Forms’ completed by all 43 settings involved in the Programme, identified CPD needs included **subject-specific needs** (particularly around maths, reading and oracy), **making use of evidence-based research** and experts/external providers, and **leadership development** (including senior and middle leaders, and providing more leadership opportunities for other staff members).
- 2.11** In response to these gaps, the CPD that settings planned to undertake was diverse. Plans ranged from training for specific subjects, through to general pedagogy, wellbeing, career development and leadership-focused and procedural CPD. Most commonly, settings opted for pedagogical training, with a particular focus on core subjects such as maths and English, alongside emerging pedagogical practices and modern learning approaches. The CPD methods often involved coaching, peer review and visits to other practitioners using a range of new pedagogical approaches.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://tdtrust.org/>

## 3. Evaluation methodology

- 3.1** SQW was commissioned by the IOA to conduct an independent evaluation of the Workforce Development Programme from April 2019 to December 2020. The aim of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the process of supporting schools to identify teacher development needs and the provision of funding to support those needs was associated with improvements (or likely future improvements) in teacher satisfaction, teacher retention and educational outcomes.

### Evaluation approach and activities delivered

- 3.2** SQW's approach to this evaluation involved two main phases of work, an **inception and scoping phase** to agree the parameters of the work and obtain a greater understanding of the intervention and school support plans, and a **primary data collection phase** to gain insights into the support activities that took place and gain feedback from the Programme recipients about the effect it had on teaching standards and job satisfaction. The activities delivered by the evaluation included the following:

#### Inception and scoping phase

- 3.3** This phase was delivered between April and October 2019 and included the following activities:
- An inception meeting in April 2019, which included agreements on some adaptations to the scope of the evaluation plan (more details below).
  - Scoping interviews with four key stakeholders in the Programme management and delivery teams (managers at the TDT, Experts Advisers and the Programme Lead at DfE) to better understand the background and structure of the support, the schools' networks, and how they worked together.
  - Attendance at the final event run by TDT for participating schools and colleges, which was used as an opportunity to introduce the evaluation, conduct informal discussions with school leaders and observe the meeting.
  - A review of all 43 participating schools' and colleges' CPD audit forms and plans, to gain an understanding of the areas of development schools identified, how these areas were identified, and what CPD activities schools had requested.

#### Primary data collection phase

- 3.4** Primary data collection was carried out between June 2019 and December 2020 and included the following tasks:

- **‘Exploratory’ telephone interviews** (December 2019-January 2020) with senior leadership in 14 schools and colleges (all 43 participating settings were invited to take part, and 14 consented to be interviewed at this stage) to inform and clarify the research questions identified during the document review and to help identify school typologies to build a sampling frame for the case studies.
- **Detailed case studies** (June-November 2020) with a sample of 11 settings (6 Primary Schools, 2 Secondary Schools, 2 Colleges and 1 Additional Provision setting – 14 settings were invited to be included in the research as a case study and 11 consented). This phase included detailed telephone interviews with the strategic lead (24 leads; June 2020) followed by a series of interviews with teaching staff in the schools and colleges (21 staff; October-November 2020).
- Design and delivery of an online **Staff Satisfaction Survey**, with a baseline (June-July 2019) and follow up wave (November-December 2020).
- Design and delivery of a short **COVID-19 online survey** to schools’ and colleges’ leads to ask about the impact of the pandemic on their ability to deliver their CPD plans (November-December 2020).

## Challenges and mitigating actions

**3.5** Throughout the course of the evaluation the workplan and activities were revised in response to changes in local circumstances, the availability of data, and restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The revisions included some **changes to the scope** of the evaluation:

- The original project specification from the Opportunity Area referenced a teacher satisfaction survey and SQW planned to deliver a follow-up survey to assess the extent of change over the Programme. At the inception meeting it became clear that this had not been undertaken before the evaluation commenced. As a result, SQW agreed to develop a survey tool and deliver two waves of an online survey; a proxy baseline (since some institutions had completed their audits before the evaluation began) and follow-up survey. Details on this survey and findings from its analysis are provided in Annex A.
- The original Invitation to Tender specified cost-benefit analysis as one of the objectives for the evaluation. The lack of a comparison group to provide a true counterfactual<sup>11</sup>, as well as the proposed timescale of the evaluation, meant that conducting cost-benefit analysis using common agreed outcomes was not possible and it was agreed at the inception meeting that this element would be out of scope for the evaluation.
- The original workplan included two rounds of primary data collection (the first in September-December 2019 and the second in March-June 2020) including detailed case-

---

<sup>11</sup> The lack of a pre-existing staff survey and other contextual and operational information meant there was no clear comparative data from participating schools from which to construct an historical counterfactual, which could have been an alternative approach.



study visits in settings, followed by telephone interviews with leads in the remaining schools (those not participating as a case-study school). After completing the document review task in the scoping phase in August/September 2019, however, it became clear that there was insufficient information in the completed audits to address the main research questions. Additional information was needed from the schools in order to fully understand their CPD culture and requirements, as well as how they had identified the activities they had requested, before the planned primary data collection phase for the evaluation could be undertaken. It was agreed, therefore, to add in a series of detailed exploratory telephone interviews with senior leads in each of the participating settings, to inform subsequent case studies and telephone interviews. These exploratory interviews took place in December 2019-January 2020, while the primary data collection phase was conducted between April and November 2020).

**3.6** Due to the restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, further revisions had to be made to the workplan to accommodate the national lockdown and school closures. This was detailed in a forward-looking contingency plan prepared by SQW in February 2020. The following revisions were agreed in April 2020:

- The Programme evaluation was **extended until December 2020**, to allow schools another term to deliver CPD sessions and the SQW team a chance to visit schools in Autumn 2020.
- The **case study work was split into two stages**, one in Spring 2020, involving 'strategic' telephone interviews with senior leaders and/or development leads (where possible) to capture information and evidence on schools' activities so far, and the second in Autumn 2020 involving school visits (if possible) to interview teaching staff and observe CPD sessions and/or meetings (where appropriate).
- **The administration of the follow-up Staff Satisfaction Survey was postponed** to November 2020, to allow schools another term to deliver CPD sessions.
- **A 'COVID-19' online survey**, to be administered to senior leadership at all schools in November 2020, was added to gain an understanding of how COVID-19 had affected CPD delivery in schools.

**3.7** In Autumn 2020, due to the continuation of the pandemic and related restrictions, it was agreed that SQW would not visit schools in-person to conduct the final stage of the case study research. Instead, schools were asked to connect SQW with members of staff who had participated in activities funded by the Workforce Development Programme, in order to conduct online/telephone interviews and/or focus groups. It was also agreed that SQW would not reach out to *all schools* to ask for participation in 'confirmatory interviews' (to avoid placing an undue burden on schools who were already responding to the pandemic) and instead would focus on schools that had participated in the evaluation to that point. SQW did, however, include an option in the COVID-19 survey for respondents to provide their contact

details if they would like to be included in the interview phase of the evaluation (one further school was subsequently interviewed having provided their details in December 2020).

## Analysis

- 3.8** The outputs from the various evaluation activities were analysed and synthesised thematically. Alongside the textual analyses conducted at the end of each phase, the SQW team undertook team 'de-briefs' throughout the evaluation to discuss and synthesise findings from each phase and discuss emerging findings with the IOA Programme Manager. A final de-brief was held in December 2020 to discuss the final stage of qualitative research, the findings from the case studies, and the findings from the online surveys. The team identified common themes across the participating settings, highlighting the achievements of the Programme, the outcomes the Programme helped to promote, what worked well (and not so well) and recommendations for the future. These findings are discussed in sections 4 and 5 below.

## 4. Key findings

- 4.1** This section provides a summary of the findings from the interviews with the key Programme stakeholders (including a DfE representative and the TDT), the exploratory interviews with senior leaders and staff in the schools (including case-study schools), the online Staff Satisfaction Survey and the online COVID-19 survey. It covers findings relating to what the Programme achieved, the challenges that the schools faced and how they overcame them, and an overview of the impact of COVID-19 on the CPD programmes in the settings. It concludes with a summary of reflections and key learning from the Programme.

### Understanding the context

- 4.2** Ipswich was identified as an Opportunity Area in 2017 and was characterised as having **low levels of educational attainment** outcomes for young people from **disadvantaged backgrounds**, a high proportion of pupils who started school with **lower than expected skills** (typically around speech and language) or the behaviours needed for learning, and, historically, a **lack of a culture of collaboration** amongst schools and colleges in the town. **Low staff retention and motivation** were also identified as a local issue, though the findings from the SQW 2019 school and college Staff Satisfaction Survey suggested that respondents<sup>12</sup> were:

- part of a stable and experienced core of staff, with just under half of the respondents having been in the profession for 10 or more years (the average length of time in the profession in our sample was 12 years, which is slightly lower than the national average of 13 years<sup>13</sup>), and over three quarters (77%) of respondents having worked in their settings for three or more years (with more than one quarter having worked in their setting for over 10 years)<sup>14</sup>.
- broadly satisfied with their school or college (85% responded that they enjoyed working there and 73% said they would recommend their institution as a good place to work), even though they felt opportunities to progress were limited (see below). These rates were slightly lower than the national average (88% and 82% respectively)<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> It should be noted that the survey, developed by SQW and building on the TALIS survey, was disseminated by the IOA central team to all participating settings in the Programme. It was not possible for SQW to control or mitigate any response bias since we did not have access to data on all staff. The findings from the survey should be taken as indicative and illustrative.

<sup>13</sup> Based on England's data from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey 2018. Accessible online from <https://www1.compareyourcountry.org/talis-teacher-survey/en/2/all/default>

<sup>14</sup> The average length of time that teachers in our sample had spent in their setting was 10 years in primary schools and nine years in secondary schools. This is higher than the national average, which, according to the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey 2018, were 6.8 years for primary teachers and 7.5 years for secondary teachers in England.

<sup>15</sup> Based on the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey 2018. Accessible online from <https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/talis2018tables.htm>

**4.3** It should be noted, however, that the situation is more complex than these basic statistics would suggest.

- Although there are pockets of high deprivation in Ipswich, many schools reported that they had relatively low proportions of students who were in receipt of Free School Meals (FSM) and Pupil Premium. This clearly affected their funding and the level of support they could provide. Schools noted, however, that families did not to always apply for FSM even though they were eligible. In other cases, families did not quite meet the threshold for financial support, though the schools felt pupils needed additional support. Many schools reported situations that affected the support needs and stability of the student body, including:
  - a high proportion of students with speech and language needs and
  - a high proportion of students from families in transit (including migrants or visiting professionals at the University).

Schools argued that, although their student population required increased support, they were not receiving adequate funding to support students' needs.

- The lack of collaboration between schools was not universal, but it tended to be with schools outside the town. Many schools in Ipswich are academies, for example (though some became incorporated more recently, since 2017) and feedback from staff and school leaders suggested that they tended to engage and collaborate primarily with their own academy trust schools, most of which were in other geographical areas.

**4.4** Addressing these various challenges placed pressures on school and college budgets, and the interviewees reported that, for a number of years, they had not been able to invest as much as they wanted in their CPD programme, with one school noting that they had not allocated any budget for CPD in recent years. Money for CPD was not ring-fenced in school or college budgets and other needs (including individual pupil support) were often said to be so great that institutions focused on addressing their immediate challenges rather than considering long-term development. The funding that was offered through the Programme thus came as very welcome news to many senior leadership teams and, initially, the Programme as an **additional source of funding** appeared to be the key motivation for schools and colleges to apply for the Programme.

## The achievements of the Programme

**4.5** As indicated, the Workforce Development Programme was introduced in a period when educational settings in Ipswich were facing multiple challenges, each putting a strain on their resources and finances. Overall, there was a consensus amongst participating senior leaders and teaching staff that taking part in the Programme was a worthwhile investment of time, with a number of strong positive outcomes.

- For some of the participating school and colleges, the Programme appeared to have been a **driver for change**, improving their perception and understanding of CPD and their approach to CPD planning.
- In other cases, the Programme appeared to have been **an agent for change**, transforming their ability to deliver CPD and enabling senior leaders to move their staff development plans forward.
- All of the schools and colleges who participated in the evaluation reported that they had become **more strategic and considered in the planning of their CPD programmes**.

**4.6** In the following sub-sections, we review the main achievements of the Programme as reported by participants, starting with the audit process with TDT, before considering the impact on the delivery of the CPD programmes.

### The audit process

**4.7** This element of the Programme, **led by the TDT**, included an audit of provision (including feedback from teaching staff about the CPD provision in their settings) and a series of **shared learning** events. The latter were monthly events, to which the senior leaders from all participating settings were invited to attend. The first couple of meetings focused on the audit form and funding application processes, while the subsequent meetings were intended to promote a discussion between the schools. Attendees were encouraged to raise issues, queries and stories of success, with the hope that the educational settings would develop a learning community.

“  
I have never before  
looked at CPD in  
such detail – and  
clearly, we should

” **Primary school headteacher**

**4.8** Although the initial motivation for many institutions to join the Programme was the available funding, each of the interviewees noted that the **audit process had added great value to the Programme** and they had benefited from this element. Some of the senior leaders noted that going through this process was the first time that they had collected and received feedback on CPD from the teaching staff. Many reported that this was an *‘eye opener’* for them, and even the senior leaders in schools who said they involved their teaching staff in the development of their CPD programme *‘as a matter of course’*, said they found the process useful, as it helped confirm that their plans were addressing the interests and needs of their staff.

**4.9** Inspired by the audit process, one school subsequently engaged the entire teaching staff in the development of their CPD programme, with each member of staff taking responsibility for developing each of the subjects or areas for development that were identified in the audit. The headteacher and teaching staff of this school reported that having ownership of an area of development encouraged creative thinking in researching and developing CPD, ensured that the CPD programme was relevant to the school, and in addition, increased staff motivation

and enthusiasm for the profession. Interviewees noted that the audit process helped settings identify their needs and any gaps in their existing CPD programme.

**4.10** Following the audit process, there was a level of commonality across settings in both the needs identified and the training programmes selected:

- **Pedagogy** – teaching skills including coaching and peer learning: senior leaders commented that the feedback from the teachers indicated that teachers were interested in progressing in their profession through improving their classroom skills, with a strong preference for peer learning, mentoring and coaching approaches.
- **Management** - in particular for middle managers: senior leaders identified a gap in their governance structure that would be improved by strengthening their middle management strand and more generally raising the management and leadership skills of their wider teaching staff. SQW's baseline Staff Satisfaction Survey (2019) indicated that less than half (44%) of the respondents felt that there were opportunities for them to progress into a leadership role.
- **Mental health and wellbeing** – to enable staff to be able to support students with their mental health needs, to help teachers deal with behavioural issues and to support teachers in managing the relationship with parents. Dealing with discipline in the classroom and addressing parent or guardian concerns were two identifiable sources of stress for teachers as indicated in the Staff Satisfaction Survey (60% referred to discipline issues and 63% of respondents reported concerns in addressing parental challenges).
- **Subject specific training** – the identification of subject-specific CPD needs was reported to have been less prevalent than in previous years, but it was still identified in settings where leaders felt there were issues with the performance of specific subjects (mostly maths and English). Nonetheless, subject-specific CPD that was subsequently commissioned focused primarily on pedagogy and classroom skills rather than subject knowledge.

**4.11** In addition to helping settings to better identify their CPD needs, the audit process and the work with TDT introduced schools and colleges to the importance of evaluating the progress and the outcomes of the CPD programme. Where senior leaders reported that, previously, they had not followed up with staff who attended CPD sessions, many reported that they had begun to do so, getting feedback on sessions and developing a plan to assess the impact of the training on the practice and progress of the staff who were trained. Interviewees noted that implementing an evaluation process for their CPD programmes had increased their confidence in harnessing the skills staff acquired through the training to contribute to their school improvement.

## Delivering the CPD programme

- 4.12** Following the audit, schools and colleges generally moved their CPD programme **from a cascade model of delivery** (where one or a small number of staff attended a training session and then trained their colleagues, based on their learning from the sessions) **to a model that involved the entire school staff in training sessions**. Interviewees noted that before the Programme, budget constraints meant that they could only afford to send a small number of staff to training sessions each year, and the only way for them to provide CPD for the rest of their staff was to use the cascade model. The key issue with this approach was that content tended to get diluted as the member of staff brought back what *they* picked up and *their interpretation* of the materials. Thanks to the additional funding provided through the Programme, settings were able to send their entire teaching staff to be trained together, and the senior leaders reported that the key benefits from this were a much more comprehensive training and greater consistency in quality and practice across the setting.
- 4.13** The senior leaders who were interviewed commented that **the additional funding also provided access to a higher quality CPD** than they could have afforded in the past. The settings were able to purchase external training sessions (where previously many tended to opt for internal training), and to purchase training from national providers who were of high quality, well established and experienced. The funding enabled the settings to cover the cost of travel<sup>16</sup> (mostly to London) as well as the higher cost of the session. In addition, the additional funding enabled the settings to pay for cover teachers to **release the teaching staff** not only to attend the training session, but also to have time to reflect on what they had learned and to embed that learning, including preparing new lesson plans and conducting further research.
- 4.14** The CPD activities engaged with through the Programme were not focussed solely on formal training sessions. Many schools and colleges increased their staff participation in **peer learning** and a number of settings funded one-to-one **coaching sessions** for their staff. The peer learning included one-to-one or group **meetings** (to plan lessons jointly, discuss teaching issues and share good practice), **observations** (both of colleagues from the same setting and of colleagues from other settings) and providing each other with **feedback**. Research shows that collaboration with peers is a key feature in effective CPD (Cordingley *et al.*, 2003<sup>17</sup>, 2005<sup>18</sup> and 2007<sup>19</sup>), and the feedback from the interviewees confirmed that this

<sup>16</sup> When travel and in person training was still possible.

<sup>17</sup> Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B. & Evans, D. (2003) The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning. In: Research Evidence in Education Library. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London

<sup>18</sup> Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Evans, D. & Firth, A. (2005) The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning. Review: What do teacher impact data tell us about collaborative CPD? In: Research Evidence in Education Library. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London

<sup>19</sup> Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Isham, C., Evans, D. & Firth, A. (2007) What do specialists do in CPD programmes for which there is evidence of positive outcomes for pupils and teachers? Report in:

was a key strength of their new CPD Programmes, leading to a number of positive outcomes, as reported by both senior leaders and teaching staff.

### Programme outcomes

**4.15** The Programme appeared to be on the way to meet a number of its intended aims under Opportunity Area Priority 2 (developing skilled practitioners and the delivery of fulfilling careers):

- Interviewees reported that teaching staff appear to have increased confidence in their teaching skills, and this was reflected in their practice in the classroom.
- In addition, teaching staff reported feeling valued and appreciated, because of the investment that their place of work was putting in to increasing their skills.
- Senior leaders commented that high levels of staff satisfaction helped with staff retention. Many of the settings that took part in the evaluation noted that staff retention was not currently an issue for the school. There was a feeling amongst staff that they had:
  - prospects for progression and
  - support from the senior leadership to invest in their professional development.

**4.16** Due to the timeframe of the Programme and the evaluation it was too early, at the time of writing this report, to find evidence of any positive outcomes on pupils' and students' attainment. However, interviewees provided some **anecdotal stories of improvements in young people's speech and language** (such as an increase in vocabulary and oracy skills), **maths**

**skills** (including improvement in national assessments results) **and reading skills**, following the training that teaching staff received in these subjects and the improvement in their teaching practices.



**If we want to keep staff, it's not necessarily about teaching and learning responsibilities and wages, but about developing them as a person and valuing them**



**Primary school headteacher**

---

Research Evidence in Education Library. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.



**4.17** Progress in relation to some of the other aims was less evident, however. Interviewees noted that the Programme had not been able to promote greater networking amongst all of the participating educational settings, for example. While some interviewed senior leaders said that they found the shared learning meetings helpful in promoting valued partnerships with other schools in Ipswich, for instance, these were the exception and tended to be on a small scale (generally with one other school).

**4.18** There was recognition that this was always going to be a challenge given both the historical and structural context of Ipswich. The Programme delivery team had hoped that the Programme would be a catalyst for developing a network of schools for collaboration and shared learning, though participation in the shared learning events was not mandatory. Many of the senior leaders said that they stopped attending meetings because they did not find them

helpful. One commented that meetings tended to be overtaken by a vocal few and the resulting discussions were not relevant to their school, while another reported that the discussions were too general and at too high a level to be helpful.

“  
**In Ipswich in general, we are working in different directions, we have different objectives... a collaborative approach was always going to be tricky**

Primary school headteacher

## Challenges and mitigating measures

### Programme launch

**4.19** The **timing of the Programme's introduction (Autumn Term 2018) was said to have posed a key challenge for the settings.** In the first year, settings were required to make applications for CPD funding very soon after the completion of the audit process, which some said did not allow them enough time to digest the results of the audit and develop a considered CPD programme. In addition, they were required to commission CPD sessions after their timetable for the year had been established, which made it challenging both to fit sessions in and to free teachers up to do to their training.

### Application process

**4.20** Interviewees also commented that the **application process and reporting requirements of the Programme felt quite onerous** and required a great deal of resource from the settings (mainly the time senior leaders and staff spent on researching and completing the forms).

**4.21** That said, a number of the schools noted that the requirement to meet a deadline for the funding '*forced them into action*', and in a way became an enabler for the Programme. The interviewees noted that during the second year of the Programme, the Opportunity Area also showed a **great deal of flexibility** and enabled the schools and colleges to rollover the funding across the academic years, so that they would not lose any of the funding if they had not been able to book the CPD in time. However, they noted that the application timings could still have been better aligned with the academic year.

## Communications

**4.22** Feedback from senior leaders suggested that the **communications** from the Opportunity Area Programme could have been better, with clearer messages on what was required and by when. For many, the Programme felt a bit disorganised at the beginning, with many requirements for forms and reports (audit forms, CPD plans, application forms, progress reports) and insufficient clarity on whether they were filling in the forms correctly, what funding they would receive and by when.

**4.23** That said, interviewees noted that after the first wave of payments, and over time, **the communications have improved as had their understanding of the application process and reporting requirements**. While at the beginning it felt like they were required '*to jump through hoops*' to get their funding, during the second year of the Programme, it all became a lot clearer. Many commented that overall, the benefits of the Programme outweighed the costs of the investment (both monetary and time).

“  
It felt like there were lots of barriers being put up to prevent us from getting [the funding]

”  
Primary school headteacher

## Economies of scale

**4.24** Interviewees commented that because settings did not work in collaboration with others there was a missed opportunity for them to take advantage of opportunities for **economies of scale**. Many of the schools opted for the same training sessions<sup>20</sup> and questioned why there was not an element of central coordination of CPD commissioning through the Programme, which they felt would have enabled settings to increase their purchasing power and obtain better deals. Exemplifying this, one interviewee noted that they had a few places available in a commissioned training session and believed that a more centralised commissioning hub would have enabled them to let other schools know and let other teachers make use of the surplus places.

<sup>20</sup> Three programmes were particularly popular and were commissioned by many schools in the area: 'White Rose Maths', 'Talk for Writing' and 'Power of Reading'

## Reach of the Programme

**4.25** Finally, a number of interviewees noted that a major gap in the CPD landscape was the **limited offer for training to Teaching Assistants (TA)**. While one school provided training to their TAs, which helped progress them to a higher level Teaching Assistant and some to teachers, other interviewees commented that there was a shortage of training that are targeted for TAs to support their practice in the classroom. They noted that it would be good to extend the offer of CPD for TAs, as they are integral to the teaching staff in the settings. They felt that an investment in the professional progress of TAs would improve the quality of classroom teaching and promote school improvement.

## Impact of COVID-19 on CPD delivery

**4.26** The lockdown period (March to June/July 2020) triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic coincided with the settings' final few months of Programme delivery. This had an impact on their ability to deliver CPD, affecting all face-to-face programmes and requiring a movement of training online.

**4.27** In November-December 2020 (and during the second lockdown in England), as an addition to the evaluation, SQW administered a **short online survey to senior members of staff** to ask about the implications of COVID-19 on their ability to plan and deliver CPD programmes to staff. Thirteen senior leaders responded to the survey: 10 were from primary schools, one from a nursery school, one from a junior school and one from a secondary school.

**4.28** According to the responses from an online survey of settings' leads, the pandemic meant that their original plans were only delivered in part (9 of 11)<sup>21</sup>, or that CPD had to be delivered fully or partly online (9). As a result, over half of the respondents (6 of 11) stated that the delivered Programme was of lower quality than they had anticipated. This they attributed to the fact that there were fewer opportunities to share learning or network with colleagues internally or, in the few cases where partnerships had been developed, with staff in other schools, in addition to the lack of ongoing provision from external providers and changing priorities<sup>22</sup> within their own settings. In the contemporaneous qualitative interviews, senior staff said that the closure of schools meant that there were fewer opportunities for teaching staff to implement and embed their training through practice in the classroom and there was a worry that the learning would fade by the time teachers were back in classrooms.

**4.29** That said, some survey respondents and interviewees reported benefits to CPD delivery as a result of the regulations associated with COVID-19. Many welcomed online CPD as a time-efficient, cost effective and flexible method of delivery and many have taken this learning forward to implement a blended learning approach to their training programmes.

<sup>21</sup> Respondents who stated COVID-19 had impacted on their delivery plans

<sup>22</sup> Not least of which was developing and delivering learning opportunities for children who needed to self-isolate in their homes

## Impact of COVID-19 on staff participation in CPD

- 4.30** In SQW's follow-up Staff Satisfaction Survey, we included additional questions on the impact of COVID-19 on staff professional development activities. Most respondents (36 of the 55 who responded to the COVID-19 related questions) felt that COVID-19 had affected their ability to participate in CPD activities. Of these, a high proportion (21 out of 36) said fewer activities were available to them and five said they were not able to participate in any CPD. In 10 cases, however, respondents said they had been able to participate in more CPD activities than would have otherwise been the case.
- 4.31** The proportion of teachers who reported they had participated in CPD activity over the previous 12 months were similar between the baseline (2019) and the follow up survey (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on the perceived quality of that CPD activity was mixed, though marginally less negative than the response from senior leaders. Whilst 24 respondents felt that CPD activities had been of a lower quality than previously, 25 felt that there had been no change and six felt the activities were now of higher quality. There was a difference, however, in the type of CPD that teachers participated in, with a higher proportion of teachers reporting attending online sessions and reading professional literature as a CPD activity in 2020 (92% and 84% respectively) than in the baseline survey in 2019 (50% and 65% respectively)<sup>23</sup>.
- 4.32** Similarly, respondents were split on whether **COVID-19 had impacted how they felt about teaching**: 27 respondents said it had affected how they felt about teaching, whilst 28 said it had not. When asked to explain their answer, most of those who said that the COVID-19 pandemic had affected how they felt about teaching explained that there had been added stress and responsibility on their roles, with little additional support from central government or the media. Many teachers felt undervalued by society with little recognition of the work they had done throughout the lockdowns and the risk they placed themselves in by continuing to work in a school environment. They felt the COVID-19 pandemic had had a negative impact on their own and their student's mental wellbeing, while a smaller number of teachers felt that working in the teaching profession during the COVID-19 pandemic had been a positive and rewarding experience. In questions about external perceptions of the profession, there was an indication that they felt less valued than previously, both in terms of policy makers and the wider media. Although just 13 per cent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement 'teachers' views were valued by policy makers in England in the baseline questionnaire (2019), this had gone down to less than one in 10 in 2020 (9%). While around one fifth of the initial respondents (22%) agreed or strongly agreed with the second statement, 'teachers were valued by the media in England', this had gone down to 15% of respondents in 2020. These findings indicate a general feeling amongst teachers of being

---

<sup>23</sup> It is important to note that the follow-up survey had fewer than half the responses to the baseline survey and responses to the follow-up survey may have been affected by external circumstances, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, the findings from the survey should be seen as indicative and illustrative only.

undervalued and unappreciated and that these feelings have increased over the course of the pandemic.

## Reflections and key learning

**4.33** As noted above, the feedback from the interviewees suggested that in all their settings, the senior leaders have become a lot more strategic in the planning of the CPD programme. A number commented that they had learned that the key to an effective CPD programme was to find the right **balance between the needs of the school and the wishes and interest of the staff**. They noted that such a balance helped ensure the buy-in of the staff and their full engagement with the CPD, while at the same time helped to develop a CPD programme that supported school improvement. They felt the audit process had helped this, since it included engaging the entire teaching staff in providing feedback, while a detailed analysis of the outcomes of the audit helped them to understand the implications of their individual setting's strengths, the gaps and CPD needs, as well as how to address them.

“  
**We are definitely thinking much more strategically now about what we do**  
 ”  
 Primary school headteacher

**4.34 Indeed, the audit process was itself the crucial strength of the Programme.** The element of partnership between headteachers, senior leadership and teaching staff in the development of the CPD programme, which was promoted through the audit exercise, is one of the key standards for effective CPD as recommended by the DfE<sup>24</sup>. Some of the senior leaders who were interviewed noted that the audit process was so helpful that they were considering, budget permitting, to **repeat the audit periodically** to keep checking that their CPD plan continues to address their settings' needs.

**4.35** A key risk to the **sustainability** of comprehensive and well-balanced CPD programmes in Ipswich schools, however, **is the reliance of the schools and colleges on the external budget** that was provided through the Programme. The Programme did not require settings to develop any strategies as to how they would ensure the ongoing progression of their CPD planning and delivery. Some schools will not yet have embedded the Programme-funded changes within their school culture and so the immediate legacy of the Programme may thus be limited. Changes may become more integrated over time but this highlights a gap in the

<sup>24</sup> The DfE's standards for effective professional development were produced by the Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group, based on evidence from England and internationally. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/standard-for-teachers-professional-development>. The Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group is an independent group of teachers, headteachers, academics and education experts working to define a new standard for teachers' professional development- [Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/standard-for-teachers-professional-development)

design of the Programme: **a strategic exit strategy would have helped to ensure the longer-term effect of the investment.**

- 4.36** Each of the interviewees noted that it would be very challenging for their settings to keep the momentum of CPD-related activities once the funding stopped, as they still had limited budgets (and none ring-fenced for CPD). This highlighted the challenge for the Programme, which was that it was not always in a position to ensure that, although schools and colleges welcomed and appear to have integrated (as far as possible) the changes the Programme prompted in terms of the **principles of their CPD planning**, the longer-term **integration and embedding of enhanced CPD may still, for most schools, be largely reliant on finding additional funding**<sup>25</sup>. The funding that was awarded through the Programme (£1,000 per member of staff) was considerably higher than the budget that previously was generally available for CPD in settings' annual budgets. Some schools received as much as £50,000 for their CPD fund, a sum which they felt they would not be able to match internally in the future.
- 4.37** There were a few localised solutions to these issues, which may reflect the fact that the Programme had indeed become the agent of change in some settings or was simply the driver. One of the senior leaders noted that the key learning point that they had taken away from their experience of the Programme was the importance of having dedicated funding allocated specifically for CPD, and in the future they planned to ensure they **ring-fence funds for CPD** in their annual budget. In this case, the Programme was a clear **driver of change** though it remains to be seen whether that ring-fencing is embedded or subject to external pressures.
- 4.38** By contrast, two other senior leaders noted that they had adopted a more strategic approach, using part of the Programme funding to purchase a whole school subscription to an online CPD resource (Educare<sup>26</sup>). This meant that they had unlimited access to online CPD sessions and other resources and materials for the whole school, which they could access in their own time. They noted that this had helped to embed a sense of ownership of their own professional development amongst staff and also supported the continuation of the CPD Programme in the school, since it offered unlimited access to resources at a cost that the school could sustain. In these instances, the Programme had become an **agent of change**.
- 4.39** Finally, a few interviewees commented that being an Opportunity Area meant that there is a great deal of investment in Ipswich, and this includes many funding opportunities for schools and colleges. They noted that **schools needed to become adept in navigating through the system and in applying for funding opportunities**. At the same time, they felt that the **Opportunity Area Programme needed to be better at marketing and explaining what opportunities are available** to settings and provide support to schools and colleges to ensure that they are able to take advantage of the options that are available to them.

<sup>25</sup> Some schools may also need further support (at least in the short to medium-term) in how to develop effective CPD programmes.

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.educare.co.uk/>

## 5. Summary and conclusions

- 5.1** There was consensus amongst participating senior leaders and teaching staff that taking part in the Programme was a worthwhile investment of funding and time, with several strong positive outcomes for their settings. The findings from the evaluation indicated that the Programme appeared to be on the way to meet its intended aims under Opportunity Area Priority 2 (developing skilled practitioners and the delivery of fulfilling careers), specifically:
- increased confidence of staff in their teaching skills
  - teaching staff reported feeling valued
  - reports of higher levels of staff satisfaction (anticipating that this will promote staff retention)
  - anecdotal indications of better outcomes for children in speech and language skills.
- 5.2** The Programme has prompted **some networking** amongst a minority of participating settings, but it was patchy and there were suggestions that, even where partnerships had started to develop, they had suffered during the various lockdowns and other regulations imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 5.3** The **key strength of the Programme**, cited by all interviewees, was the **audit process**, led by TDT. It was said to have helped sharpen senior leaders' thinking around CPD planning, supported the development of CPD programmes that were better aligned to settings' needs and supported school improvement. The additional funding enabled schools to develop more effective models of professional development and facilitated the commissioning of higher quality provision of CPD.
- 5.4** The **main challenge** that the Programme faces is the **extent to which the changes made to school and college CPD processes and plans are sustainable**. The Programme provided a substantial investment in the area, through TDT support and considerable funding allocations for CPD, and some schools indicated that they had learnt from the Programme, incorporating the need to include staff in CPD planning and enabling longer-term CPD through strategic purchasing and access to external materials. In most cases, however, such longer-term strategic thinking was less evident. Schools and colleges were not required by the IOA model to demonstrate a strategic exit plan to ensure that the learning from the Programme would be embedded in their institution's practice. Most institutions indicated that they remained dependant on finding additional funding to maintain the level of focus on CPD as well as the training the Programme had enabled.
- 5.5** The review of Ipswich's context highlighted the fact that the schools and colleges were facing a number of significant challenges, with constrained budgets, changes to inspection frameworks, competing demands on teachers' time, and, more recently, the implications of working under the regulations imposed by a pandemic, for instance. In this climate, the

additional funds provided by the Programme were much welcomed. The IOA Programme will come to an end in 2021, however, and most settings will revert to planning and delivering CPD with a lower budget. There is an opportunity for the local authority to capitalise on the learning and good practice that have been achieved through the Programme so far. One possibility could be to further develop **the local system and coordinate CPD opportunities and activities across educational settings in the area**. Such coordination could lead to economies of scale in the commissioning of CPD and promote greater collaboration and networking between local schools and colleges.



## Annex A: Staff Satisfaction Surveys

**A.1** In the summer of 2019, SQW conducted a baseline survey of teachers in Ipswich to understand the state of professional development, school climate and job satisfaction within schools in the IOA. The baseline survey had 144 usable responses. In winter 2019, a follow up survey was conducted and had 61 usable responses. Please note that whilst comparisons can be made between the baseline and follow-up survey, the survey did not collect personal information so it is not known how many individuals took part in both surveys and changes in individual-level responses cannot be tracked.

### Profile of respondents

**A.2** Respondents to the **baseline survey** were well-qualified (around 75% having a bachelor's degree, PGCE or Masters), mostly female and White British. The majority of the 144 respondents (82) worked at a primary school, 40 worked at secondary schools, 10 at special schools (SEND) and 12 at nursery schools. Almost half (69) of respondents had been in the teaching profession for 10 or more years, with a further 56 in the profession for between three and nine years and 13 for fewer than three years. In terms of length of time working at their current school, one-quarter of respondents (38) had been there for 10 or more years, just over half had been there for between three and nine years (74), and the remainder for fewer than three years (32). Positions held within the school ranged from Classroom Teacher (54 respondents or just over one third), Teaching Assistant (26), Support staff (23), and Head of Faculty/Year/Department (18). Eleven respondents were in senior leadership roles with eight being Deputy Head or Assistant Head Teacher and three being Head Teacher.

**A.3** Respondents to the **follow-up survey** were also well-qualified, mostly female and White British, and had a very similar profile to the baseline respondents. The survey was primarily completed by those working at primary schools (49 out of 61 respondents), with eight responses from secondary schools and four from nursery or infant schools. Over half of the respondents (34) had been in the teaching profession for 10 or more years, with 17 in the profession for between three and nine years and nine for fewer than three years. In terms of length of time working at their current school, 17 respondents had been there for 10 or more years, 27 for between three and nine years and 17 for fewer than three schools. One-third of respondents (21) were Classroom Teachers, with other positions Teaching Assistant (8), Support staff (8), Head of Faculty/Year/Department (8), Head Teacher (7), and Deputy Head/Assistant Head Teacher (5).

### Professional development activities

**A.4** In the baseline survey, 122 out of the 144 respondents had attended a course or workshop in person in the previous 12 months. Most respondents had also read professional literature and taken part in peer and/or self-observation and coaching. Around half of the respondents had

participated in online courses and seminars. Five respondents had not taken part in any professional development activities in the last five years. For those who had taken part, most had been released from teaching duties for activities that took place during regular working hours. Less than half (58 respondents), however, were reimbursed for the costs of participation (such as travel costs, for instance), and even fewer (34) subsequently received professional benefits or increased salary (13). However, most respondents (94 or 65%) said that their professional development activities had a positive impact on their teaching practice.

**A.5** In the follow-up survey, attendance at in-person courses or workshops was (not surprisingly) lower but attendance of online courses and seminars was markedly higher, which reflects the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the delivery of professional development activities. A higher proportion of respondents than at the baseline had taken part in a professional development network of teachers, read professional literature and taken part in peer and/or self-observation and coaching. Only one respondent reported not taking part in any professional development activities in the past year. For those who did take part in professional development activities, over half (36) were released from their teaching duties, one-third (20) received reimbursement for the costs (though it is not clear what the costs were) but few received professional benefits (16) or increased salary (10). Again, 42 of the 60 respondents (around 70%) said that the activities had a positive impact on their teaching practice.

**Table A-1: Respondents who took part in professional development activities in the 12 months before the survey**

	Baseline survey (n=144)		Follow-up survey (n=61)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Courses/workshops attended in person	122	85	42	69
Online courses/seminars	72	50	56	92
Education conferences or seminars	46	32	22	36
Observation visits to other schools	41	28	11	18
Observation visits to workplaces/businesses	5	3	2	3
Peer and/or self-observation and coaching	76	53	37	61
Professional development network of teachers	38	26	32	44
Reading professional literature	94	65	51	84
Other	29	20	6	10

*Source: SQW analysis of online surveys*

**A.6** Some of the barriers to participation in professional development activities that teachers faced changed between the baseline and follow-up survey. Whilst professional development conflicting with work schedules and not having time due to personal responsibilities remained a key barrier, other issues had decreased. **Proportionately fewer respondents** in the follow-up survey (compared to the baseline survey) felt that there was a lack of support

from senior leadership, that no relevant opportunities had been offered or that the cost of professional development presented a barrier.

**Table A-2: Barriers to participation in professional development**

	Baseline survey (n=139)		Follow-up survey (n=60)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
Professional development is too expensive/unaffordable	79	57	24	40
There is a lack of support from senior leadership	25	18	3	5
Professional development conflicts with my work schedule	73	53	32	53
I do not have time because of personal responsibilities	44	32	20	33
There is no relevant professional development offered	43	31	9	15
There are no incentives for participating in such activities	62	45	23	38

*Source: SQW analysis of online surveys*

## Staff satisfaction

**A.7** The baseline and follow-up surveys included a number of questions on staff satisfaction and the tables for these questions are included below. It is difficult to draw conclusions on this data as the follow-up survey had fewer than half the responses to the baseline survey and responses to the follow-up survey may have been affected by external circumstances, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, the following tables should be seen as indicative and illustrative only.

**Table A-3: Agreement with statements as applied to their school**

	Baseline survey (n=136)		Follow-up survey (n=58)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
This school provides staff with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions	87	64	38	66
This school provides parents or guardians with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions	78	57	34	59
This school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions	104	76	35	60
This school has a culture of shared responsibility for school issues	99	73	42	72
There is a collaborative school culture which is characterised by mutual support	98	72	45	78
The school staff share a common set of beliefs about teaching and learning	105	77	50	86
The school staff enforces rules for student behaviour consistently throughout the school	90	66	48	83
This school encourages staff to lead new initiatives	104	76	44	76
Teaching in this school is generally very good	122	90	48	83
The school has an effective school management team	110	81	46	79

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

**Table A-4: Agreement with statements about what happens in their school**

	Baseline survey (n=135)		Follow-up survey (n=58)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
Teachers and students usually get on well with each other	132	98	57	98
Most teachers in this school believe that the students' wellbeing is important	134	99	58	100
Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say	132	98	58	100
If a student from this school needs extra assistance, the school provides it	127	94	55	95
Teachers can rely on each other	118	87	52	90

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

**Table A-5: In your experience in your position at this school, to what extent do the following occur?**

		Baseline survey (n=134)				Follow-up survey (n=58)			
		All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say	All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say
I experience stress in my work	No.	34	92	6	2	12	44	2	0
	%	25	69	4	1	21	76	3	0
My job leaves me time for my personal life	No.	37	77	16	4	16	37	5	0
	%	28	57	12	3	28	64	9	0
My job negatively impacts my mental health	No.	14	69	45	6	6	33	17	2
	%	10	51	34	4	10	57	29	3
My job negatively impacts my physical health	No.	8	59	61	6	2	31	24	1
	%	6	44	46	4	3	53	41	2

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

**Table A-6: Thinking about your job at this school, to what extent are the following sources of stress in your work?**

		Baseline survey (n=130)				Follow-up survey (n=58)			
		All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say	All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say
Having too much lesson preparation	No.	8	67	43	12	5	24	24	5
	%	6	52	33	9	9	41	41	9
Having too many lessons to teach	No.	13	48	58	11	6	13	36	3
	%	10	37	45	8	10	22	62	5
Having too much marking	No.	21	45	53	11	4	14	38	1
	%	16	35	41	8	7	25	67	2
Having too much administrative work to do (e.g. filling out forms)	No.	34	61	27	8	10	29	18	0
	%	26	47	21	6	18	51	32	0
Having extra duties due to absent teachers	No.	8	55	56	11	3	20	34	0
	%	6	42	43	8	5	35	60	0
Being held responsible for students' achievement	No.	27	49	43	11	13	22	21	1
	%	21	38	33	8	23	39	37	2
Maintaining classroom discipline	No.	13	65	42	10	7	23	25	2
	%	10	50	32	8	12	40	44	4

		Baseline survey (n=130)				Follow-up survey (n=58)			
		All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say	All the time	To some extent	Not at all	Prefer not to say
Being intimidated or verbally abused by students	No.	6	38	75	11	2	7	44	4
	%	5	29	58	8	4	12	77	7
Keeping up with the changing requirements from Ofsted and the Department for Education	No.	21	78	22	9	18	21	15	3
	%	16	60	17	7	32	37	26	5
Addressing parent or guardian concerns	No.	13	69	40	8	7	26	21	3
	%	10	53	31	6	12	46	37	5
Modifying lessons for students with special needs	No.	17	57	47	9	3	23	29	2
	%	13	44	36	7	5	40	51	4
Relationships with other teachers	No.	4	40	78	8	5	12	37	3
	%	3	31	60	6	9	21	65	5
Lack of support from senior leadership/line managers	No.	11	37	75	7	3	12	41	1
	%	8	28	58	5	5	21	72	2

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

**Table A-7: General feeling about their teaching job**

	Baseline survey (n=122)		Follow-up survey (n=55)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
The advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages	80	66	39	71
If I could decide again, I would still choose to work as a teacher	77	63	38	69
I would like to change to another school if that were possible	20	16	6	11
I regret that I decided to become a teacher	13	11	5	9
I enjoy working at this school	106	87	52	95
I wonder whether it would have been better to choose another profession	42	34	21	38
I would recommend this school as a good place to work	89	73	47	85

	Baseline survey (n=122)		Follow-up survey (n=55)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
I think that the teaching profession is valued in society	40	33	14	25
I am satisfied with my performance in this school	107	88	52	95
All in all, I am satisfied with my job	94	77	46	84
I think about leaving the teaching profession	35	29	16	29
I have scope to progress as a classroom teacher	61	50	30	55
I have scope to progress into a leadership team role	54	44	25	45
I have scope to progress to a higher pay level	62	51	29	53
I have the opportunity to help all my students realise their potential	94	77	41	75
I do not have the autonomy I need to do a good job as a teacher	25	20	11	20

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

**Table A-8: Agreement with statements**

	Baseline survey (n=122)		Follow-up survey (n=54)	
	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%	Total 'strongly agree' or 'agree'	%
I am satisfied with the salary I receive for my work	52	43	30	56
Apart from my salary, I am satisfied with the terms of my teaching contract (e.g. benefits, work schedule)	88	72	40	74
Teachers' views are valued by policymakers in England	16	13	5	9
Teachers can influence educational policy in England	24	20	8	15
Teachers are valued by the media in England	27	22	8	15

Source: SQW analysis of online surveys

# SQW

## Contact

For more information:

**Maya Agur**

*Managing Consultant, SQW*

T: +44 (0)20 7391 4111

E: [magur@sqw.co.uk](mailto:magur@sqw.co.uk)

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

14 – 15 Mandela Street

London

NW1 2DU

[www.sqw.co.uk](http://www.sqw.co.uk)

## About us

### SQW Group

SQW and Oxford Innovation are part of SQW Group.

[www.sqwgroup.com](http://www.sqwgroup.com)

### SQW

SQW is a leading provider of research, analysis and advice on sustainable economic and social development for public, private and voluntary sector organisations across the UK and internationally. Core services include appraisal, economic impact assessment, and evaluation; demand assessment, feasibility and business planning; economic, social and environmental research and analysis; organisation and partnership development; policy development, strategy, and action planning. In 2019, BBP Regeneration became part of SQW, bringing to the business a RICS-accredited land and property team.

[www.sqw.co.uk](http://www.sqw.co.uk)

### Oxford Innovation

Oxford Innovation is a leading operator of business and innovation centres that provide office and laboratory space to companies throughout the UK. The company also provides innovation services to entrepreneurs, including business planning advice, coaching and mentoring. Oxford Innovation also manages investment networks that link investors with entrepreneurs seeking funding from £20,000 to £2m.

[www.oxin.co.uk](http://www.oxin.co.uk)