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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction

This is the report of work undertaken by the Quality in Education Centre of the University of Strathclyde, in conjunction with colleagues from the Universities of Aberdeen and Glasgow, on behalf of Learning and Teaching Scotland. It explored the continuing professional development (CPD) needs of teachers in years 2-6 of their professional lives. The objectives of the project were:

- To seek the views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional life on effective CPD they have received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery;
- To seek teachers views on their CPD needs;
- To seek teachers views on the relative priorities of their CPD needs;
- To seek teachers views on barriers to their participation in CPD and make recommendations on how these barriers might be overcome;
- To compare the views of these teachers with the views of other stakeholder groups such as head teachers, local authority employers and experts in CPD;
- To develop recommendations that can be used by LT Scotland to guide the development of future programmes of CPD support.

Views of the teachers in years 2-6 were gathered through group interviews using nominal group technique (NGT) (59 participants from 4 local authorities) and an electronic national survey (667 useable responses). These provided a rich seam of data which is considered alongside the views of other stakeholders and existing research evidence from both within and outwith Scotland.

2. The policy context

The Scottish CPD framework is individually oriented and is based on a series of competence-based standards. Despite an acknowledgment of the diversity of possible CPD experiences, policy documents tend to privilege formal CPD opportunities over informal professional learning. The Professional Review and Development (PRD) process is acknowledged as being central to effective career-long CPD, and good habits can and should be embedded in the induction and early professional development phases. However, despite the existence of the PRD process as the backbone of Scottish CPD policy, there is nonetheless a gap in the CPD framework for teachers in years 2 and 3. In addition, negotiating the CPD pathways established in the framework can be difficult for those teachers not in consistent, permanent, full-time employment.

The project built on the existing knowledge base, taking into account the opportunities and challenges afforded by a policy context which is influenced heavily by the McCrone Agreement, the Curriculum for Excellence and the changing culture developing through the Assessment is for Learning initiative.

3. Teachers in years 2-6: CPD views on effective CPD

Respondents identified a number of models of effective delivery, including:

- Practical/interactive sessions (e.g. workshops, small groups)
- Job shadowing /cooperative teaching
- Demonstrations, particularly with role play
• Opportunities to practice new strategies during the sessions
• Follow-up sessions where tutors visit schools to support implementation of strategies

They also identified issues relating to timing and/or duration of CPD ‘events’:
• They favoured CPD that is delivered over multiple sessions, not ‘one-offs’, allowing
time between for consolidation and reflection
• After school sessions should allow sufficient travel time for teachers to get there
• No one time will suit all, but twilight sessions appear to be the most convenient

In terms of content, respondents felt that CPD should be practically relevant and should include strategies/resources, hints and tips that can be implemented immediately. It should also aim to address contemporary issues and provide contemporary resources that are ‘proven’ to be effective and versatile.

4. Teachers in years 2-6: CPD needs and priorities

CPD needs identified in the survey paralleled those identified in the NGT sessions. While the order of priority varied slightly between the NGT and survey results, and between teachers with different lengths of experience, the following were identified as particular needs:

• Curriculum for Excellence
• Behaviour management strategies
• Keeping pedagogical knowledge and practice up-to-date
• Supporting pupils with additional support needs
• Career guidance and progression
• Subject or topic specific CPD

The relative priority of CPD needs was fairly consistent across the different year groups, although CPD relating to behaviour management and supporting additional support needs decreased in priority according to length of experience, and the priority of CfE as a CPD need increased very slightly in relation to length of experience.

It should also be noted that respondents did not merely identify CPD ‘topics’; they also identified needs relating to CPD mode.

5. Teachers in years 2-6: Barriers to CPD

Flexibility and/or variety of local authority provision and financial costs were identified as being the most significant barriers, although in general, respondents did not have particularly strong views about barriers to their participation in CPD.

There were some differences in view relating to respondents’ year of service: those with less experience were more likely to identify a lack of stable employment as a barrier, while those with more experience were more likely to see CPD which did not relate directly to career progression as a barrier.

6. Emerging issues and recommendations

In light of the key issues arising as detailed above and the bearing in mind the current policy context, eight strategic recommendations emerged from the project. The recommendations
include implications for a range of stakeholder groups including schools, local authorities and national bodies.

**RECOMMENDATION 1**
The years 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. Year 2-6 teachers have a range of needs and work in a range of different contexts, therefore a variety of CPD opportunities should be available. Any future developments in the national CPD framework will need to accommodate the need for flexibility.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**
Those year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. Therefore national bodies, local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**
The transition between the induction year and year 2 is important, and the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. Thereafter it is crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process; there are implications here for school and CPD leadership. There might also be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**
Participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicate that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. However, mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**
Year 2-6 teachers want CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation. In particular, they want this to focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular the CfE).

**RECOMMENDATION 6**
Informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit. CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers. Therefore opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.

**RECOMMENDATION 7**
While teachers in years 2-6 might have CPD needs particular to their stage of professional development, most of the views expressed in the project could equally be seen to be relevant to all teachers, a point endorsed in the stakeholder consultation exercise. The wider implications of the research for teachers’ CPD in general, should therefore be recognised and taken on board where appropriate.
RECOMMENDATION 8
Participants in the stakeholder consultation exercise expressed their appreciation at being given access to the interim research findings with some requesting access to the final report. Stakeholder engagement with this issue is vital in order for developments to move forward and consideration should therefore be given to a dissemination strategy which includes making the findings available and accessible to teachers and other relevant stakeholder.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CfE</td>
<td>Curriculum for Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Chartered teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENI</td>
<td>Department of Education in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPD</td>
<td>Early professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTCS</td>
<td>General Teaching Council for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Initial teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>Initial teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Local education authority (England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local authority (Scotland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQT</td>
<td>Newly qualified teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>Professional review and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQT</td>
<td>Recently qualified teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED</td>
<td>Scottish Executive Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Standard for Chartered Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Standard for Full Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQH</td>
<td>Scottish Qualification for Headship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STNE</td>
<td>Scottish Teachers for a New Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA</td>
<td>Teacher Training Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Teacher Development Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 RESEARCH CONTEXT

1.1 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This project explores the views of teachers in years 2-6 on their continuing professional development (CPD) needs. The objectives as outlined in the tender specification are as follows:

1. To seek the views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional life on effective CPD they have received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery;
2. To seek teachers’ views on their CPD needs;
3. To seek teachers’ views on the relative priorities of their CPD needs;
4. To seek teachers’ views on barriers to their participation in CPD and make recommendations on how these barriers might be overcome;
5. To compare the views of these teachers with the views of other stakeholder groups such as head teachers, local authority employers and experts in CPD;
6. To develop recommendations that can be used by LT Scotland to guide the development of future programmes of CPD support.

1.2 BACKGROUND

While the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) defines CPD as ‘anything that has been undertaken to progress, assist or enhance a teacher’s professionalism’ (SEED, 2002, p2), it should be acknowledged that the discourse about professional development is typified by ‘conceptual vagueness’ (Coffield 2000, p3). Friedman and Philips (2004, p369) indicate that legitimacy of professional development activities is often perceived in terms of formal training courses linked to work or gaining a qualification – portable and bankable. However, an emerging paradigm is one that moves professional development away from the practice of attending courses and training days to the concept of lifelong or continuing learning which is undertaken in a variety of ways, and where emotional and social as well as intellectual and practical engagement are viewed as co-existing and co-dependent (Day, 2004).

It is reasonable to assume that this lack of conceptual clarity pertains to all stages of a teacher’s professional development, including the early professional development (EPD) stage (see 1.3 for definition of term). The concept of EPD is an emerging area of interest, with a fairly limited body of literature addressing this stage of development explicitly. However, a recent review of literature in early professional learning, commissioned by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), reports that ‘what little evidence emerged seems to suggest that the needs of new teachers differ from those of their more experienced colleagues’ (GTCS, p49). In Scotland the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) project, led by Jim McNally at the University of Stirling, is producing some interesting results in relation to the value of ‘informal learning’ at the EPD stage. The aim of the project is ‘to improve the learning of new teachers and other new professionals by developing, evaluating and disseminating a research-based, practical model of early professional learning’. Outside Scotland, an evaluation of the Early Professional Development Pilot Scheme in England argues that key conditions for effective early professional development include: teacher autonomy; school support; mentor support; and LEA support (Moor et al, 2005).

The emphasis on teacher autonomy identified by Moor et al appears to fit well with discussions about the kind of teacher that will be best able to implement the Curriculum for
Excellence (CfE). The ‘Teachers for Excellence’ debate, launched by the Education Minister, stated that ‘Teachers are going to be key to the successful delivery of CfE and need to develop the capacity to be Teachers for Excellence’ (www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk). Part of that excellence is the expectation that teachers will take more ownership of CfE, and that teacher autonomy will feature highly. It is therefore vital that EPD is capable of supporting this cultural change as well as related pedagogical changes.

This project builds on the existing knowledge base, taking into account the opportunities and challenges afforded by a policy context which is influenced heavily by the McCrone Agreement, CfE and the changing culture developing through the Assessment is for Learning initiative. Views of the teachers in years 2-6 provide a rich seam of data which are considered alongside the views of other stakeholders and existing research evidence from both within and outwith Scotland.

1.3 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms continuing professional development (CPD) and early professional development (EPD) are used throughout this report. An all-encompassing conception of CPD is adopted, articulated neatly by Day (1999):

Professional development consists of all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute through these to the quality of education in the classroom. It is the process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills and emotional intelligence essential to good professional thinking, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives. (p4)

While the term EPD is used in much of the literature it should be noted that there is no agreed definition of what exactly constitutes EPD, other than that it occurs at the early stages of a teacher’s career. Most of the studies considered in the literature review use EPD to describe the 2 years after the induction year, but this is by no means universally agreed. For the purpose of the report, EPD can be considered to be the CPD undertaken by those teachers in the year 2-6 phase of their careers.

1.4 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH: OVERVIEW

The overall methodological approach uses a variety of complementary methods to ensure as representative a range of views as possible. Three distinct data collection phases have been identified, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data. The phases are incremental in that each phase informs the next phase, thereby testing and re-testing the analysis adding cumulative integrity and validity to the data. The three phases are outlined overleaf and are matched to the objectives as stated in the tender specification:
Details of the data collection for each phase are discussed in section 4.1, while a more detailed discussion of the rationale for and application of Nominal Group Technique can be seen in Appendix 1.
2 POLICY CONTEXT

This section outlines the policy context for EPD in Scotland, setting it within the wider CPD context, before going on to give an overview of EPD policies elsewhere in the UK. It concludes with a summary of policy-related issues arising.

2.1 THE SCOTTISH CONTEXT

Teachers in Scotland are expected, and indeed contractually obliged, to work within the national CPD framework. Particular aspects of the framework are outlined in a number of policy documents, with a summary entitled ‘Continuing professional development’ published by SEED (now known as the Scottish Government) in 2003. This section provides an overview of that document as well as: Professional Review and Development (SEED, 2003) and the Framework for Professional Recognition (GTCS, 2007), and considers some resulting implications for teachers in years 2-6 of their careers. It also reports on recent evaluations of the CPD framework and draws on existing research carried out by the National CPD Team.

2.1.1 The CPD framework

The SEED CPD document provides a fairly brief overview of the CPD framework, including a description of CPD and explanations of: the teacher induction scheme; the Standard for Full Registration (SFR); Chartered Teacher (CT); the Standard for Headship (SQH); and a questions and answers section. It provides an accessible and readable overview of the Scottish Executive CPD Framework, emphasising that CPD is for all teachers (including managers) and should address their development needs. Whilst acknowledging that the range of experiences that can contribute to teacher development is very wide, it does tend to emphasise the SFR and the more formal routes of CT and SQH. For example, while there is recognition that CPD is not just about taking courses, the bulk of the document is concerned with courses. It highlights the importance of the induction year experience, and while acknowledging explicitly that the SFR is for all teachers, not simply those in the induction phase, it does not focus on the immediate post-induction phase. However, it should also be acknowledged that the document was published in 2003 and that a number of developments have taken place subsequently.

Different CPD pathways are outlined and linked to specific standards: SFR, SCT and SQH. The importance of standards is emphasised and teachers are given the strong message that no matter where they are in their teaching career, there is a relevant standard against which their competence can be assessed. However, while the Chartered Teacher and Standard for Headship routes have end points, the SFR should be used as a career-long aid to identify professional strengths and possible development needs, with CPD planned in conjunction with line managers through the professional review and development (PRD) process. The focus in the Scottish Government’s CPD framework is very much on formal CPD with minimal explicit recognition of informal CPD. McNally (2006), drawing on the work of Frank Coffield, suggests that ‘there is a strong tendency for policy makers, researchers and practitioners to admit readily the importance of informal learning and then proceed to develop policy, theory and practice without further reference to it’ (p2). This will be an important consideration in any developments arising from this project.

2.1.2 Professional review and development

Professional review and development (PRD) is generally recognised as central to CPD, being the process through which CPD needs are identified and planning undertaken. The PRD process is outlined in a document published by SEED in 2003. The document sets the PRD process within the context of the national agreement ‘A teaching profession for the 21st century’ (SEED, 2001), stressing that the PRD process is for all teachers, and describing
CPD activity as ‘anything that has progressed a teacher’s existing skills or enhanced her or his professionalism’.

The PRD process recommends that teachers maintain a CPD profile for the current year and for two previous years if possible; this is a mandatory requirement for entry into the CT programme. It is noted that new teachers will maintain a professional development portfolio during the induction period and should be encouraged to continue with their CPD portfolio. Those entering the Chartered Teacher programme require a portfolio. The document provides an overview of the process together with exemplars. It describes a CPD framework that has six stages – beginners; next steps; building excellence in learning and teaching; into management; aspiring headship; ongoing development for all teachers – and links these stages to the indicators used in How Good is our School, the HMIe evaluation framework.

The PRD process seems key to the challenges faced by year two teachers, although it is not entirely clear where they fit into the six stages. However, the CPD portfolio is identified by SEED as very good practice, and although not prescribed, is highly recommended. New teachers are encouraged to perceive this as a natural extension of the process already undertaken during induction. It is presumably therefore important that probationer teachers are introduced to good practice in the induction year.

2.1.3 Professional recognition

Since the publication of the above documents in 2003, the GTCS has established procedures for teachers to gain professional recognition/registration in specific areas (GTCS, 2007). The guidance document provides an explanation of conditions and procedures for gaining professional recognition. In so doing it recognises the need for flexibility in the profession as well as the need to ensure that the high quality of teachers and teaching is maintained. Professional recognition/registration is open to all fully registered teachers who have at least two years post-probationary teaching experience; so within years 2-6, only those in year 4 or above would be eligible.

In addition to allowing teachers to gain professional recognition in a range of ‘areas of professional interest’ such as literacy, numeracy, assessment, mentoring and, for primary teachers, in identified curriculum areas, it also establishes new procedures for teachers to add categories to their registration. For example, primary teachers can gain additional registration in teaching in S1/2 or in a secondary subject, and secondary teachers can gain registration in additional subjects or as a primary teacher (subject to appropriate qualifications and experience). The professional recognition framework is not mandatory, and is not tied to any specific standards in the CPD framework. Professional recognition is awarded for a period of five years, after which time the teacher is required to provide evidence of ongoing expertise in the area.

While the framework is designed to bring additional flexibility for teachers, its link to the existing CPD framework is perhaps not entirely clear. Nonetheless, for teachers in year 4 and above, it seems to provide another professionally relevant and flexible route for teachers to take in planning CPD that is both personally and professionally relevant to them.

2.1.4 Implications for teachers in years 2-6

In considering the structure of the CPD framework in relation to the needs of teachers in years 2-6 of their careers, a number of observations can be made.

New teachers are included in documents on CPD, PRD and professional recognition. The documents claim that the good practices and processes established in the induction year should continue through the CPD portfolio. The CPD framework (SFR, SQH, SCT) and guidance on professional recognition outline clear career development pathways that can be
undertaken. However, for teachers in years 2 and 3 of their careers there appears to be no specific CPD requirements/opportunities other than to engage in the PRD process (see Figure 2 below).

| Year 1 | Induction |
| Year 2 |
| Year 3 |
| Year 4 | Professional Recognition/Registration |
| Year 5 |
| Year 6 |
| Year 7 | Commence Chartered Teacher Programme |

**Figure 2: CPD opportunities/requirements for early career teachers**

In identifying teachers as being in years 2-6 of their careers, this implies that all teachers follow a fairly standard pattern of induction year followed by full-time teaching. For a variety of new teachers this simply does not happen: some teachers take gap years, some choose to work part-time, some cannot find full-time posts, some undertake short-term supply cover posts, and some work towards full registration outwith the teacher induction scheme. For most of these teachers, engaging in sustained, progressive and planned CPD can be problematic. In addition, studies conducted by Draper *et al* (1991, 1997, 1998 in Wilson *et al*, 2006) highlight the potentially harmful effect of short-term contracts of employment during the probationary period on staff morale and on teachers’ developing sense of professionalism. Although there are recommendations for the inclusion of supply teachers in the policy documentation, there may be inconsistent practice throughout the schools and authorities. There could be serious implications in this inconsistency for new teachers who are employed as supply teachers.

### 2.1.5 Evaluation of Scottish EPD Policies

While there is no specific EPD policy as such to evaluate, a number of recent evaluations of CPD more generally have some relevance to the years 2-6 stage. These evaluations include the GTCS report on probationer teachers’ experiences of the induction scheme (GTCS, 2005); and reports by Audit Scotland (2006) and HMIE (2007) on the implementation of *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* [The McCrone Agreement] (SEED, 2001).

In October 2005 the GTCS published a report on ‘Experiences of the Teacher Induction Scheme: Operation, Support and CPD’, detailing the extent to which the teacher induction scheme, established as a result of the McCrone Agreement, had been successful in meeting the developmental needs of teachers during the early stages of their careers. The GTCS report was the first attempt to evaluate the success of what was, at the time, a radical new approach to meeting the EPD needs of newly qualified teachers. However, it should be acknowledged that the GTCS was evaluating its own policy and therefore might not be considered to be entirely objective.

The evaluation involved surveys being sent to 3908 new teachers, 1222 (31.3%) of whom replied. The overwhelming conclusion was that the current ‘one size fits all’ approach was deemed to be unsuitable and that the challenge was to develop ‘… a programme of professional learning that provides choice for teachers while ensuring progression and coherence for the system as a whole …’ (GTCS, 2005).

Many respondents felt that the 0.7 FTE did not adequately prepare them for classroom teaching and bemoaned the fact that they would be asked to vacate their posts at the end of
the year, seeking supply posts instead. Many perceived this as taking a step backwards. This is an important contributory factor to the position in which year 2 teachers find themselves.

The next attempt to closely examine CPD provision in Scotland was the Audit Scotland first stage review of the implementation of the McCrone Agreement. The report, ‘A mid-term report: A first stage review of the cost and implementation of the teachers’ agreement A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century’ was published in May 2006 and offered some interesting insights identified during the empirical stage of the review. The auditors discussed the impact of the McCrone agreement through examination of six key areas, one of which was ‘professional development and support’. Recommendations were that systems aimed at monitoring the impact of CPD on teaching and learning be established and that examples of good practice from other professions be disseminated and implemented. Steps were to be taken to ensure that CPD activities were targeted correctly at the teachers for whom they had been created.

Then in January 2007 HMIE issued its analysis of the implementation of the McCrone Agreement. In a report entitled ‘Teaching Scotland’s Children: A Report on Progress on Implementing A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century’ they offered a detailed description of progress so far in four domains, including ‘supporting and developing the profession’. They found that, in line with views recorded elsewhere, Scottish teachers valued being able to develop understanding of good practice through observation of other classroom practitioners. The importance of CPD was recognised:

_for many staff, the Teachers’ Agreement has led to increased levels of self-awareness and a sense of focus on personal and professional needs. It has helped many to understand more clearly the importance of CPD in improving the learning experience and achievement of pupils._ (HMIE, 2007)

Although there was no specific discussion of the CPD needs of teachers in the early stages of their careers, there was recognition of the positive impact of programmes already in place:

___There is encouraging evidence of better approaches to continuing professional development for teachers. Improved arrangements for probationers have been particularly welcome. The enthusiasm and skills of these newly qualified teachers provide a sound basis for future improvement._ (HMIE, 2007)

It is therefore important that this early enthusiasm and commitment demonstrated by beginning teachers is not diminished by CPD programmes which may fail to meet their needs.

2.1.6 Existing knowledge in CPD team

The National CPD team, whose role is to support CPD development throughout Scotland (see [http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/cpdscotland/about/team/index.asp](http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/cpdscotland/about/team/index.asp)), has already carried out some investigative work in this area from the perspective of early career (year two) teachers, asking them about their preparedness to teach following the induction year and about their CPD needs. A draft position paper (Taylor, 2006) outlines responses from year two teachers, and staff that supported them during their induction year, in five different local authorities. The paper indicates that the new teachers either appear unclear about the possible CPD pathways, or are more focussed on immediate practical concerns. There is also a disjuncture between the expectations of the new teachers and their schools in relation to the levels and type of continuing support, with the continuation of mentoring in some form emerging as a priority for many new teachers. However, it should be noted that the paper is
currently in draft form and that further analysis of the data is likely. Nonetheless, there are some themes emerging which are worthy of consideration:

Year two teacher respondents were positive about their experiences of the induction year on the whole, but felt that further CPD focused on learning and teaching was necessary, as was CPD focusing on working with other colleagues. There was a view expressed that the move to a full timetable in year two was overwhelming and that additional support would have been helpful. A number of gaps in the induction year were identified and many of these were practical. Suggestions for additions to induction programmes included visits to other schools and working with children with additional support needs. The responses also included recurring references to the value of having a mentor and requests that mentoring continue in some form in year two, although in a less formal way. The year two teachers also felt they needed some guidance on CPD, especially as their thoughts began to focus on CPD activities that would enhance their career progression.

Staff in schools who had supported the year two teachers as probationers felt that the calibre of the probationer was important as well as the quality of support offered, in terms of determining the outcome of the induction year. They too expressed a view that some continuation of mentoring should be recognised as advantageous. Other suggestions included: designated CPD for recently qualified teachers, induction conferences and more emphasis on the provision of welcome/induction packs in schools.

2.2 EPD POLICIES ELSEWHERE IN THE UK

Some researchers, for example Bolam (2000) (in Wilson et al, 2006), have suggested that the emphasis for CPD in the UK has shifted from a focus on teachers’ individual needs to meeting systemic needs reflecting Government policy to raise standards and ensure managerial accountability. Both Northern Ireland and Wales have specific EPD policies which are outlined in this section. No formal EPD policy currently exists in England, although a pilot project was undertaken in 12 LEAs between 2001 and 2004; the context for this and the outcome of its evaluation are discussed later in this section.

2.2.1 EPD in Northern Ireland and Wales

As well as providing information relating to the aims of the EPD stage, the Northern Irish and Welsh documents focus mainly on the technicalities of EPD procedures. As such they provide guidance on practical issues and inform stakeholder groups, for example beginning teachers, headteachers, and governing bodies, of the different steps that need to be taken in order to complete the EPD process successfully. Relevant forms, contact details and appendices are provided.

Both the Northern Irish and the Welsh policies speak of three interrelated or integrated stages underpinning teacher education. The first stage is the initial training stage and is provided by Higher Education Institutions in partnership with schools and other agencies. The second stage is the induction period which coincides with the first year of teaching and this phase is followed by a two-year programme of early professional development in the second and third years of teaching. EPD is seen to provide a structured framework, and forms the foundation for career-long professional development for which beginning teachers should take increasing responsibility as the support programme progresses. The EPD stage provides newly qualified teachers with a programme of monitoring, guidance and support tailored to individual needs. In addition, it builds on the teacher’s knowledge, skills and achievements acquired in previous stages.

The Department of Education in Northern Ireland (2001) has been utilising a teacher education framework based on a competence model since 1996, following a period of
extensive consultation. The competences are associated with personal and professional qualities and are organized under the following five headings:

- understanding the curriculum;
- subject knowledge and subject application;
- teaching strategies and classroom management;
- assessment and recording of pupils’ progress; and
- foundation for further professional development.

A number of specific competences have been marked for development predominantly at the EPD stage, but the EPD stage should also allow the beginning teacher to continue to develop those competences already demonstrated in the initial and induction stages.

The EPD stage is a structured framework which allows the beginning teacher to address his/her career development needs in the context of the school’s wider needs. In addition, it enables newly qualified teachers to developing existing and new competences. Both national policy documents emphasize that the main aim of the EPD stage is to encourage teachers to become reflective practitioners.

A number of structural aspects are in place in both policies:

- **Career-Entry Profile**
  Both policies require beginning teachers to record their competences in a Career-Entry Profile (CEP). This profile links the three interrelated stages and provides a foundation for a continuing process of systematic reflection which underpins professional development.

- **Tutor**
  An EPD mentor will ‘help reflecting on development, improving practice and planning for the future’ (Department of Education Northern Ireland, 2001) and should ‘offer support and guidance as a critical friend’ (Department of Education Wales, 2006). He or she should be a knowledgeable teacher, be approachable, have the ability to offer constructive advice, be a good listener, encourage reflection and be a good role model.

- **Review and formal assessment meetings**
  With Tutor, Head Teacher and staff from other agencies.

- **Observations**
  This shared experience will inform the identification of needs, goals and achievements and can function as a means of reflecting throughout the EPD stage.

- **Reduction of teaching timetable**
  -10% in Wales.

In Northern Ireland, teachers are expected to carry out one professional development activity (PDA) in each of years two and three; a focused activity involving background reading, reflection and subsequent planning (Neil and Morgan, 2003).

In terms of quality assurance and evaluation, in Northern Ireland EPD is subject to inspection. In addition, during 2000, the Committee for EPD established a Working Group to carry out a monitoring exercise. Neil and Morgan (2003) report that evaluations of the programme suggest many teachers find the process ‘too rigidly defined and that it detracts from their teaching’ (p38). In Wales there is no formal assessment of EPD and teachers must take greater ownership of their personal and professional development.

From the Northern Irish and Welsh national policy guidance literature, it is clear that beginning teachers who are not in regular employment may find it difficult to engage in EPD.
in a meaningful way unless they are in one school for a prolonged period (i.e. at least 2 terms in Northern Ireland). Teachers who are employed on a one-year contract and on long-term substitute cover can, and should, take part in EPD. In the case of teachers who are working in more than one school at once (e.g. peripatetic teachers), schools will normally be funded for the EPD stage proportionately so this arrangement should reduce barriers to participation in professional development.

2.2.2 EPD in England

While teachers in England are subject to a fairly prescriptive, standards-based CPD framework, national drivers for change in approaches to continuing professional development in schools have forced many local education authorities (LEAs) to reconsider earlier stances regarding the importance of collaborative working. Successive policies, issued by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (formerly the Department for Education and Schools), have encouraged LEAs to invite teachers to participate in CPD opportunities in which they were not only participants, but were engaged in offering support, advice and training to each other through collaborative learning and the establishment of supportive communities of practice. Partnerships between LEAs have been encouraged with the aim of promoting school improvement through development of CPD capacity and the sharing of good practice linked to use of collaborative enquiry:

> LEAs are in a good position to act as researchers, developers, brokers, connecters, and facilitators of good practice and by doing so they can add significant value to school improvement. (Woods, 2001)

The importance of utilizing existing expertise within schools rather than importing external CPD providers is emphasised, as is the importance of sharing that expertise with schools in the wider community. The underpinning value is acknowledgement of the importance of acknowledging and validating existing practice. Essential to success is a commitment to the enhancement of school based research, resulting in increased research engagement among all practitioners, and/or school communities of practice and enquiry. Also essential is a commitment to effective dissemination of research findings and associated good practice (Handscomb, 2002). Handscomb promotes a model which prioritises ‘learning and developing together’.

Part of the evolving CPD policy in England included a three-year EPD pilot project carried out in twelve LEAs between 2001 and 2004. The LEAs in the pilot projects were awarded £700 per term for each teacher in year two and £300 per term for each teacher in year three, and were given flexibility as to how to use this. The pilot projects were evaluated by NFER (2005).

The programme was based on two underlying principles – (1) second and third year teachers were to have a say in decisions regarding funding of their EPD needs and, (2) there was a commitment to providing each new teacher with a personal mentor. A range of possible impacts of EPD on teachers’ careers were examined:

> … The top five impacts, measured in the final year of the project were

- an enhancement to pupils’ learning
- an enhanced willingness to undertake professional development,
- actual teaching practice
- the contribution made to college and school
- thinking on career development … (NFER, 2005)
It was not only the new teachers who benefited. There was a ‘ripple effect’ which impacted in a positive way on colleagues and pupils. Four pivotal key characteristics contributing to outcomes of EPD were identified – teacher autonomy, school support, mentor support and LEA support. The benefits of a ‘collaborative grassroots approach’ were recognised, as was the commitment of all involved – staff and pupils.

Meanwhile, in 2003, the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) published a report into early professional development in more general terms that is not within the parameters of the pilot project. HMIs visited 61 schools – primary, secondary and special schools and the subsequent report, ‘Teachers’ Early Professional Development’, detailed the particular challenges posed by provision of effective CPD to teachers in the early stages of their careers. It outlined methods of identifying teachers’ early professional development (EPD) needs, evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of EPD, the effect of EPD on teachers’ professional and career development and subsequent impact on pupils work. The importance of achieving ‘value for money’ in this area was also underlined.

Several significant findings emerged. In most schools the review carried out at the end of the induction year ‘… was not used systematically to identify teachers’ development needs or linked closely enough to the setting of teachers’ performance management objectives …’ (Ofsted, 2003).

Many teachers in the early stages of their careers suffered from a lack of appropriate monitoring of individual developmental needs, resulting in EPD provision of very variable quality and suitability. Interestingly, most teachers and their senior managers reported that the most valuable forms of EPD were ‘… the observation of effective teachers in their own and other schools, collaborative planning and teaching with colleagues, and coaching from teacher mentors …’ (ibid 2003). However, despite the relative success of the EPD pilot projects, the programme was not adopted. Rather, due to CPD funding arrangements, LEAs and schools were expected to support EPD through their general CPD provision. More recently though, the Teacher Development Agency (TDA) has embarked upon a three-year project to provide guidance that will support year two teachers more effectively. The project is currently in phase 2: developing guidance, trialling and publishing (April to October 2007).

Based on an assessment of the evidence from twenty research studies of CPD for teachers in England, Bolam and Weindling (2006) report that the majority of their findings support recent and current CPD policy and practice. In addition, from the discussion above, it is clear that the implementation of a structured, supportive programme of EPD impacts greatly not only on the teachers who participate, but also on all those in the context in which they find themselves leading their professional lives. A commitment to Handscomb’s model of ‘learning and developing together’ provides the conceptual basis for an effective EPD programme.

2.3 SUMMARY

The Scottish CPD framework is individually oriented and is based on a series of competence-based standards. Despite an acknowledgment of the diversity of possible CPD experiences, policy documents tend to privilege formal CPD opportunities over informal professional learning. The PRD process is acknowledged as being central to effective career-long CPD, and good habits can and should be embedded in the induction/EPD phases. However, despite the existence of the PRD process as the backbone of Scottish CPD policy, there is nonetheless a gap in the framework of teacher in years 2 and 3. In addition, negotiating the CPD pathways established in the framework can be difficult for those teachers not in consistent, permanent, full-time employment.
Accountability is an issue: those responsible of the auditing and quality assurance of CPD policy appear to be wanting to see measurable outputs, yet this can result in a limited conception of CPD which is easy to measure, for example, the counting of hours as opposed to the consideration of quality experiences.

The teacher induction scheme in Scotland is considered to be a real success, yet its success gives rise to real concerns about continuity at the year 1 to year 2 transition. These concerns relate to both the type and level of support available as well as to the employment status of the post-induction teacher.

EPD and CPD policies elsewhere in the UK are also subject to debate about their focus and purpose, with concerns expressed about the relative focus on individual, institutional and systemic needs.

Both Northern Ireland and Wales have specific EPD policies for year 2 and 3 teachers; policies which share many similarities. However, the assessment/inspection of the two policies is quite different, and raises questions about the impact of policy quality assurance on its implementation. Northern Ireland and Wales share concerns with Scotland about the employment status of early career teachers and the resulting implications for their EPD experiences.

While England does not currently have an EPD policy, contemporary CPD policy debate seems to be attributing increasing importance to the notion of collaborative, contextually relevant EPD/CPD.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review considered a range of different types of literature, including: policy documents; existing literature reviews; empirical studies; and conceptual articles. There was no literature specifically on the year 2-6 career phase, but a range of both national and international literature was reviewed which considered various aspects of CPD in general and early professional development (EPD) in particular.

The review of literature is organised under the project objectives. However, objectives 5 and 6 relate to the outcomes of the empirical data, so are not included in this section. In addition to objectives 1-4, one other important contextual theme is discussed in relation to the literature, namely: teacher development and the early professional development (EPD) phase.

3.1 TEACHER DEVELOPMENT AND THE EPD STAGE

In a literature review of early professional learning by Wilson et al (2006), approximately 3500 articles about teachers’ CPD were identified, although only 13 related to early professional development specifically. They state that, apart from their own report, little has been written about ‘the particular needs of new teachers who have completed their probationary period’. Little attention has also been paid to ‘identifying provision and support which new teachers have found helpful’ and their literature search revealed no published studies relating directly to teachers’ early professional learning, following the completion of their compulsory probationary period in Scotland.

Wilson et al point out that a very large study of early professional learning, part of the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme, has been commissioned (McNally et al, ongoing) but that this will not report until 2008.

The literature reviewed relates to teachers in the induction and early post-induction phase, mainly years two and three, and as such does not cover the range that is being investigated in the context of this project. However, this perhaps indicates that the experiences and needs of years 2-6 cannot be seen to be covered by one perspective, rather the needs of a year two teacher are likely to be quite different from those of a year six teacher. In the Scottish context, the delineation of years 2-6 as a distinct career phase relates more to the structure of the Scottish CPD framework than it does to teacher development per se.

Turley et al recognise the demands on new teachers’ ‘emotions, energy and skills’ (p27), viewing EPD as a social process as well as a technical one.

Teacher development is a complex process; one which has intrigued researchers and practitioners for many years. There exist numerous attempts at understanding and classifying the process of teacher development, ranging from the linear model outlined by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) which suggests that teachers move along a spectrum of: novice; advanced beginner; competent; proficient; expert, through to more elaborate models such as that suggested by Ingvarson (1998), which sets out the following stages of development:

- Provisional registration
- Entry/survival
- Confirmed registration
- Stabilization
- Master teacher
Brighouse (1995 in Wilson et al, 2006) suggests there are 5 stages: initial education and training, beginner teacher to established expert, early management to established expert, consultant practitioner and teacher entering retirement. Fuller (in Wilson et al, 2006) associates different concerns with different stages of a teacher’s development. This theory has been the starting point for much teacher development research in the USA and the three stages he has identified are as follows: concern for self (primary survival as a teacher), concern for the task (focus on actual performance) and concern for impact (relating to positive influence on pupils). However, others (Pigge and Marso, 1997 in Wilson et al, 2006) have suggested teachers are concerned about impact throughout their development and that this is not limited to one particular stage.

Models as described above tend to be fairly linear and in many cases appear to be based on structural considerations such as registration/licensing, with a focus on skill development. Huberman (1993) warns that while for some teachers the process may appear to be linear, ‘for others there are stages, regressions, dead-ends and unpredictable changes of direction sparked by new realisations’ (p4). Huberman (ibid) is credited with proposing the first significant non-linear model of teacher development, based on a 5-stage career cycle. However, Day et al (2007) draw a useful distinction between ‘career stage’ and ‘professional development phase’, arguing that to conceptualise teacher development in relation to career phases is narrow and restrictive. Instead they offer a model which identifies six ‘professional life phases’. The model has been derived from empirical data from 300 teachers involved in a DfES funded study in which they were asked about their perceptions of their own identity, motivation, commitment and effectiveness. Interestingly, despite arguing that teacher development needs to be considered in a wider context than that of career stages, the professional life phases in the model correspond to years of teaching experience. For example, the first phase spans years 0-3 and, according to Day et al, focuses on commitment, support and challenge. The next phases spans years 4-7 and focuses on identity and efficacy in the classroom.

Absent from most analyses of teacher development is any consideration of such concepts as intuition (see Atkinson and Claxton, 2000), informal social learning (see McNally, 2006) and the importance of context to professional development.

Fieman-Nemser (2006) rejects the traditional trajectory of teachers’ professional development following ITE. She argues that such generic models provide little information about the type of learning and make assumptions about the pace and modes of teachers’ learning. A wider conception of teacher development implies a more varied and flexible view of CPD in general.

The concept of CPD is difficult to define (Guest, 2000 cited in Friedman and Phillips, 2004). While diverse interpretations might suffice for everyday purposes, it has been argued that inadequate, imprecise or non-existent definitions of CPD can make comparison of research studies difficult (Cordingley, 2003). However, some authors of more recent articles appear to be attempting to address this issue with several adopting Day’s (1999) definition of CPD as stated in section 1.2 above.

This notion of CPD as ‘all encompassing’ is evident in the literature reviewed (Evans 2002; Friedman and Phillips, 2004; Turner, 2006). Although the needs of induction year teachers have been recognised for some time, recognition of the distinctive nature of EPD; that is teachers in the second to sixth year of their careers, appears to have developed within the
last five years (Banks and Mayes, 2001; Moor et al, 2005; Turner, 2006). A number of the theoretical papers reviewed are based on earlier empirical studies within the context of formal CPD (Bubb and Earley, 2006; Clarke and Hollingsworth, 2002; Friedman and Phillips, 2004). However, there is growing interest in the contribution of informal learning to CPD across professions (Conlon, 2003; Eraut, 2004), in the teaching profession at all stages (Fraser et al, 2007) and EPD in particular (Turner, 2006). The role of informal learning in teachers’ EPD is currently under-represented in literature.

In conclusion, considering teachers in years 2-6 to be one homogenous group is conceptually unviable. None of the empirical studies reviewed here covers that specific stage – most focusing on much earlier professional development, in particular years 1-3. This suggests that the categorisation of years 2-6 in Scotland is more to do with the structure of the CPD framework than it is to do with stages of teacher development, and as such CPD support and guidance must recognise this.

3.2 OBJECTIVE 1: EFFECTIVE CPD AND MODES/MODELS OF DELIVERY

In 2005 an English-based CPD Review Group conducted a systematic review of the literature on the impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning (Cordingley et al).

Evidence of impact of individually oriented and sustained CPD interventions was compared with evidence about the impact on teaching and learning of sustained, collaborative CPD and overall, the evidence showed the effectiveness of collaborative CPD in bringing about changes in teaching and learning (Cordingley et al, 2005; Bolam and Weindling, 2006), which is in line with Handscomb’s model of ‘learning and developing together’. Collaboration was shown to be most effective for professional development and was also said to encourage teacher commitment and CPD ownership if the CPD focus and agenda is set by others. In contrast, the studies of individually oriented CPD provided only weak evidence of their capacity to influence teacher or pupil change. Tentative conclusions made by the Review Group include the proposition that paired or small group work may be more beneficial than CPD in larger groups. In addition, it was argued that CPD which incorporates active experimentation connected to teachers’ own classrooms is most effective in developing teaching and learning and that combining external expertise with in-school learning will have a greater impact on CPD outcomes. The contribution and value of high quality external CPD provision is consistent with findings reported on by Bolam and Weindling (2006). Examples of effects of well structured CPD on teachers include: teacher attitudes and beliefs, teacher knowledge, teacher approaches to learning and teacher behaviours. The impact of teacher CPD on pupils may influence their attitudes and motivation, achievement, behaviour and learning strategies (Cordingley et al, 2005; Bolam and Weindling, 2006). In their synthesis of twenty research and evaluation projects concerned with capacity-building through teachers’ professional development in England, Bolam and Weindling summarise underpinning factors in effective CPD as follows:

- teacher agency and the importance of the availability of differentiated CPD opportunities;
- processes that support professional development, such as coaching, mentoring, collaborative working and reflective practice;
- capacity at the school level including leadership and CPD coordination;
- external support and networking.

A variety of factors linked to successful outcomes for Masters level CPD, in terms of impact on school practice, include: collaborative work, specific workplace mentoring, informed interest from senior managers, a collegiate school culture, consonance with school
development priorities, sufficient time and opportunity to undertake relevant projects, personal development and enhanced promotion prospects.

The focus of this paper (Kearns, 2001) on the identification of how HEIs might move forward in accrediting EPD is interesting, and Kearns outlines three possible ways in which this might be done:

- EPD portfolios can be assessed as reflective, academic, action research studies and submitted to gain named awards at postgraduate level;
- EPD portfolios can be submitted as evidence in claims for Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL);
- schools could verify EPD activity which will subsequently be accepted by HEIs as the basis for postgraduate awards. This would require only moderation of a sample by HEIs.

Effective support from colleagues in school was identified as a significant predictor of successful completion of PDAs – this was true even for these teachers with broken employment patterns.

The article concludes by recommending ‘the facilitation of EPD networks, whereby beginning teachers gain greater control over their own development’ (p. 80).

Rhodes et al (2005) suggest that whilst conclusive evidence does not exist, current research seems to suggest that ‘adequate induction support and engagement with effective early professional development are likely to have implications for longer-term retention’ (p338). The authors highlight a point already made by McNally (2006), when they state that ‘becoming a teacher requires the shaping of a new professional identity’ (p348). They suggest that this process is enhanced significantly by networking and collaboration within the school context, warning that ‘for NQTs working in schools with an impoverished culture of collaboration and with little access to networking, it is reasonable to assume that the transition to an understanding of professional self will be harder to achieve’ (p348).

The aim of Smethen and Adey’s (2005) research was to find out how induction experiences affect the teachers’ early professional development. The study is explicit in its intention to examine the effects of induction in relation to teacher retention, and Smethen and Adey contend that ‘if teacher retention rates are to be improved, there is a need to develop individualised induction support, rooted in professional education, rather than training’ (p187).

A ‘substantial proportion’ of respondents in Thewlis’ (2006) study reported that issues relating to ‘performance management and training and development’ had been lacking in their induction year. Where teachers did have a development plan, 75% felt confident that it would help them in the coming year.

Turley et al (2006) draw on a range of literature in outlining how teacher induction programmes have developed in the last twenty years and the growing focus on mentoring, stating that ‘the type of mentoring and coaching that they receive should be differentiated to address their specific needs, and it should be personalized for their professional growth’ (p28). This clearly has implications for any national system of support which must be flexible enough to support the different needs of early career teachers, yet rigorous enough to ensure consistency in access to appropriate support. The article also stresses the importance of selection and training of supporters or mentors.

In the qualitative responses to the survey carried out by Thewlis et al (ibid) of 119 new
teachers in years 1 and 2 of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment programme in California, four key themes arose in relation to respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of their induction programmes: support provider; networking with colleagues; monthly professional development meetings; and opportunities for reflection. Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, the majority of these concerns relate to social interaction and relationships with colleagues:

- the importance of social and relational aspects of professional development
- maintaining networks with peers at similar stage of development is important

3.3 OBJECTIVES 2 AND 3: YEAR 2-6 TEACHERS’ CPD NEEDS AND THE RELATIVE PRIORITY OF THESE NEEDS

Wilson et al (2006) refer to researchers such as Hustler et al (2003) and Lewis et al (1999), who suggest that length of time in the profession may account for differences in teachers' choice of CPD activity. For instance, newly qualified teachers want their individual development needs to be met and are more likely to undertake CPD related to classroom management or specific aspects of the curriculum. This matches findings from an empirical study reported on by Kearns (2001): when given the choice, early career teachers select professional development activities not only related to school priorities and class priorities but also personal interest. Despite a growing interest in the contribution of informal learning to CPD, a number of studies reported by Wilson et al (2006) indicate that teachers define CPD conservatively and associate it primarily with attendance at courses, seminars and workshops. Bolam and Weindling (2006) report that striking a balance between national, school development and individual needs can be problematic. Indeed, most teachers in a study undertaken in 2003 for the DfES felt that principal drivers of CPD had been school development needs and national priorities and that these had taken precedence over individual needs (Hustler et al, 2003 in Wilson et al, 2006). Across Europe, updating teachers’ subject knowledge and support for curricular reform are the most commonly reported topics for CPD. Other topics include: teaching methodologies, use of ICT, management, special needs, multicultural teaching and behaviour management (Wilson et al, 2006).

As part of the EPD programme in Northern Ireland, beginning teachers are required to undertake professional development activities (PDAs) and to record these in a portfolio. Kearns (2001) found that commonly chosen topics included: ICT, learning difficulties in literacy and numeracy; behaviour management and religious education. Reasons given for the choice of PDA undertaken were interesting: 50% related to a current school priority; 28% to personal choice/interest; and 22% to identified pupil needs. Significantly, needs identified against the competence framework were not mentioned as driving the choice of PDA undertaken. Rather than focusing on the competence-based framework, the study reports that ‘many [of the beginning teachers] focus… predictably upon trialling lessons, extending lesson repertoires or demonstrating curriculum developments that respond to DENI strategic priorities, or the needs of the school or class’ (p78).

Smethen and Adey (2005) carried out a comparative study of post-induction year teachers before and after the statutory induction arrangements came into place in England. They found that both sets of participants reported that the focus of their work moved from ‘managing’ the induction year to deeper consideration of pedagogy in the second year of teaching. They expressed a need for more time for lesson planning so that they could develop their teaching style further. The teachers also recognised the increased pressures in year two brought about by managing a full teaching timetable and the demands of being a ‘fully fledged member of the team’ (p193). While all except one of the teachers in the study reported feeling like a teacher as opposed to a novice in year two, they nonetheless
expressed ‘a preference to discuss issues with teachers who started at the same time as themselves or were recently qualified’ (p196), thereby highlighting the importance of maintaining networks with peers.

Interestingly, the aspects that the second and third year teachers identified as examples of things that would have been useful in supporting their training and development or in career planning were the same issues identified as lacking in initial teacher training: more training courses; observing other teachers teaching; receiving more reviews and feedback; and more support from their mentor, tutor or head of department (p11). It should be noted, however, that the percentage of respondents identifying these as needs was relatively small, ranging from 2% to 8%.

- Networking and collaboration within the school context is vital.
- Accreditation of EPD seems important to local and national governments, particularly in England and in Northern Ireland, but there was no evidence of the extent to which the teachers themselves view accreditation as important.
- Given choice, early career teachers select professional development activities related to school priorities, class priorities and personal interest – not related to competence framework (Northern Ireland).
- In years two and three CPD needs focus on pedagogy and extending teaching repertoires, as opposed to the ‘survival’ focus of the induction year.

3.4 OBJECTIVE 4: BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN CPD

All teachers are expected to engage in CPD although only an estimated 5% of teachers study for an award at Master’s level (Arthur et al, 2006). In England in 2005, a new scheme for government support of teachers’ postgraduate professional development at masters’ level and above was launched by the Teacher Training Agency (now the Training and Development Agency). Higher Education Institutions in partnership with LEAs and individual schools were invited to apply for funding to subsidise fees for teachers on courses leading to postgraduate qualifications. The application process required bids to analyse their proposed provision against seven specific criteria, one of which was ‘to reduce identified barriers to teachers’ participation in postgraduate professional development’ (Arthur et al, 2006). A research project by Arthur et al (2006) explored perceptions of factors affecting teachers’ success in completing assessed work. Although this study looks at barriers to completion of Postgraduate Professional Development courses at Master’s level, it is still relevant to our project in that many stakeholders, especially local authority education officers, deem the provision of postgraduate CPD to be important.

Disincentives to engaging in CPD include reversing the aforementioned factors (collaborative work, specific workplace mentoring, informed interest from senior managers, a collegiate school culture, consonance with school development priorities, sufficient time and opportunity to undertake relevant projects, personal development and enhanced promotion prospects) and in addition financial cost, personal inconvenience (including consequences for work-life balance) and teachers’ lack of self-confidence in undertaking research and written reports. A brief analysis of withdrawals indicated a range of reasons why teachers relinquish an accredited route and included personal circumstances (births, marriages, illness, deaths, relocations) and institutional changes in school (job or responsibility change, department restructuring, refocusing of school priorities) etc.

Participants in Kearns’ (2001) study of the Northern Irish EPD programme also reported that contact with other beginning teachers was ‘generally lacking’, and some felt ‘that they could not be open about their difficulties in completing EPD activities when senior staff in their schools or the ELB were present (p77).
The paper reports on a number of barriers to completing EPD identified by beginning teachers: lack of time; heavy workload in terms of planning, teaching and assessment; and personal, financial and family circumstances (p78).

McNally (2006) examines the early professional development of teachers in their induction year, arguing that ‘the early experience of teaching is largely informal with strong emotional and relational dimensions associated with identity formation’ (p3). McNally acknowledges the complexities of defining ‘informal learning’, but draws on the work of Frank Coffield in suggesting that ‘there is a strong tendency for policy makers, researchers and practitioners to admit readily the importance of informal learning and then proceed to develop policy, theory and practice without further reference to it’ (p2).

Employment status – temporary/supply teachers experience more difficulty and greater variation in EPD support. Not being in regular employment as a teacher or not being employed in a school for prolonged periods. Other barriers to involvement in CPD include lack of support in the workplace, lack of access to resources and facilities available, lack of time, personal circumstances or financial cost.

3.5 KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The following points emerge as key concerns from the literature review. Each point has fairly wide ranging significance to the project but they are linked to the specific objectives to which they have most relevance.

• The years 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is more common elsewhere for ‘EPD’ to be considered as something engaged in by teachers in years two and three.
• Year 2-6 teachers have different needs and work in different contexts; therefore a ‘one size fits all’ programme would not be appropriate.
• Those year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment may have particular difficulty in accessing appropriate CPD/EPD.
• The induction year experience and resulting employment status will have a significant effect on the year 2 teacher and their CPD needs.
• It is important that the end of the induction year report/review is useful to the teacher in year 2 - there is a need for a professional development and learning continuum in which new competences are developed and existing skills are built on.
• The evaluation and review stage in EPD needs to be used to identify development needs more effectively.
• Evaluation and review of CPD in schools should involve monitoring the impact of CPD on teaching and learning.
• Continuing mentoring in some form into the EPD stage is seen as valuable.
• Mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.
• The purpose of EPD should be articulated as this has a bearing on its design and content.
• Situated, contextually appropriate CPD is vital – active experimentation connected to teachers’ own classrooms is likely to have a beneficial impact on teaching and learning.
• EPD/CPD which is too prescriptive can be seen to be less relevant to context and can detract from the teaching task in hand.
• Any national EPD structure and system of support needs to be flexible enough to support individual teachers’ needs yet be rigorous enough to ensure consistency in access to appropriate support.

• Emotional, informal and social learning should be recognised and be made more explicit in the EPD structure. EPD should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example, mentoring, observing, peer coaching, networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD.
The empirical work for the project was designed in three distinct phases:

- Phase 1 – identification of year 2-6 teachers’ CPD needs through Nominal Group Technique (NGT)
- Phase 2 – national survey of year 2-6 teachers sent electronically to all schools in Scotland
- Phase 3 – consultation with stakeholders on recommendations arising from phases 1 and 2

The phases were incremental in that each stage built on the previous one, thus adding cumulative integrity to the findings. A more detailed overview of each phase, including its limitations, is provided below.

4.1 NGT – OVERVIEW AND RATIONALE

Nominal Group Technique (NGT) is a highly structured methodological process which claims to identify the shared views of a group on a specific issue. The process incorporates four distinct phases:

1. Independent generation of ideas in response to a stimulus question
2. Sharing (and listing) of these ideas in round-robin fashion with no discussion
3. Clarification of each individual response, and grouping of similar ideas together
4. Individual voting to prioritise ideas.

The highly structured nature of the process limits the influence of dominant individuals and also limits the influence of the researcher on the group’s deliberations, as the researcher acts as facilitator only, following a strict protocol. It is also extremely time effective as the data is recorded and organised during the session, thereby also ensuring that the data and its organisation have been validated by the participants. The process allows for data to be gathered which reflects both the range of views and the relative strength of views, again making it a very time efficient process.

However, while proponents of the technique claim that it provides consensus of view (Delbeq et al, 1975), critics claim that the structured way in which views are gathered results in artificial consensus (Lomax and McLeman, 1984). In the context of this study, the views gathered through the NGT process were used to inform the next phase of data collection, the national survey, thus limiting the potential drawbacks of considering the NGT data alone to represent a consensus view from the target population.

4.1.1 NGT – data collection

During the month of June 2007, 10 NGT sessions were arranged with a total of 59 participants in the following four local authorities:

- Aberdeenshire
- Fife
- Glasgow
- North Lanarkshire

In all authorities bar one, three separate NGT sessions were arranged and were run either consecutively or concurrently. Numbers of participants per session ranged from 5 to 8, with
two sessions having only 2 participants. For a full discussion of the process including ethical and sampling issues, see Appendix 1. The analysis of NGT data is described in detail in section 4.3, however, in brief, the analysis involved clustering thematically and coding responses to the stimulus question, ‘What kind of CPD would you like at this stage of your career?’ In addition, the CPD needs that were perceived to be of greatest priority were identified using a scoring system.

4.1.2 NGT participant profiles
The vast majority of the participating teachers was female (81% / n=47), whereas only 11 of the NGT session participants were male teachers (1 person did not indicate their gender). The majority of participants were in their 3rd or 2nd year of teaching (assuming year 1 is the induction year), respectively 32% (n=19) and 29% (n=17) – refer to Figure 3 below for an overview. Almost two-thirds of participants worked in the primary sector (64% / n=38), whereas nearly a third (32% / n=19) taught at a secondary school. Three participants indicated that they worked in special education. Most teachers in the NGT sample group had a PGDE/PGCE qualification (64% / n=38) whereas 34% (n=21) had qualified through the BEd route.
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**Figure 3: NGT participants – year of teaching**

4.1.3 NGT – data analysis
The wide-ranging responses to the stimulus question (‘What kind of CPD would you like at this stage of your career?’) were clustered thematically, analysed and coded using the software programme NVivo. Coding categories were created and all comments made in response to the stimulus question were attributed to these codes or ‘nodes’ as they are called in NVivo; a node is therefore a way of bringing together ideas, thoughts and definitions about data, along with selected passages of text. The coding process involved clustering similar items and a final total of 30 nodes or coding categories were devised (refer to Figure 5 in section 5.3). For a complete list of items coded under each node, please refer to Appendix 6.

In addition to analysis of the range of items generated, the NGT structure also allows for the strength of view to be identified, the NGT sessions requiring participants to individually score their top 5 priority CPD needs. The item perceived to be of highest priority was given 5 points, followed by 4 points to the next highest priority item and so on. For all items in each node the total number of points awarded by participants was calculated as illustrated in column three in Figure 5 – also shown is the number of items (i.e. responses) contained within each node. It should be noted that the number of items categorised under each node
is not necessarily indicative of strength of view, and the nodes are therefore not directly comparable. The identification of nodes has been imposed during the analysis process and each node is not necessarily deemed to be a category of similar size or value. Rather, the nodes have been developed in a grounded way to assist in making sense of themes arising from the data.

4.2 NATIONAL SURVEY

The data from the NGT sessions was used together with issues identified in the literature review to develop a questionnaire for the national survey (see Appendix 2). Using this information as a basis for the survey design gave the questions more immediate relevance to the target population. However, in an attempt not to restrict questions to issues identified by the NGT participants, survey respondents were also given the opportunity to add their own issues or to make narrative comment.

The survey was created on the web-based SurveyMonkey application, and a link to the survey was sent by email to headteachers in all Scottish schools, asking them to pass the email on to any year 2-6 teachers in their schools. The research team also took the opportunity to flag up phase 3 of the project – the stakeholder consultation – as headteachers were to be invited to take part in that.

4.2.1 Survey implementation

During the months of September and October 2007, an on-line survey (see Appendix 2) was distributed electronically to year 2-6 teachers. An up-to-date database held by the GTCS indicated that the total number of registered teachers in the target group was 14,828; although not all of these teachers would necessarily be working in schools at present. These teachers were invited to participate in the survey via emails sent to school head teachers, who were requested to forward the invitation on to relevant staff.

The number of responses received was 707. Assuming a target population of around 12,000 (allowing for teachers who were registered but not teaching), this represents a 5.9% response rate. As some responses could not be used due to respondents failing to answer important sections of the questionnaire, the useable sample size was 667 (539 female and 138 male). With a target population of 12,000 and with 677 responses received, testing at a 95% confidence level we have a confidence level of plus or minus 3.5, representing a high level of confidence that the sample is representative of the wider population. Of this sample, 588 teachers were in a permanent teaching post and 89 were in a temporary post, while 639 teachers worked in the state sector and 37 worked in the independent sector. Further demographic information is discussed below. Analysis of open-ended questionnaire responses involved identification of specific themes which were clustered together to form more general categories of themes. Tables summarising all the categories of themes emerging in these analyses for each of the open-ended questionnaire items are presented in Appendix 3.

4.2.2 Survey – respondent profiles

Year of teaching career

As shown in Figure 4 overleaf, respondents were relatively evenly distributed across years 2-6, with the highest number of teachers (171) being in year 3 and the lowest number being in year 6 (113).
Age
The majority of teachers (469) were aged between 22 and 30. The next most common age group was 31-40 (124), followed by 41-50 (77) and 51+ (7).

Teaching qualification
The majority of teachers (474) had PGCE/PGDE qualifications. 172 participants possessed a BEd and 31 teachers reported having another form of teaching qualification. This latter category included combined honours degrees and foreign teaching qualifications.

Level of teaching post
The vast majority of teachers (621) were in unpromoted teaching posts. 53 teachers reported being in promoted posts while three reported that their level of teaching post was unknown at the time of completing the questionnaire.

Teaching sector
The majority of teachers taught in primary (266) and secondary (380) schools. 13 teachers, however, taught in special schools while 8 taught in the nursery/preschool sector. 10 teachers reported working in more specific sectors such as a Gaelic school, autism unit, and education and care centre.

School setting
While the majority of teachers worked in cities (208), towns (195) and small towns (132), a significant proportion taught in schools that were based in villages (68) and rural settings (66).

4.2.3 Survey – data analysis
The survey data was collated in SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com), which provides quantitative data in tabular form, including average response ratings for the ‘tick box’ questions. Narrative responses were collated for each question and analysed thematically using a grounded approach, that is, categories were derived from the data, not imposed by the researcher.
4.3 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Interim recommendations were developed as a result of the analysis of the NGT and survey data. The recommendations, and a brief explanation of how they were arrived at, were outlined in a briefing paper around which the consultation exercise was focused (see Appendix 4). The briefing paper and an invitation to take part in the consultation exercise were sent to head teachers in all schools in Scotland, all local authority CPD coordinators and relevant contacts in HMIE and GTCS. Stakeholders were invited to attend one of two consultation seminars, one in Aberdeen and one in Glasgow, or to take part in the exercise via email. Numbers of respondents were as follows:

Aberdeen seminar 2
Glasgow seminar 9
Email consultation 9

While proportionately these numbers were small, it might reasonably be assumed that had the issue and the briefing paper cited a negative reaction then more responses would have been likely. In addition, the respondents represented all the key stakeholder groups, including a balance of headteachers from primary, secondary and non-state schools as well as local authority CPD co-ordinators and representatives from HMIE and GTCS.

For each recommendation respondents were asked to consider:

- The extent to which the recommendation seemed appropriate according to their own experience of CPD for year 2-6 teachers
- How feasible/desirable it would be for schools to take the recommendation forward
- Other support (from local authorities or national organisations) which might be necessary in order to take the recommendation forward.

Responses from both of the seminars and the electronic exercise were collated under the six recommendations (see Appendix 5). Analysis of the data is presented in Chapter 5.
5 RESULTS

The results from all data collection phases are presented in relation to each project objective. Specifically, results relating to Objective 1 include data from the survey while results relating to Objectives 2 and 3 include data from NGT sessions and the survey. Results relating to Objective 4 include data from the survey and results relating to Objective 5 include data collected in consultations with stakeholders. In addition, a number of important issues that were identified in the survey, but that do not link explicitly, or exclusively, to any of the project objectives are discussed in section 5.5. Objective 6, the recommendations arising from the project, is discussed in section 6.

5.1 RESULTS RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 1: EFFECTIVE CPD AND MODES/MODELS OF DELIVERY

Objective 1 sought to solicit the views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional lives on effective CPD that they had received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery. This objective was addressed predominantly through the survey and results are presented below with illustrative quotations.

5.1.1 Survey Data
Teachers’ views on effective CPD that they had received and best practice modes and models of delivery were collected by way of an open question which invited participants to comment on aspects of effective CPD that they had experienced; the focus it adopted, the form it took and what made it effective. Themes emerging from each of these three parts of the questions are discussed separately below with illustrative quotations and are summarised in Appendix 3.

Focus of effective CPD

Eleven categories of CPD were identified as having been effective. These are listed below in descending order of the number of times they appeared. However, it should be noted that this does not necessarily represent priority as the responses were spontaneous and respondents were not asked to prioritise, merely to give an example of effective CPD they had received:

- Pedagogy
- Subject/sector specific CPD
- Children’s needs
- ICT/new technologies
- National priorities
- Career progression
- Health and safety training
- CPD for probationer teachers
- Mentoring/coaching
- Strengthening links with the wider school community
- Pastoral care/guidance

These categories of themes are summarised below. The number of teachers who referred to each theme is shown in brackets.
Pedagogy (n=121)
CPD relating to pedagogy formed the largest category of themes and comprised sub-themes concerning assessment, learning strategies and behaviour management. The most commonly reported assessment related CPD was Assessment is for Learning (n=23) and Formative Assessment (n=19). A number of teachers (n=12) also commented on the utility of SQA workshops that they had attended. The most commonly reported CPD relating to learning strategies was Co-operative Learning (n=17) and critical/thinking skills (n=7). Other useful CPD on learning strategies included Mind Mapping, Brain Gym and Circle Time. Numerous teachers (n=27) commented on the effectiveness of CPD on behaviour management that they had attended including Bill Rogers and Andy Vass seminars and courses on assertive discipline, challenging challenging behaviour and dealing with violent pupils.

Subject/sector specific CPD (n=68)
Several teachers commented that the CPD that they had found to be most useful was subject specific. Indeed, subject specific CPD represented the most commonly reported single focus of CPD that teachers had found to be effective (n=66). Useful sector specific CPD included nursery planning and approaches to teaching and learning in the upper primary years.

Children’s needs (n=35)
CPD that addressed children’s needs was viewed as a useful topic of CPD and formed a large category of themes. Themes comprising this category related to CPD on children’s psychological, physical, educational and special needs. CPD involving children’s psychological needs included motivation in the classroom, self-esteem and helping children link emotions with thinking and action. Effective CPD relating to children’s physical needs involved courses attended on active play, while children’s educational needs related to encouraging numeracy and literacy. CPD that dealt with children’s special needs formed a large sub-category of themes (n=20). Teachers reported the utility of CPD that had furthered their understanding of specific learning difficulties (e.g. ADHD, Aspergers, Autism, Dyslexia, Dyspraxia) and other special educational needs. One teacher also mentioned the usefulness of CPD on inclusion of looked after children.

ICT/new technologies (22)
Echoing comments made in relation to perceived ICT training needs, a number of teachers reported on the use of CPD that they had received on ICT or new technologies. Of particular use, was CPD held on SMARTboard and Interactive Whiteboard which was reported by 10 and 7 teachers respectively. Website building courses were also found to be useful.

National priorities (n=16)
A number of respondents reported that CPD relating to national priorities was useful. The most common response within this theme (n=14) was CPD received on A Curriculum for Excellence. Training for new curriculum areas was also reported to be useful.

Career progression (n=15)
CPD relating to career progression was commonly reported as having been effective. Here the majority of CPD identified related to leadership and included general leadership courses as well as courses in specific forms of leadership such as pastoral care, curriculum leadership, project leadership and preparing for a promoted post.

Health and safety training (n=6)
CPD to enhance one’s understanding of health and safety issues was mentioned by 6 teachers and involved CPD in the areas of first aid, domestic abuse and child protection.
CPD for probationer teachers (n=4)
CPD designed specifically for probationer teachers was identified as having been effective. Specifically, teachers commended their local authority probationer programmes which included separate CPD training days and weekly meetings for probationers.

Mentoring/coaching (4)
CPD relating to mentoring or coaching represented a small theme generated by responses from teachers who valued subject specific coaching and mentoring provided for probationary teachers.

Strengthening links with the wider community (n=3)
CPD that assisted staff in strengthening links with parents and the wider school community was reported to be effective and included training on developing links with parents and the local community and reporting to parents.

Pastoral care/guidance (n=3)
CPD which enabled staff to gain experience of providing pastoral care or guidance was mentioned by three teachers and included participation in counselling courses and a postgraduate certificate in guidance.

While these topics were identified in response to a question about effective CPD respondents had undertaken, they might also usefully be considered in relation to Objective 2 which explores CPD needs.

Forms of effective CPD
This section considers the different forms or modes of CPD that respondents had found to have been effective. Analysis of responses gave rise to the following five categories of themes which are discussed below:

- Interactive/collaborative CPD
- Presentations/seminars
- In-house CPD
- Shadowing
- In-service

Interactive/collaborative CPD
The largest category of themes related to CPD that adopted a practical or collaborative format, indicating that CPD that involved interacting with others or undertaking practical activities was perceived to be the most useful. Although formats that combined presentations and practical activities were considered effective by many (n=22), it was generally felt that ‘hands on’ CPD was more engaging than lecture-style presentations, as is reflected in the following comment: In general, I find that CPD programmes that involve a practical, hands on approach are more effective than those where you are talked at and given packs and leaflets to read.

Collaboration with colleagues was also reported to be an effective format for CPD in its provision of opportunities to network with others and share good practice. Here, teachers pointed out their preference for working in small groups which often permits more focused tuition. Similarly, several teachers (n=11) mentioned the interactive nature of CPD they had undertaken where, for example, staff completed writing tasks, interacted with others and used different forms of technology. A further aspect of practical CPD that was considered
useful concerned sessions that involved demonstrations of or allowed staff to practice new strategies. Examples of this included teachers participating in the actual activities that pupils would undertake, or demonstrations involving pupils being taught as they would in the classroom. One teacher referred to two examples of such CPD sessions:

Practical CPD with actual practice and examples, not a lecture, e.g. 1: getting to try out SMARTboard, e.g. 2: classroom management training with drama workshop – actors pretending to be difficult pupils – how do you deal with it, how do you react? Excellent.

Presentations/seminars
Whilst the general consensus among teachers was that practically based CPD is the most effective, some (n=7) reported that they found presentation style formats useful. It should be noted, however, that five of those comments related to presentations from experts in the field so it is likely that the expertise itself rather than the way in which it was delivered is what was found to be effective in those cases.

In-house CPD
A number of teachers (n=12) felt that they had benefited from in-house CPD. This included departmental CPD, school-led working groups and CPD delivered in-house by visiting subject development officers. Within this theme, the most commonly reported form of effective CPD was departmental CPD. One teacher, for example, felt that such in-house delivery of CPD could be delivered by staff who had attended external courses, thereby saving costs: Computing teachers get together to discuss and dissemination by other teachers who have been on courses. Why have the expense of all staff going through the same course, having time out of school? However, it should be noted that there is a significant body of research which is critical of the ‘cascading’ approach to CPD (see for example Solomon and Tresman, 1999).

Shadowing
A number of teachers (n=6) identified job shadowing as an effective form of CPD. This theme included shadowing within different departments of the school, residential weeks and visits to other classrooms in other schools. Illustrating the effectiveness of this kind of CPD, one teacher commented: I have visited other schools to watch a particular strategy or scheme being used. It is great to see people putting things into practice and seeing where I can apply this in my job.

In-service
Finally, having in-service days dedicated to CPD was appreciated by many staff (n=7) and included whole school and cluster in-service days.

What made the CPD effective?
Nine themes emerged from analysis of teachers’ responses to what made the CPD in which they had participated effective. These are as follows:

- Way in which CPD was delivered
- Duration of CPD
- Practically useful
- Improved understanding of assessment
- Effectiveness of strategies gained
- Contemporary nature of CPD
- Increased knowledge/awareness
- Not fully covered in initial teacher education
- Helped develop confidence

Way in which CPD was delivered
Strengthening the previously discussed view that effective CPD is practical and interactive in format, a large proportion of teachers linked effective CPD to the way in which it was delivered. Specifically, many teachers found discussion and sharing of ideas with colleagues useful (n=18), as well as the opportunity to network (n=11) and learn from more experienced peers (n=6), or from those from the same subject area (n=3). Typical feedback included the following: The best CPD I have been on has been the opportunity to meet up with colleagues, usually of a similar subject, and share good practice, resources and ideas. With this the impact is immediate. Again, teachers identified practically based CPD as effective and valued opportunities, for example, to attend workshops, engage in scenario sessions, observe demonstrations and try out new strategies. Feedback included:

I have attended workshop style courses on teaching strategies and feel these were effective as the format offered the opportunity to spend a good amount of time discussing the content of each workshop and how it would impact on the classroom. I was also very impressed by a SFA coaching course I attended. The people attending the course took on the role of the children while the instructor took us through lots of practical examples that we could use with any age group.

Provision of follow-up sessions represented a further feature of effective CPD delivery. Specifically, teachers (n=5) recalled CPD which included follow-up class visits by tutors to support the implementation of new strategies. Such delivery of CPD was considered to have substantially more impact than typical Powerpoint presentations, as is reflected in the following response:

I enjoyed the Highland Literacy Programme CPD. It was well organised with clear, useful resources and encouraged interaction between the teachers. The sessions were then followed up with class visits and feedback from the tutors, certainly made more impact than Powerpoint presentations!

The engaging style of the speaker was identified by a number of teachers (n=10) as a further component of effective CPD delivery. Here, typical responses referred to the passion, expertise, knowledge and enthusiasm of speakers, which helped get teachers "fired up" and motivated.

Duration of CPD
While two teachers welcomed the “short and to the point” nature of CPD, a number of teachers (n=7) identified CPD that extended over a period of time rather than a ‘one-off’ session to be effective. Such extended CPD, according to staff, allowed time to cover topics in greater depth and discuss issues with other teachers. Moreover, sessions that were not held over consecutive days allowed teachers time to reflect before the next session and undertake professional reading. One teacher, for instance, stated:  

The time aspect [CPD held over two days] was useful because it gave you a real opportunity to get to grips with how you could use the strategies in your own department. Sometimes I have found that one day courses seem to cram too much in and one comes away a Jack of all trades and master of none.
Time of day, specifically outwith school hours, was a further aspect of CPD that was considered effective. Several teachers (n=11) identified twilight sessions as being effective, while one teacher mentioned distance learning.

**Practically useful**
The practical utility of CPD represented a major theme. One of the most frequently cited comments was that effective CPD provided resources, strategies or ideas that were relevant and could be implemented in class. The following responses illustrate this theme: *it allowed me to adapt many strategies to my own classroom; I enjoy practical days where you bounce out of the room with great new USEABLE ideas; I have used the skills I learned that day a number of times.* Reflecting the benefits of job shadowing, one teacher commented: *I have visited other schools to watch a particular strategy or scheme being used. It is great to see people putting things into practice and seeing where I can apply things to my job.* Extending this theme, teachers reported that CPD involving strategies that can be implemented immediately are especially useful and of greater practical value than theoretically oriented CPD, as is reflected in the following comment:

> CPD looking at learning strategies are the most effective because I can use them straight away to benefit the children...the more hands on/practical CPD, i.e., – I can take away and do it – are more important to me than the theory bits.

**Improved understanding of assessment**
A number of teachers (n=7) commented on the effectiveness of CPD that was related to assessment. Such CPD was considered effective because it provided clarity on SQA expectations and provided an insight into how exam papers are assessed using real life examples. Some teachers felt that this enabled them to mark papers more accurately. One teacher wrote: *SQA CPD workshops are effective because they are subject focused and provide key information about how papers are marked. You also then have resources you can use in school.*

**Effectiveness of strategies gained**
Many teachers (n=19) attributed the effectiveness of CPD that they had undertaken to its provision of strategies that have proven to work. Teachers commented that they have been able to see the effectiveness of strategies in practice and that hints and tips gained have been useful. More specifically, a number of staff (n=5) commented that CPD on behaviour management had assisted them in effectively managing indiscipline. For example, they reported that they were able to deal with behaviour problems more calmly and consistently and implement effective strategies for dealing with everyday situations. The versatility of strategies gained emerged as a sub-theme, with some teachers (n=4) commenting that the strategies gained from CPD were effective because they could be applied to a variety of situations or learning stages.

**Contemporary nature of CPD**
The contemporary nature of CPD emerged as a small theme, which was mentioned by four teachers. These respondents felt that CPD was effective when it provided up to date thinking and ideas for lessons. This was valued as it was seen to be ‘refreshing’ and in some cases, provided an opportunity for update on national developments.

**Increased knowledge/awareness**
A number of comments were made that reflected the increased knowledge or awareness that teachers had gained from their CPD experiences. This theme comprised sub-themes relating to increased awareness of issues affecting pupils, increased reflection on teaching and increased awareness of national priorities. The most commonly cited response within
this theme (n=7) concerned the effectiveness of the CPD in understanding learning from pupils’ perspectives and how to cater for all pupils’ needs. The effectiveness of the CPD in helping teachers understand the ‘bigger picture’, that is, issues that affect pupils outside of the classroom, was also reported. On another aspect of increased knowledge, some teachers (n=5) specified the effectiveness of CPD for increasing their awareness of national priorities. Specifically, two teachers reported on how CPD had provided an insight into A Curriculum for Excellence needs and approaches and its practical implications. Others reported finding CPD useful because it linked with national initiatives. Examples of the perceived effectiveness of CPD for promoting reflection on one’s teaching style or approach to teaching included comments that the CPD had encouraged teachers to make lessons more engaging and to try different approaches. Typical feedback included: …they were good because they encouraged you to think about the way in which you teach rather than the subject itself.

Not fully covered in initial teacher education
This small theme emerged from two responses conveying that effective CPD addressed a topic (additional special needs and assessment) that received limited coverage during initial teacher education. One teacher wrote: ...effective because it covered an area of assessment which I believe is vitally important as a teacher but something not enough focus is placed on during the PGDE course.

Helped develop confidence
Finally, a small number of teachers (n=4) found CPD to be effective because it helped them to develop confidence for teaching. Comments included perceptions that CPD had raised confidence for teaching in general, as well as in particular areas such as marking. One teacher commented: …it was good to see that experienced and inexperienced teachers had the same problems assessing writing. It gave me more confidence in being able to assess children’s work.

Ineffective CPD
Although it was not an objective of the project to gain views on ineffective CPD, some teachers commented on CPD experiences which they had found to be unhelpful. Given the potential for such feedback to provide an insight into how CPD provision might be improved, responses are reported here. The most commonly reported concern (n=9) related to content or presentation. CPD that lacked resources or new ideas, failed to link concepts to the classroom situation, lacked originality and presented old ideas in a ‘gimmicky’ fashion was considered to be ineffective in content, while CPD that was overly reliant on presentation or presented by tutors perceived to be ‘out of touch’ and unrealistic, failed to engage. One teacher wrote:

For the most part, CPD has been ruined for me by attending badly presented courses. A typical example: ‘Here is a Powerpoint, here is a paper print out of the Powerpoint, I shall now read out loud the Powerpoint, we will now stop for ten minutes for you to do a paired discussion task’ (this only lasts two minutes and we spend the rest of the time complaining about how we could be spending our time).
5.1.2 NGT Data
Although it was intended for Objective 1 to be addressed in the questionnaire only, some relevant data was collected during NGT sessions. Specifically, a key theme that emerged from the NGT data concerned CPD mode or delivery. This was viewed to be of high importance, receiving a relatively high number of points (52) and appearing in the top three priorities in one of the NGT sessions (see Figure 6). In addition, a theme emerged that related to the perceived need for more practically based CPD. Adding further strength to the forms of effective CPD identified in the survey, the NGT data revealed a desire for a variety of delivery modes and the more specific need for twilight sessions. A number of teachers also expressed the wish for consolidation of CPD, i.e., progressive development as opposed to one-off sessions; opportunities to get together with other teachers to share ideas and to have external experts visit the school and provide feedback on teaching. Further supporting survey responses, the need for practicality included more ‘hands on’ time in CPD sessions, observations of real life situations and practical ideas for the classroom.

5.1.3 Summary of data relating to objective 1
A number of aspects have been identified through both the NGT sessions and the survey as being central to the ‘effective’ CPD. These are listed below, but must be considered alongside the understanding that NGT and survey participants’ views of what constitutes ‘effective’ CPD are influenced by their individual perceptions of the purpose of CPD; this was not something that was asked. According to the NGT and survey responses, effective CPD should/might:

- Be practical and collaborative, offering opportunities to network and share practice
- Include demonstrations of, and experimentation with, new strategies in ways that connect directly to own classroom context and can be implemented immediately
- Be progressive, offering opportunities for consolidation and reflection between sessions
- Link with national initiatives and be contemporary and original
- Offer opportunities for shadowing/observing
- Include supportive processes such as mentoring
- Be supported by the school through effective leadership and coordination
- Be differentiated to accommodate the wide range of needs identified by year 2-6 teachers, in terms of both focus and mode of CPD.

5.2 RESULTS RELATING TO OBJECTIVES 2 AND 3: YEAR 2-6 TEACHERS’ CPD NEEDS AND THE RELATIVE PRIORITY OF THESE NEEDS

Objectives 2 and 3 concerned identifying teachers’ views on their CPD needs and the relative priorities of those needs. Data relating to these objectives were collected in NGT sessions and the survey and are presented below.

5.2.1 NGT Data
Figure 5 overleaf shows the range of nodes, or categories, identified by NGT participants and also indicates the number of points awarded to items in each of these nodes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Number</th>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Total points awarded to items in this node</th>
<th>No. of items in this node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CfE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Career guidance &amp; progression</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Subject or topic specific CPD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Behaviour management strategies</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CPD mode or delivery</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Management &amp; leadership</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sharing practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Broadening experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Observation and shadowing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Professional terms and conditions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Exam issues and moderation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Personal &amp; interpersonal development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stage or context specific CPD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Practical CPD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Research, development &amp; scholarship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pastoral care &amp; guidance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mentoring and coaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Working with others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Collegiate CPD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>National initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Extra-curricular opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Familiarisation with resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: Node listing and total number of points and items per node**

As illustrated in Figure 5, the node with the highest priority score (96) is the ‘CfE’ coding category. Teachers in year 2-6 indicated and prioritised the need for EPD in relation to CfE and would particularly welcome guidance on how the new curriculum will affect classroom practice. More guidance on how to implement CfE was wanted along with support for cross-curricular learning and integration of topics. With 82 points, ‘Career guidance and progression’ was the second highest scoring node. Teachers emphasised a need for more information about career pathways, particularly for the phase after year 6, and in addition, support with practical skill development is wanted, e.g. help with development of interview skills. This node can be linked to node number 8 – ‘Management and leadership’ – as is shown in Appendix 7 (Appendix 7 provides a diagrammatic representation of the ways in which the themes arising from the NGT data are linked and inter-related). This node covers needs relating to leadership development and development of management skills.

‘Pedagogy’, the third highest priority node, covers a wide range of EPD needs relating to active learning, formative assessment strategies and specific teaching techniques such as cooperative learning and mind-mapping. Node number 4 contains a wide range of items...
relating to specific subjects or topics and EPD needs mentioned are in a variety of primary and secondary areas including maths, expressive arts and Higher level subject specific training. The ‘ASN’ node covers the need for information about (identification of) specific learning difficulties as well as EPD in the area of learning support. The ‘Behaviour management’ node includes items relating to behaviour management skills and restorative practice. Different to most other nodes, the ‘CPD mode or delivery’ category refers to structural aspects of EPD rather than covering content-based CPD needs, relating more directly to Objective 1. Connecting nodes also containing structural EPD needs are ‘Observation and shadowing’, ‘Mentoring and coaching’ and ‘Collegiate CPD’ (refer to Appendix 7). EPD experienced with other teachers is a recurring theme in many nodes either explicitly in categories such as ‘Sharing practice’, ‘Working with others’, ‘Mentoring and coaching’ and ‘Collegiate CPD’ or more implicitly as mentioned in the ‘CPD mode or delivery’ node.

Relative priorities of CPD needs
To further refine the data gathered, an analysis was made of the top priority items identified in each NGT session. For each NGT session, the top 3 priority items were taken. Two NGT sessions had two items in equal third place and therefore these two sessions have 4 items that were included. For analytical purposes, the top 3 priority items for each NGT session were matched to their accompanying nodes to provide us with an overview of priority nodes. It should be noted that as two NGT sessions had two participants only, their priority scores have been excluded from this analysis. An overview of top priority items by node is shown in Figure 6 below:

![Table: Top priority items by node](image)

The above analysis of data in relation to strength of view and top priority items informed parts of the survey undertaken in Phase 2.

In summary, the analysis of the NGT data provides a list of the range of themes arising as presented in Figure 5, as well as an indication of the year 2-6 teachers’ CPD priorities, as seen in Figure 6.

5.2.2 Survey data
As previously outlined, some questionnaire items were designed to test the representativeness of findings acquired through the NGT process. One such question (Question 10) asked teachers to prioritise on a scale of 1-5, a number of CPD needs which were derived from the NGT analysis. Figure 7 presents the average rating allocated to each CPD need (on a scale of 1-5 where 1 = ‘not important at all’ and 5 = ‘very important’), in addition to the percentage of respondents who indicated the CPD need as an important (4)
or very important (5) priority. Although the survey responses were largely supportive of findings from the NGT process, some differences should be noted. Firstly, the top priority identified in the survey concerned keeping up to date with teaching strategies rather than CPD relating to A Curriculum for Excellence. Secondly, subject or topic specific CPD and having a greater variety of modes of CPD delivery were prioritised more highly in the survey than in CPD sessions. Although the format of the NGT sessions was likely to have stimulated more thoughtful responses than the survey, given that more participants were involved in completion of the survey than in NGT sessions, more weight should arguably be placed on the survey results when interpreting the findings from both data collection phases. It should also be noted that the survey sample was more representative in terms of the year of teaching than the NGT sample which was dominated by teachers in years 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD need</th>
<th>Average rating</th>
<th>Percentage indicating rating of 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up to date with teaching strategies in order to meet specific pupils’ needs (e.g. formative assessment, cooperative learning, active learning)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing more about A Curriculum for Excellence and how it will impact on my practice</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject or topic specific CPD</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management strategies</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater variety of modes of CPD delivery (e.g. accredited programmes, sustained progressive learning rather than one off courses, networking with other teachers)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and supporting specific learning difficulties</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional training in Support for Learning</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and guidance on career progression</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing greater awareness of contractual rights and responsibilities in a range of areas</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Average ratings given to specified CPD needs and percentage of teachers indicating that item is either important or very important

The ratings for question 10 were then broken down by year of teaching service (see Appendix 8). While no striking differences of view were apparent, there were patterns in four of the items which are worthy of mention. The identification of CPD relating to CfE went up
slightly with year of service, indicating that those teachers most recently qualified felt most confident with CfE (although they still rated this as being very much a CPD need). Perhaps the most striking pattern is the decrease by year of experience, in the identification of CPD on behaviour management strategies as a need. This pattern was also mirrored for the item on ‘additional training in support for learning’; that is, teachers with fewer years of service were more likely to identify this as a CPD need. The converse was true for CPD on leadership; those with more experience, arguably beginning to look for leadership roles, were more likely to identify this as a need than those with fewer years of service.

To supplement Question 10, teachers were asked to specify any additional CPD needs that they may have. The main themes that emerged from responses to each question are discussed and illustrative quotations are provided. As mentioned above, a summary table of themes is presented in Appendix 3. It should be noted that many of the issues identified were already covered in Question 10, and so the themes presented are not necessarily new, but add depth and illustration to previous responses. Analysis of responses gave rise to the following eight broad categories of themes:

- Teaching methods/resources
- Marking/assessment
- Specific/subject related CPD
- Pupil support
- CPD relating to non-curricular areas
- Career progression
- Understanding national initiatives
- Needs arising from limitations in current CPD provision

The specific themes comprising these general themes are illustrated in Appendix 3 and discussed below.

**Teaching methods/resources**
This theme related to CPD that would help staff develop new teaching resources or strategies. Supporting results of the NGT sessions, one of the most common responses included the need for training on ICT or new technologies. Several teachers (n=13) commented that they would appreciate training on how to use technologies such as SMARTboard and Interactive Whiteboard as a teaching tool or means of sharing good practice. New technologies that teachers felt they would benefit from gaining training in included digital camera and video, podcasts, digital film making and web design. One teacher felt that the need for proficiency in ICT was so strong, that training in addition to one’s personal CPD was required: *As a school of ambition with a high level of ICT, [we] need good regular ICT input to keep up with pupil needs – over and above AWB personal CPD.*

CPD to help develop teaching resources was a further need commonly recognised and included the requirement for an increased range of resources and formats through which to teach lessons. One teacher, for example, felt that having an increased repertoire of teaching resources would assist in addressing individual pupils needs: *I would like to have experience of a wider range of literature, media etc. to teach in the class and also to give me more ideas for meeting individual pupil requirements.* On considering how these resources might be gained, some teachers (n=3) noted that they would appreciate opportunities to learn new teaching methods from others via inter-school CPD, co-teaching and observation and sharing classroom practice. Feedback included:
When you leave teacher training college, you never (or rarely) have the opportunity to see others teach and to look at different ideas, so I feel I am using the same things over and over again…as the youngest in the department I feel under pressure to show my colleagues new things …I feel that more inter-school CPD on teaching methods would be useful.

As in NGT sessions, the need for CPD relating to specific learning strategies was identified by a number of staff (n=9). Specific learning strategies such as Brain Gym, Active Play, and outdoor learning were specified as well as strategies relating to national initiatives including Co-operative Learning and Assessment is for Learning. Finally, a small number of teachers (n=3) mentioned their desire for strategies to assist in managing behaviour (n=1) and in promoting psychological skills such as motivation, confidence and enterprise (n=2). The perceived need for development in promoting psychological skills among pupils represents a new CPD need that was not identified in NGT sessions.

Marking/assessment
Supporting the node identified in NGT sessions on exam issues and moderation, some teachers (n=5) highlighted their requirement for CPD relating to marking and/or assessment. Comments related to marking advice for specific subject areas including Higher History, creative writing and art. One teacher, for instance, reported: Attendance at the SQA base in Dalkeith to see how all the art work gets assessed and to see standards would be an asset to my teaching.

Specific/subject related CPD
Paralleling findings from NGT sessions, one of the most commonly reported needs included subject specific CPD and specific courses such as training to support teaching in Gaelic and courses for boarding students. Several teachers (n=9) identified the need for more subject specific training in a variety of subjects (not all teachers specified the subject) and a small number (n=2) of teachers highlighted the need for CPD in practical subjects such as art and design.

Pupil support
As in NGT sessions, the need for CPD in the area of pupil support was commonly reported. This theme comprised issues relating to supporting children with special needs, understanding the needs of pupils from different cultural backgrounds and general pupil support such as pastoral care and guidance. The perceived need for development in the area of understanding the backgrounds of pupils from different cultures represented a new theme which, although related to the node on inclusion, was not mentioned specifically in the NGT sessions. Teachers identifying this need commented that they would appreciate CPD on teaching pupils with little or no English and on understanding the different cultural backgrounds represented by their pupils. Those reporting the need for CPD relating to supporting children with special needs felt that they would benefit from being informed of new ways of providing support and better understanding of conditions such as autistic spectrum disorders. One teacher also expressed dismay at the lack of courses available for those in the SEN sector: There are very few courses available specifically for teachers in the SEN sector in my authority and I feel these would be very useful as many courses aimed at mainstream schools are completely irrelevant.
CPD relating to non-curricular areas
As in the NGT sessions, CPD relating to non-curricular areas was mentioned by a small number of teachers and included support for extra-curricular activities and responsibilities and mini bus driving. Some teachers (n=5) also reported the need for first aid and health and safety training.

Career progression
CPD needs relating to career progression were reported by a number of staff (n=8), and largely related to management and leadership development. One teacher also commented that advice on career progression would be appreciated while another identified the need for guidance on gaining chartered teacher status.

Understanding national initiatives
The need to better understand national initiatives was reported by a few teachers (n=3) and included being kept informed of developments relating to A Curriculum for Excellence and how they will influence the curriculum. One teacher expressed frustration at the perceived lack of meaningful progression relating to the programme, writing: ACE – what is happening? A Lot of people cynical – re-branding of same old problems. Nothing changes. Concrete steps instead of theoretical jargon. Another teacher expressed the need for training on the McCrone agreement: We need trained on the legal side of the McCrone agreement as we all have very heavy timetables and it is very difficult to cope.

Needs arising from limitations in current CPD provision
A number of CPD needs emerged from perceived limitations in current CPD provision (although this is dealt with in more detail in relation to Objective 4 in section 5.3). Here, the most commonly reported themes (n=3) included the need for better access to CPD such as having more flexible options for undertaking CPD (e.g. during evening times or via DVDs or online resources), and being able to access CPD from remote locations. One teacher commented: As I am in a very rural situation, it'd be good if my local authority would run CPD programmes open to all in all areas of the islands instead of the better options being run in the main town. Other responses included the need for more variety in courses offered, more CPD that includes group working and more CPD on “what actually qualifies as CPD.” Finally, one teacher suggested that discussions to identify the CPD needs of groups of teachers would be beneficial: It would be of benefit to have a small discussion group led by the school’s CPD coordinator or promoted member of staff to identify the CPD development needs of individual departments or groups of teachers.

5.2.3 Summary of data relating to objectives 2 and 3
CPD needs and priorities identified through the NGT and survey data relate principally to:

- Keeping up-to-date with teaching strategies
- Additional support needs
- National priorities, especially CfE
- Subject specific development
- ICT
- Behaviour management
- Career progression.
5.3 RESULTS RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 4: BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN CPD

Objective 4 had two goals: to collect teachers’ views on barriers to their participation in CPD and to make recommendations as to how these barriers might be overcome. The first part of this objective was addressed in both open and closed questions in the survey, the results of which are discussed below. The second part of the objective relating to recommendations is considered in section 6 which deals specifically with recommendations arising from the project as a whole.

5.3.1 Survey data

Figure 8 presents the average rating allocated to each CPD barrier in addition to the percentage of respondents who rated the barrier high (4) or very highly (5). In general terms it should be noted that there were no items where the average response exceeded 3, therefore presumably indicating that respondents did not feel that there were significant barriers to their engagement in CPD. Financial cost was the most frequently reported highly rated barrier (32%), followed by lack of flexibility or variation in local authority CPD provision (28%) and geographical location (18%). Other barriers concerning personal circumstances, CPD not relating directly to career progression prospects, employment status, school CPD culture and policy were relatively evenly distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier to participation in CPD</th>
<th>Average rating</th>
<th>Percentage indicating rating of 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority course provision which is not sufficiently flexible or varied</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD that is not directly linked to career progression prospects</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My geographical location</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances and difficulties with work-life balance</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policy on CPD entitlement</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD culture in my school</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being in stable employment (i.e. long-term/permanent contract)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Average ratings given to specified barriers to participating in CPD and percentage of teachers indicating that item is either important or very important

Responses to this question were broken down by year of service (see Appendix 9). As might be expected those respondents in the immediate post-probation year (year 2) were more likely to identify a lack of stable employment as a barrier. The ratings for this item decreased slightly the longer teachers worked (with the exception of year 6 which showed a very slight increase on year 5). As might also be expected, there was a very slight increase in the identification of ‘CPD which is not directly linked to career progression’ as a barrier corresponding to years of teaching experience.
A supplementary open-ended question invited teachers to specify any further barriers to participation in CPD. Again, many respondents used this question as an opportunity to elaborate on barriers that they had identified in the preceding question and so many of the themes emerging from responses do not represent new ideas. The following nine themes emerged from analysis of the data, which are discussed below and summarised in Appendix 3:

- Budget constraints
- Lack of support from school
- Time constraints
- Accessibility
- Availability of CPD
- Content/format of CPD
- Recognition for informal/in school CPD
- Personal circumstances
- No further barriers

Budget constraints
Although they had already identified the financial cost of courses as a barrier in the preceding question, many teachers made further comments relating to budget constraints. The cost of cover for classes was a commonly identified barrier (n=9) which resulted in restrictions on the time that could be spent out of school, limited number of staff being able to attend, or in most cases, staff not being able to attend at all. Typical responses included: [Barriers include] venue and time opportunities, particularly if I would like to visit another school/teacher and this has to be done during school hours. It can be difficult for schools to have funding to cover such activities...Other responses relating to budget constraints included severe budget cuts for CPD within the local authority (n=3) and the school having limited or no CPD funds (n=4).

Lack of support from school
A number of comments were made that reflected teachers' frustration with the school policy on CPD entitlement or CPD culture within the school management. The majority of responses referred to staffing problems caused by teachers attending external CPD during school hours, specifically, lack of class cover (n=19), as illustrated in the following comment: It is difficult to attend courses because cover in schools is so tight it becomes more hassle than it's worth! Barriers teachers had encountered that were caused by management decisions were varied and in a few cases, reflected the notion that school management were unsupportive, or indeed, obstructive. For example, school managers were reported to have rejected teachers' applications to attend promotion related courses (n=2), to have failed to provide CPD targets during reviews despite requests (n=1) and to have been generally unhelpful (n=1). In addition, the ethos and policies towards CPD within some schools was perceived by some to be unsupportive with, for example, the focus of CPD being on meeting the school development plan (n=1) or extra-curricular work (n=1) rather than personal needs.

Time constraints
One of the most commonly cited barriers to engaging in CPD concerned time constraints. With regard to CPD held during school hours, numerous teachers (n=24) reported having difficulties finding the time to fit CPD into everyday teaching due to priorities and commitments elsewhere. Typical responses included: I am a new teacher, who, I feel is still very much learning in the classroom, building resources and ensuring that my class is running sufficiently that CPD is sometimes an after thought. Finding the time to plan cover lessons was also seen to be problematic and some teachers (n=3) reported feeling guilty about leaving their classes to participate in CPD. Other time related barriers to undertaking
CPD included finding time to identify available CPD (n=1), having no time to share CPD experiences with colleagues (n=2), having CPD sessions clash with family commitments (n=1) and having a lack of time to put CPD gains into practice. This latter theme is illustrated in the following response:

So far I have found that it’s great to get out on CPD days to meet up with colleagues and remember that the world does not revolve around your school. However, on return to school invariably you never get time to stop and think about what you have learned and how to progress with it. It’s hugely frustrating when this happens as it feels a bit of a waste.

Accessibility
Gaining access to CPD represented a large theme and comprised sub-themes relating to employment status, location, inconvenient timing, registration difficulties and poor communication on CPD opportunities. Employment status was a barrier for nine teachers, five of whom had no access to CPD due to not being employed on a permanent basis. One teacher wrote: As a supply teacher I am currently excluded from CPD normally given to permanently employed teachers. Is CPD available to supply teachers committed to one authority and/or who are on long-term contracts? A further four teachers explained that places on CPD courses are often prioritised for those who are either in a promoted position or who have longer lengths of service: A lot of good courses tend to get offered to promoted staff and long-term staff. I would like to have more chances to go! A number of teachers (n=7) expanded on difficulties associated with the geographical location of where external CPD was held. For these staff, the inconvenience and costs associated with having to travel served as a barrier, as is illustrated in the following comment: My geographical location is the biggest barrier to my participating in CPD. I would like to attend festivals such as SETT but this would involve flights and staying in a hotel. Staff are not always reimbursed and are sometimes responsible for booking flights/hotels themselves. The inconvenience and personal expense is off putting.

The timing of courses was a commonly reported barrier with teachers reporting that CPD sessions often start shortly after or before school has finished, leaving little time to travel to the venue (n=4) and that they often feel too tired to attend CPD at the end of a day’s work (n=5). Responses reflecting these issues included: A lot of CPD courses assume that schools finish at 3:00 and therefore start at 3:30. My school doesn’t finish until 3:30 and this causes many difficulties, and; CPD is something that I feel to be very important. I feel, however, that by the end of the day I am very tired and do not feel that I get the whole benefit of the CPD. Other barriers relating to the timing of CPD included not wishing to attend CPD held in evenings (n=3), weekend courses being unsuitable (n=2) and not being able to attend courses offered on only one occasion due to clashes with other commitments (n=2). Consistent with calls in NGT sessions for more twilight sessions, two teachers commented that twilight or distance learning courses are more convenient.

Registration difficulties served as a barrier for several teachers (n=11) who reported difficulties securing spaces on CPD courses due to limited spaces, courses often being oversubscribed and the prolonged nature of local authority booking processes. Two teachers also commented that their local authority’s online booking system was problematic: …the current online booking system we use is not reliable, wastes time and needs to be rectified to make getting onto CPD courses a lot easier. It does put people off booking on courses. Finally, poor communication regarding CPD opportunities was raised by eight teachers who due to lack of information within their schools or local authorities, did not know how to access CPD. One teacher explained: Courses are very often only offered on one date per year so if they clash with something else you miss it for a year. Another teacher felt that dissemination of information on CPD opportunities from the CPD co-ordinator could have
been improved: There is a slight problem in the trickling down of information from the CPD co-ordinator... it either takes too long that places are already allocated or it doesn't reach me at all.

Availability of CPD
A number of teachers felt that the variety of CPD opportunities, provided by both local authorities and online or distance learning (n=10), was limited. Most teachers felt that courses were generally lacking variety, while one felt that CPD opportunities were not available in areas of interest and another felt that CPD was lacking on “the basics”. The most commonly mentioned barrier (n=11), however, concerned the perceived lack of subject specific CPD, which is illustrated in the following comment: CPD is generic. Far more subject specific CPD is needed. My subject (computing) is fast moving and we get very, very little CPD geared to helping us keep up with the trends. A further related barrier, reported by 5 teachers, concerned the view that courses are often cancelled, sometimes at short notice. One teacher wrote: Every course I have signed up for recently has been cancelled at short notice.

Content/format of CPD
Extending the theme emerging from Question 12 concerning ineffective CPD, a number of teachers (n=13) reported that their previous experiences of ineffective CPD discouraged them from taking up further CPD opportunities. While some staff claimed that the repetitiveness or lack of specificity of CPD previously undertaken served as a barrier, the most commonly cited barrier (n=6) related to what was perceived to be the typical content or format of CPD. Supporting previously discussed themes, and comments during NGT sessions, lecture-style CPD sessions that lack practical elements were considered ineffective. One teacher wrote:

Most courses I have been on I have not found particularly effective or inspiring and so I don’t have much faith in them to be honest. I was taught that sitting listening is not a good way to learn but that is how most courses seem to be run.

Four teachers also identified problems with ‘one off’ courses. Specifically, these teachers lacked motivation to attend such courses due to not being able to follow-up learning gained and perceiving that one-off CPD sessions lack in-depth information.

Recognition for informal/in school CPD
Failing to gain recognition for informal/in school CPD represented a small theme arising from responses from three teachers, two of whom reported that barriers to undertaking in school CPD were caused because such CPD is not recognised as part of the contractual requirement. Extending this notion, another teacher explained that the majority of her personal CPD is undertaken on an unrecognised, but nonetheless time consuming, ‘ad hoc’ basis.

Personal circumstances
The final theme emerging from responses to Question 14 concerned personal circumstances, which some teachers (n=6) elaborated upon after having already specified this barrier in Question 13. The most commonly cited issue within this theme concerned difficulties for teachers with young children attending twilight CPD sessions due to the cost of childcare.

No further barriers
Whilst the vast majority of teachers specified further barriers to participating in CPD, it should be noted that some staff (n=7) indicated that they had not experienced any
further barriers. Indeed, some teachers commented that they have received many CPD opportunities and have been supported by their schools. Typical responses included: *I have a very supportive school. I have had lots of opportunities*; and, *my school has been thoroughly supportive of me taking a proactive approach to CPD opportunities.*

5.3.2 Summary of data relating to objective 4
The survey data did not indicate particularly strong views about barriers, but those that were identified included:

- Cost of courses
- Arranging appropriate cover to be released from class commitments in order to undertake CPD
- Lack of variety in CPD ‘provision’
- School cultures, including a lack of support from school management
- Time constraints
- Timing of CPD events
- Regional differences and limited availability or choice
- Previous negative experiences

5.4 RESULTS RELATING TO OBJECTIVE 5: STAKEHOLDERS’ VIEWS
Six strategic recommendations were developed as a result of the analysis of data from phases 1 and 2:

**RECOMMENDATION 1**
The years 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. **Year 2-6 teachers have different needs and work in different contexts, therefore differentiated CPD opportunities should be provided.**

**RECOMMENDATION 2**
Those year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. Therefore **local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.**

**RECOMMENDATION 3**
The transition between the induction year and year 2 is important, and the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. **Thereafter it is crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process.** There might be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**
Participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicate that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. However, **mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.**
RECOMMENDATION 5
Year 2-6 teachers want CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation. In particular, they want this to focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular CfE).

RECOMMENDATION 6
Informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit. CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers. Therefore opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.

In general terms the six recommendations were welcomed, and the data from which they emerged was seen to mirror the respondents’ own perceptions of the situation. Respondents felt that much of what was being said by the year 2-6 teachers, and what was being recommended in the briefing paper, while relevant to this particular group could be seen to be equally relevant to all teachers. Comments were made about the ‘ethos and culture’ of CPD being vitally important to addressing such recommendations, acknowledging the importance of supporting and encouraging year 2-6 teachers in particular to ensure that retention is maximised. There was also acknowledgement of the potential tensions between school and personal development needs. Several of the respondents also noted links between the various recommendations, seeing them as interdependent.

Many respondents expressed their pleasure at being given opportunity to engage in the consultation exercise, and at having access to the initial results in the briefing paper (Appendix 4).

Recommendation 1 acknowledged that the years 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage, concluding that it is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. The crux of the recommendation stated that year 2-6 teachers have different needs and work in different contexts, therefore differentiated CPD opportunities should be provided.

There was overwhelming support for this position, with acknowledgement that it applies to all teachers and not just those in years 2-6. Some of the comments focused on the induction/year 2 transition in particular, suggesting that it could be more productive in many cases. Mentoring and collaborative activities, while the focus of recommendation 4, were seen to be important ways in supporting differentiated CPD needs. It was noted that creating a framework which was supportive yet flexible enough to meet the range of CPD needs would be a real challenge, and that it should recognise the need for progression in addition to differentiation.

On the positive side, one of the respondents remarked on the enthusiasm of teachers in the early years of their careers, and their openness to change and development. Another group acknowledged the need to ensure that leadership development is supported in years 2-6. One respondent felt that there needed to be better cooperation between schools and local authorities in supporting CPD, while another highlighted the importance of skill and time in ensuring effective leadership of CPD at school level. The potential tension between meeting school and personal development needs was also highlighted here. Other issues raised
were the potential for universities to offer cross-authority CPD to widen the range of available opportunities and the need to ensure that teachers in years 2-6 could gather evidence of their CPD that might be used in claiming APL for Chartered Teacher, for example.

**Recommendation 2** focused on year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment, noting that they may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. This recommendation suggested that local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.

Most of the responses to this recommendation expressed strong agreement with the sentiment. It was suggested that while the responsibility for supporting the CPD of non-permanent staff was a shared one, there might usefully be some national planning to formalise a solution to the problem. Funding CPD for supply non-permanent teachers was identified as a concern.

One response suggested that it was already ‘feasible’ to offer CPD to supply teachers who are in the school, but it should be recognised that this is only a partial solution as these teachers are still likely to have difficulties in planning a coherent programme of development and in accessing collegiate support such as access to PRD.

The importance of addressing this issue was highlighted in terms of its impact on improving the retention of teachers.

**Recommendation 3** highlighted the importance of the transition between the induction year and year 2, suggesting that the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. It went on to say that thereafter it is crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process, suggesting that there might be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

A number of responses stressed the importance of training for reviewers and reviewees in the PRD process, as well as for mentors in general (although this point is also addressed under recommendation 4). School ethos and relationships, and leadership of CPD were also mentioned again here as being fundamental to effective PRD. There were several comments relating to the link between the final profile and the PRD process – suggesting that it could be more effective.

**Recommendation 4** centred on the evidence from participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicating that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. It suggested, however, that mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.

This recommendation again met with the agreement of respondents in the consultation exercise, with appropriate training, support and time being seen as crucial. However, questions were raised over ‘standards’ for mentors and how one might identify a ‘good’ mentor. Other comments centred on issues of mentor selection and motivation, and the adoption of a collaborative approach to mentoring, that is, that the mentoring function does not have to be carried out by one person alone. Recognising mentors appropriately (financially and professionally) was also raised as an issue. Interestingly, one response suggested that links between mentors and leaders might be explored, suggesting that mentors often go on to become school leaders.
**Recommendation 5** highlighted the message that year 2-6 teachers want CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation, with a particular focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular CfE).

While not disputing these perceived needs, several of the respondents felt that the focus on the classroom was somewhat narrow, stressing the importance of CPD relating to school-wide and national initiatives too. While the data from phases 1 and 2 showed that the year 2-6 teachers recognise these wider CPD agendas, the priorities identified in both our empirical data and the literature review, focused on CPD which would have a direct and immediate impact on the classroom context. It appears that the issue is perhaps that the balance between these different agendas needs to be discussed and agreed explicitly. There are links here to the tension discussed earlier between personal and school (or national) needs.

One response seemed to express some concern with the concept of ‘active experimentation’, seemingly implying it might be dangerous to the welfare of pupils. The term might need clearer definition to ensure that it is seen as a positive, proactive approach to trying out new ideas and approaches.

**Recommendation 6** suggested that informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit, acknowledging that CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. It highlighted that collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers, concluding that opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.

This recommendation was endorsed fully in all responses. The positive effects of collaborative CPD were noted, with respondents suggesting that ‘creative solutions’ to CPD should be found, and that action research was one useful way forward. Working within existing learning communities was also mentioned as a feasible possibility.

### 5.5 FURTHER ISSUES

#### 5.5.1 Further issues emerging from survey responses

The final questionnaire item invited teachers to make any additional comments about their participation in CPD. Responses to this question were diverse and included frustrations about expectations for participation in CPD, positive perspectives on CPD and recommendations for future practice. These are considered below.

Some teachers (n=6) took the opportunity to raise concerns regarding expectations for participation in CPD. Specifically, inconsistency across local authorities on expectations for participation, having to document hours of CPD undertaken and the frequent introduction of new initiatives and paperwork was believed to have given rise to ill feeling amongst teachers. Indeed, one teacher commented that the usefulness of CPD had become obscured and a further three staff felt that it had become a ‘ticking box’ exercise. The following responses illustrate these views:

- Some regions provide courses within school hours, however different regions (despite all teachers being on the same pay scale) expect people to give up their own time to attend. There is no consistency across the country and I think this leads to a lot of very bad feeling about participation in CPD.
• I think that teachers already do more than their contracted hours and it seems insulting to be made accountable for documenting these extra hours. CPD shouldn’t just be about attending 35 hours for the sake of it, but more about value for you as a teacher.
• The usefulness of CPD tends to get lost, as the constantly ever increasing paperwork, changing programmes, new initiatives just blur everything into many hours of one step forward and two steps back.

Despite these negative views of CPD, it should be noted that a number of positive comments were made (n=20). In general, these comments related to the benefits of CPD in terms of assistance to teaching, networking opportunities and career development. One teacher, for example, commented: CPD can be invaluable and I would advise any teacher who is at the start or early on in their career to take as many opportunities as possible. On an informal note, there are also excellent opportunities for networking and sharing ideas and methods.

The majority of other issues that were raised have already been discussed above. However, some themes emerged which are worthy of consideration and are discussed below. The number of teachers who commented on the theme is shown in brackets.

**Support in planning CPD (n=2)**
One teacher recommended that teachers should be allocated a more senior member of staff to assist in reviewing and planning one’s CPD, while another suggested that having a framework in place for career progression would be beneficial: It would probably be beneficial to have a better idea of the overall framework of career progression and CPD requirements at this stage so that is something I actively plan rather than courses/activities I sign up to that relate more to classroom practice needs.

**Evidencing CPD undertaken (n=2)**
This theme related to having improved methods for recording and storing information relating to CPD participation. One teacher suggested that an example document would be helpful to demonstrate how to collect and evidence CPD.

**Recognising and defining work as CPD (n=12)**
In general, responses from teachers regarding their participation in CPD reflect the traditional notion of CPD as involving formal activities such as training courses or professional qualifications. Fitting with the conceptualisation of CPD discussed earlier in this project report, a number of teachers recognised ongoing work that they undertook on an ‘ad hoc’ routine basis as CPD, despite it not being formally acknowledged as such. Such CPD included personal reading, such as LTS bulletins and discussions with colleagues, which one teacher felt was the “most useful” means of development. Not having such work recognised as part of the contractual requirement was frustrating for some and four teachers reported that greater clarity on definitions and requirements for CPD are required.

**Individualisation of CPD (n=4)**
Finally, a small group of teachers highlighted the need for CPD to be dictated by individual preferences and needs rather than those of the school or local authority. Comments included: CPD programmes should not be dictated by the region when it is of no use or relevance to the individual. Surely it is the teacher’s right to choose their own CPD without limitations; and, CPD needs to be specific to each individual, not just grouping everyone into a ‘training session’ that has little relevance to the majority of those attending.
5.5.2 Further issues emerging from consultations with stakeholders

It is worth pointing out the positive reaction to this research identified through the stakeholder consultation. Despite small numbers being involved in the consultation exercise, reactions were overwhelmingly positive. In particular, the following comments illustrate stakeholders' appreciation at being given access to the research:

I really appreciate having access to the research findings. They very much support feedback from our own staff. This is very reassuring.

I am delighted to see this research being carried out and such clear recommendations being made.

I look forward to reading the outcomes of this further research.

It is therefore perhaps worth considering how the issue raised in the final report might be shared with the stakeholder community more widely.
6 KEY MESSAGES AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS (objective 6)

This section provides an overview of the key messages arising from the project. These key messages are then considered in relation to the policy context, as outlined earlier, and the literature review, in proposing strategic recommendations.

6.1 Key messages

Key messages are summarised here in relation to the project objectives.

6.1.1 Effective CPD and modes/models of delivery (objective 1)

Respondents identified a number of models of effective delivery, including:

- Practical/interactive sessions (e.g. workshops, small groups)
- Job shadowing /cooperative teaching
- Demonstrations, particularly with role play
- Opportunities to practice new strategies during the sessions
- Follow-up sessions where tutors visit schools to support implementation of strategies

They also identified issues relating to timing and/or duration of CPD ‘events’:

- They favoured CPD that is delivered over multiple session, not ‘one-offs’, allowing time between for consolidation and reflection
- After school sessions should allow sufficient travel time for teachers to get there
- No one time will suit all, but twilight sessions appear to be the most convenient

In terms of content, respondents felt that CPD should be practically relevant and should include strategies/resources, hints and tips that can be implemented immediately. It should also aim to address contemporary issues and provide contemporary resources that are ‘proven’ to be effective and versatile.

6.1.2 CPD needs and the relative priority of these needs (objectives 2 and 3)

CPD needs identified in the survey paralleled those identified in the NGT sessions. While the order of priority varied slightly between the NGT and survey results, and between teachers with different lengths of experience, the following were identified as particular needs:

- Curriculum for Excellence
- Behaviour management strategies
- Keeping pedagogical knowledge and practice up-to-date
- Supporting pupils with additional support needs
- Career guidance and progression
- Subject or topic specific CPD

The relative priority of CPD needs was fairly consistent across the different year groups, although CPD relating to behaviour management and supporting additional support needs decreased in priority according to length of experience, and the priority of CfE as a CPD need increased very slightly in relation to length of experience.

It should also be noted that respondents did not merely identify CPD ‘topics’; they also identified needs relating to CPD mode.
6.1.3 Barriers to participation in CPD (objective 4)
Flexibility and/or variety of local authority provision and financial costs were identified as being the most significant barriers, although in general, respondents did not have particularly strong views about barriers to their participation in CPD.

There were some differences in view relating to respondents’ year of service: those with less experience were more likely to identify a lack of stable employment as a barrier, while those with more experience were more likely to see CPD which did not relate directly to career progression as a barrier.

6.1.4 Implications for stakeholders
A number of concerns arose in the data which have implications for local authorities and schools; implications which probably have relevance to all teachers and not just those in years 2-6. The majority of these implications relate more explicitly to ‘provided’ CPD than they do to proactive teacher-led CPD, although there was a clear message that the respondents wanted consideration of a greater variety of flexible options of accessing CPD, such as DVDs and online resources.

The data suggest that year 2-6 teachers want local authorities to:
- Maximise budgets
- Ensure availability of adequate opportunities, including subject-specific CPD
- Ensure that booking systems are quick and simple to use
- Ensure that adequate places are available on courses
- Ensure that communication between schools and CPD coordinators is strong
- Make CPD available to all staff, regardless of employment status
- Ensure that CPD addresses individual and not just local authority needs.

In addition, the project respondents also want schools to:
- Make CPD policies as supportive as possible and develop a supportive CPD culture
- Consider how best to address difficulties in getting supply cover to release teachers for CPD
- Ensure that CPD addresses individual needs and not just school priorities

6.2 Strategic recommendations
The project design was cumulative, where each phase built progressively on the previous one. The final recommendations arising from the project therefore come directly from the recommendations which formed the basis of the consultation with stakeholders. In light of the positive reaction in the stakeholder consultation exercise, the original six recommendations therefore stand, amended slightly to reflect the feedback gathered. In addition two new recommendations are proposed:

RECOMMENDATION 1
The years 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. Year 2-6 teachers have a range of needs and work in a range of different contexts, therefore a variety of CPD opportunities should be available. Any future developments in the national CPD framework should accommodate the need for flexibility.
RECOMMENDATION 2
Those year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. Therefore national bodies, local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.

RECOMMENDATION 3
The transition between the induction year and year 2 is important, and the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. Thereafter it is crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process; there are implications here for school and CPD leadership. There might also be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

RECOMMENDATION 4
Participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicate that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. However, mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.

RECOMMENDATION 5
Year 2-6 teachers want CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation. In particular, they want this to focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular CfE).

RECOMMENDATION 6
Informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit. CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers. Therefore opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.

RECOMMENDATION 7
While teachers in years 2-6 might have CPD needs particular to their stage of professional development, most of the views expressed in the project could equally be seen to be relevant to all teachers, a point endorsed in the stakeholder consultation exercise. The wider implications of the research for teachers’ CPD in general, should therefore be recognised and taken on board where appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION 8
Participants in the stakeholder consultation exercise expressed their appreciation at being given access to the interim research findings with some requesting access to the final report. Stakeholder engagement with this issue is vital in order for developments to move forward and consideration should therefore be given to a dissemination strategy which includes making the findings available and accessible to teachers and other relevant stakeholder.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Rationale for and application of the Nominal Group Technique

NGT is a methodological process which identifies the shared views of a group on a specific topic. It was developed by Delbecq and van de Ven in 1968, and was originally conceived as a 'participation technique for social planning situations' (Delbecq et al., 1975, p108), social planning situations being defined as: exploratory research; citizen participation; utilisation of multidisciplinary experts and proposal review. The technique has since been applied in a wide variety of group settings, including empirical research in the social sciences. While it has been used to some extent in education research (MacPhail, 2001; Lloyd-Jones et al., 1999; Lomax & MacLeman, 1984; O'Neil & Jackson, 1983), in terms of social science research it appears to be used most commonly in the field of health studies.

NGT is a highly structured process incorporating four distinct phases:

1. Independent generation of ideas in response to a stimulus question
2. Sharing (and listing) of these ideas in round-robin fashion with no discussion
3. Clarification of each individual idea, and grouping of similar ideas together
4. Individual voting to prioritise ideas

An NGT session typically takes between 1½ and 2 hours (Gibson & Soanes, 2000) and involves between 5 and 10 participants (O'Neil & Jackson, 1983; Delbecq et al., 1975). The role of the researcher in NGT is that of facilitator and administrator, therefore minimising influence on the data (Lloyd-Jones et al., 1999). Lomax & McLeman (1984) refer to the 'omniscience of the researcher' (p184) in many research methods where the assumptions of the researcher are imposed through the framing of questions and the coding of responses. This is minimised in NGT, as the organisation, categorisation and prioritisation of responses is driven by group members.

The formation of the stimulus question, however, is crucial to the success of the technique, and it is vital that the researcher is clear about what they want to find out from the process. Delbecq et al. (1975) compare NGT to using a microscope: 'Properly focused by means of a good question, NGT can provide a great deal of detail about the matter of concern to you' (p74). They claim that in order for participants to provide this richness of data they must themselves be knowledgeable in the area under consideration. In this particular project, all participants are within the defined population and will therefore have knowledge and experience of CPD and views on their own particular CPD needs.

The NGT process results in a list of responses to the question(s) in priority order and, it is claimed (Delbecq et al., 1975), provides a consensus of opinion. This claim has since been disputed (Lomax & McLeman, 1984; Lloyd-Jones et al., 1999), primarily because it is argued that the highly structured nature of the process influences group dynamics in such a way that it results in an artificial consensus. It should also be noted that in obtaining consensus, however, the researcher is unable to determine from the data where competing perspectives lie. In the case of this particular study, however, the use of the same NGT exercise with several groups and the existence of official consultation data on individual aspects of the CPD framework will enable triangulation of data. Nevertheless, NGT is also open to criticism that the results are not necessarily generalisable to the whole population, as the technique forces an artificial consensus to be arrived at (Lloyd-Jones et al., 1999). However, for the purposes of this study, generalisability is not a key aim; more important is the exploration of a variety of views. The assertion is therefore made that the results are reliable for the
particular groups involved but are not necessarily representative of the entire teaching population.

Delbecq et al (1975) contend that the decision-making process incorporates two distinct phases – fact-finding or problem identification, and evaluation or information synthesis – which should not be dealt with concurrently (as in traditional group discussions). NGT is structured in such a way that these two processes are dealt with independently. Indeed, at the end of an NGT session, data will have been produced for each of these phases, making the technique efficient in terms of its data yield. It is also efficient in terms of time, as the data from the session is written up in the presence of the participants as part of the process and there is therefore no need to audio-record and transcribe the discussion or for subsequent transcript validation by participants.

The flexibility of NGT is further enhanced by its production of both qualitative and quantitative data: qualitative in terms of the articulation of pertinent issues and quantitative in terms of the rank ordering of priorities. This ‘allows the researcher to improve the accuracy of their conclusions’ (MacPhail, 2001, p168).

The structured nature of the process also allows for more equitable levels of contribution than traditional group discussions, as every participant contributes (certainly in the round-robin generation of ideas and in the voting process) and each individual idea is considered. The group is deemed to be ‘nominal’ as the process relies on individual contribution and not on interaction – the ‘group’ is therefore a group in name only. Limiting interaction (of participants with each other and of participants with the researcher) removes the potential for dominance and bias to influence the outcome. The researcher’s role is limited to that of information manager, therefore limiting the opportunity to influence the production of ideas (O’Neil & Jackson, 1983). A further advantage in terms of participants’ control is that the ideas and their categorisation are informed directly by the participants and not the researcher. This lends greater integrity to the data (MacPhail, 2001). Indeed, Gibson and Soanes (2000) go as far as to claim that ‘members have an equal opportunity to contribute’ (p462). However, this claim has met with some dispute, as others (Lomax & McLeman, 1984) have argued that, while NGT can limit the influence of dominant and/or high status individuals, it cannot eradicate their influence completely. In this study, NGT was therefore employed as a means of enabling group ideas to be pooled while at the same time minimising the capacity for dominant participants to exert undue influence on the outcome.

Proponents of the technique claim that participant satisfaction is higher in NGT than in other group interview situations (O’Neil & Jackson, 1983), a key consideration in this study as the participants would be invited to take part voluntarily and in many cases in their own time.

The structured nature of NGT brings many benefits, essentially achieved because its focus on ‘the consumer rather than the producer’ (Lomax & McLeman, 1984, p183), results in data that has had a maximum input from group participants with a minimum of influence (other than administrative) from the researcher.
Appendix 2: Questionnaire distributed electronically to teachers in years 2-6 of their careers

Teacher Questionnaire

Please note that the following questionnaire is meant to illustrate the questionnaire items only and that the survey will not be distributed to potential respondents in this format. Instead the questionnaire will be made accessible online through an internet-based resource called SurveyMonkey.
Research into Early Continuing Professional Development (after induction) – Questionnaire

The Quality in Education Centre (QIE) at the University of Strathclyde has been commissioned by Learning and Teaching Scotland to undertake research into the CPD needs of teachers in years 2 to 6 of their careers. The research is being carried out by a team from the Faculty of Education together with colleagues from the Universities of Aberdeen and Glasgow. The principal investigator is Dr Aileen Kennedy and the project manager is Summer Kenesson, Director of Quality in Education. A team of academic staff and research assistants will contribute to the various aspects of the research. (Please see below for aims of the Teacher Development Project*).

We are inviting you to complete a questionnaire as part of the study. The purpose of the questionnaire is to identify views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional life on effective CPD they have received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery. In addition, you will be asked about your CPD needs and about any barriers to participation in CPD.

The information obtained from the questionnaires will contribute to a report to be prepared for Learning and Teaching Scotland. This information will be treated as confidential and no individual, school or local authority will be identified in the report. The data may also be used in subsequent publications, and will be treated with the same confidentiality.

The questionnaire should take around 10 minutes to complete. Please return the completed questionnaire in the free-post envelope provided.

By completing and returning the questionnaire you are indicating your consent to take part in the above study and accepting the conditions outlined above. Please do not complete the questionnaire if you are not a teacher in the post-probationary period of years 2-6 of your professional life.

If you have any problems accessing or completing the questionnaire, please contact Colleen Clinton (email: colleen.clinton@strath.ac.uk; telephone 0141 950 3690).

Thank you for your time

* The project aims are as follows:
  1. To seek the views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional life on effective CPD they have received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery;
  2. To seek their views on their CPD needs;
  3. To seek their views on the relative priorities of their CPD needs;
  4. To seek their views on barriers to their participation in CPD and make recommendations on how these barriers might be overcome;
  5. To compare the views of these teachers with the views of other stakeholder groups such as head teachers, local authority employers and experts in CPD;
  6. To develop recommendations that can be used by LT Scotland to guide the development of future programmes of CPD support.
ABOUT YOU

1. Assuming that the induction year is year 1, what year of your teaching career are you in?

   Year 2
   Year 3
   Year 4
   Year 5
   Year 6

2. What is your gender?  [ ] male  [ ] female

3. Please indicate your age by ticking the appropriate box:

   22 – 30
   31 – 40
   41 – 50
   51+

4. What is your teaching qualification?

   [ ] PGCE / PGDE  [ ] BEd  [ ] Other, please specify:

5. Please indicate whether your post is permanent or temporary:

   [ ] Permanent  [ ] Temporary

6. Please indicate whether your post is unpromoted or promoted:

   [ ] Unpromoted  [ ] Promoted
### ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

7. In which sector do you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery / Pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate whether you teach in the state or independent sector:

- [ ] State
- [ ] Independent

9. Which of the following best describes your school context?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR CPD NEEDS

10. Please rate the following CPD needs on a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 = Not important at all and 5 = Very important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD Needs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing more about the <em>Curriculum for Excellence</em> and how it will impact on my practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up to date with teaching strategies in order to meet specific pupils’ needs (e.g. formative assessment, cooperative learning, active learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional training in Support for Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and supporting specific learning difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and guidance on career progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject or topic specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater variety of modes of CPD delivery (e.g. accredited programmes, sustained progressive learning rather than one off courses, networking with other teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing greater awareness of contractual rights and responsibilities in a range of areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please specify any other CPD need(s) you may have:
EFFECTIVE CPD

12. Please describe CPD that you have undertaken that you consider to have been effective. What was the focus on, what form did it take and what was particularly effective about it?


BARRIERS TO CPD

13. Please indicate to what extent the following are barriers to your participation in effective CPD, whereby 1 = Not a barrier at all and 5 = Very much a barrier:

1 = Not a barrier at all to 5 = Very much a barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to CPD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My geographical location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being in stable employment (i.e. long-term/permanent contract)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD culture in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances and difficulties with work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD is not directly linked to career progression prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policy on CPD entitlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority course provision is not sufficiently flexible/varied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Please specify any other barriers to participation in effective CPD you may experience:


15. Please add any other comments you would like to make about CPD:


Thank you very much for completing this survey.
Appendix 3: Tables summarising specific, intermediate and general themes identified in the analysis of responses to questionnaire items 11, 12, 14 and 15

Q11: Please specify any other CPD needs you may have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific theme</th>
<th>Intermediate theme</th>
<th>General theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn new teaching methods from others via inter-school CPD</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn teaching methods from others</td>
<td>Teaching methods/resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for co-teaching and observation of experienced teachers</td>
<td>Developing teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to share classroom practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased range of resources and formats through which to teach lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived need to continue to develop learning and teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having wider range of teaching tools to address individual needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop resources for teaching English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child friendly resources – for pupils of all stages of ACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use ICT in classes (Smartboard, interactive whiteboard)</td>
<td>ICT/New technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need regular OCT training over and above personal CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using podcasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital camera and video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using ICT, especially Smartboard to share good practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use of ICT, especially digital editing, both sound and video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital film making and web design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Gym/ways of bringing movement into class</td>
<td>Learning strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative learning courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of AiFL strategies</td>
<td>Strategies for promoting psychological/behavioural skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and confidence building strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing enterprise within learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural management in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching story writing in the upper primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD to model good practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking advice (esp. for creative writing)</td>
<td>Marking/assessment</td>
<td>Marking/Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking and course delivery in SG and Higher History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending SQA base to see how subject specific work is assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater awareness of post 16 SQA courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More exam writing courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific theme</td>
<td>Intermediate theme</td>
<td>General theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of building creativity in art and design</td>
<td>CPD for practically based subjects</td>
<td>Specific/subject related CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical based CPD for practical subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subject related CPD</td>
<td>Subject specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised resource for subject specific CPD like English system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject specific courses perceived to be lacking and too expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses for boarding students</td>
<td>Specific courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to support teaching in Gaelic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding autistic spectrum disorders</td>
<td>Supporting children with special needs</td>
<td>Pupil support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being informed of new ways of supporting children with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses aimed specifically at those in SEN sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching pupils with little/no English</td>
<td>Understanding the needs of pupils from different cultural backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical guidance on EAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD to understand religious backgrounds represented by pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support and guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating the secondary curriculum to meet needs of lower abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for extra curricular activities and responsibilities</td>
<td>CPD relating to extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>CPD relating to non-curricular areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minibus driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid/health and safety training</td>
<td>Health and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management CPD on being a faculty head</td>
<td>Management/leadership development</td>
<td>Career progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and leadership courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development and advice on career progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how to gain Chartered Teacher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Teacher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on legal side of McCrone Agreement</td>
<td>Understanding national initiatives</td>
<td>Understanding national initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the curriculum be affected by the CfE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD relating to the Curriculum for Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Access to CPD for supply teacher
- Improved access to CPD

### Improved access to CPD
- Needs arising from limitations in current CPD provision

### More flexible access to CPD (evenings, DVDs, online resources)
- More access to Higher Product Design courses offered by universities
- Being able to access CPD in the island areas
- Discussions led by school CPD co-ordinator to identify needs of groups of teachers
- CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### Access to CPD in evenings
- More access to Higher Product Design courses offered by universities
- Being able to access CPD in the island areas
- Discussions led by school CPD co-ordinator to identify needs of groups of teachers
- CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### More access to Higher Product Design courses offered by universities
- Being able to access CPD in the island areas
- Discussions led by school CPD co-ordinator to identify needs of groups of teachers
- CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### Being able to access CPD in the island areas
- Discussions led by school CPD co-ordinator to identify needs of groups of teachers
- CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### Discussions led by school CPD co-ordinator to identify needs of groups of teachers
- CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### CPD on what qualifies as CPD
- Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### Group working
- More variety in courses offered

### More variety in courses offered

---

**Q12:** Please describe CPD that you have undertaken that you consider to have been effective. What was the focus on, what form did it take and what was particularly effective about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific theme</th>
<th>Intermediate theme</th>
<th>General theme</th>
<th>Aspect of CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority probationer CPD</td>
<td>CPD for probationer teachers</td>
<td>CPD for probationer teachers</td>
<td>Focus of useful CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly meetings for probationers covering many aspects of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and management course</td>
<td>Career progression</td>
<td>Career progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management development course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about becoming a PT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open University course to teach a second language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping children to link emotions with thinking and action</td>
<td>Children’s psychological needs</td>
<td>Children’s needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active play in the early years</td>
<td>Children’s physical needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging numeracy and literacy in the early years</td>
<td>Children’s educational needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses specific to young children’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding specific learning difficulties (ADHD, Aspergers, Autism, Dyslexia, Dyspraxia)</td>
<td>Children’s special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Course/Training Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for learning</td>
<td>Children’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special educational needs</td>
<td>Sector specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of looked after children</td>
<td>Subject/sector specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the classroom outdoors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery planning in the early years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to teaching and learning in the upper primary years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE</td>
<td>National priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for new curriculum areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AitL</td>
<td>Assessment related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment to develop new teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course at Glasgow Caledonian University on how previous year’s exams were marked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Grade/Higher assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing exemplar exam work with standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Learning</td>
<td>Learning strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical/thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly phonics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-empowered learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management</td>
<td>Behaviour management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT (interactive whiteboard)</td>
<td>ICT/new technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT – SMART Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website building course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop motion animation and ‘green screen effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science based CPD on modern technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid/health and safety training</td>
<td>Health and safety training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring new probationary teachers</td>
<td>Mentoring/coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject specific coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National priorities**

- AifL
- Formative assessment to develop new teaching strategies
- Course at Glasgow Caledonian University on how previous year’s exams were marked
- SQA workshops
- Standard Grade/Higher assessment
- Marking workshops
- Seeing exemplar exam work with standards
- Co-operative Learning
- Mind Mapping
- Critical/thinking skills
- Jolly phonics
- Brain Gym
- Circle Time
- Self-empowered learning
- Behaviour management
- ICT (interactive whiteboard)
- ICT – SMART Board
- Website building course
- Stop motion animation and ‘green screen effects
- Science based CPD on modern technology
- First aid/health and safety training
- Domestic abuse
- Child protection
- Mentoring new probationary teachers
- Subject specific coaching
- Mentor training
| Developing links with parents and local community | Strengthening links with the wider school community | Strengthening links with the wider school community |
| Reporting to parents | Pastoral care/guidance | Pastoral care/guidance |
| Postgraduate certificate in guidance Counseling course |  |

<p>| Hands on practical course Workshops Mix of practical and discussion Small groups which allowed for one to one tuition Small groups and networking with other teachers Groups meetings with teachers from different secondary schools to discuss and create resources Sharing good practice and demonstrating effective techniques used | Practical CPD Interactive CPD Collaborative CPD | Interactive/collaborative CPD Form of useful CPD |
| 2-day interactive course 1-day interactive course Interactive Presentations and practical activities Discussion and sharing of ideas Drama workshop – role play effective Involved teachers doing actual activities that pupils would do Practical workshop with children being taught as in classroom or other demonstrations CPD that demonstrates activities in action are the most effective Group activity, discussion and problem-solving more useful than PowerPoint presentations Practical sessions, not lectures, are effective Presentations from experts in the fields PowerPoint and seminar form Working group that fed back to other teaching staff via presentations | Presentations and practical activities Demonstration/practicing of strategies Practical sessions more effective than lectures Presentations/seminars |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-house departmental CPD</th>
<th>In-house CPD</th>
<th>In-house CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After school in house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house courses delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by visiting subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house ICT course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most effective CPD takes place in department within context of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School led working groups to develop policy within the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential week</td>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td>Shadowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to other classrooms in other schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing within different departments in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various in-set days</td>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>In-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school in-service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster in-services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion and sharing ideas/practice was very useful</th>
<th>Interaction with colleagues</th>
<th>Way in which CPD was delivered</th>
<th>Effectiveness of CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to share practice and learn from peers/more experienced teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers were split into ability groups so very specific training was provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to discuss issues with colleagues from same subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunity to share ideas and resources with other schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops allow for collection of as much information as required and consultation with specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being given scenarios and having to consider how would respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to try strategies so could see how they would work in classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical ideas were explained and demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task based rather than watching PowerPoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of listening, doing and observing most useful</td>
<td>Provision of follow-up sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed up with progress check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies were proven and demonstrated through school follow up session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school inset with follow-up twilight sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions followed up with class visits – more useful than PowerPoint format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD was followed-up with class visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired by knowledge, passion and practical expertise of speaker</td>
<td>Engaging style of delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm and motivation of speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker was very interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, informal, practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly explained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to discuss strategies with other teachers very useful</td>
<td>Benefits of extended nature of CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective because extended over a full year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective because continued over time with ongoing support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to reflect/implement before the next session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled teacher to work at own pace in own time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended learning experience rather than ‘one off’ course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend session meant had more time to cover topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twilight session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short and to the point</td>
<td>Short nature of CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting practice into context</td>
<td>Practically useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided resources, ideas and/or strategies that could be implemented in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided practical ideas that are relevant to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned new strategies through shadowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of CPD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical ideas that can be implemented immediately, not theory. CPD had an immediate effect on planning and operation of class. Strategies could be implemented immediately.

Presence of RMPS teachers who clarified SQA expectations. Improved the accuracy of marking. Used real examples from student exams. Provided skills to assess pupils practically. Improved understanding of marking style as able to talk to experienced teachers.

Able to see the effectiveness of CPD on practice. Small hints and tips have been useful. Helping manage discipline in an effective way. Improved understanding of assessment.

Improved understanding of strategies gained. Effectiveness of strategies gained. Strasbourg learning and formative assessment Strategies can be used at all learning stages. Versatility of strategies learned.

Ineffective CPD. Co-operative learning and formative assessment CPD. Inaccurate and repetitive. Lack of clarity on level at which CPD will be pitched. Lack of tick boxing CPD. Strategies effective for supporting use of PLPs. Practical teaching and learning strategies that work.

Small hints and tips have been useful in an effective way. Improved understanding of assessment.

Ineffective CPD. Poor content/presentation. Inaccurate and repetitive. Persistence providers. CPD a waste of time due to poor presentation.
Course did not present or provide resources for new ideas
CPD is not always linked to the classroom situation
Often presented by the same people and reverts back to the same content
Presenters are often ‘out of touch’ from teaching and have unrealistic ideas
Provided up to date thinking and practical ideas for lessons
Inspiring and refreshing as dealt with contemporary issues
Provided opportunity for update on developments
CPD that provides up to date information on current issues is useful
Helped reflect on job and other contexts for topic
Encouraged reflection on teaching style
Encouraged to think about how to make lessons more engaging and to develop lifelong learning skills
Thinking has changed and more willing to test different approaches
Helped understand learning from pupil’s perspective
Helped consider ‘the bigger picture’ outside the classroom
Fuller understanding of how to cater for all pupils’ needs
More aware of domestic abuse issues and how to deal with them
Raised awareness of issues affecting pupil motivation
Helped reflect on job and other contexts for topic
Encouraged reflection on teaching style
Encouraged to think about how to make lessons more engaging and to develop lifelong learning skills
Thinking has changed and more willing to test different approaches

Contemporary nature of CPD

Encouraged reflection on teaching/ different approaches

Increased awareness of issues affecting pupils

Encouraged reflection on teaching/ different approaches

Increased knowledge/awareness
Linked with national initiatives
Increased understanding of impact of new guidelines for teaching Highers
Provided an insight into AiFL and ACE needs and approaches
Provided insight into practical implications of ACE
First aid training enhanced supervision of extra-curricular activities
Useful to know rights and responsibilities relating to health and safety
CPD on ASN especially useful as limited coverage at university
CPD on assessment not adequately covered in training
Developed skills and confidence
Helped develop confidence in a particular area (e.g. marking)

Increased awareness of national priorities
Increased awareness of health and safety issues
Not fully covered in teacher training
Helped develop confidence

Question 14: Please specify any other barriers to participation in effective CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific theme</th>
<th>Intermediate theme</th>
<th>General theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of courses</td>
<td>School has no CPD budget/limited funds</td>
<td>Cost of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted to one day course due to difficulties funding cover</td>
<td>Being unable to visit another school as limited funding to provide cover</td>
<td>Cost of cover for classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/cost of funding for cover if attend course during school hours</td>
<td>Having to receive CPD indirectly as cost allows for only one staff member to attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe budget cuts for CPD within local authority</td>
<td>Multiple members of the department cannot attend as it causes staffing problems</td>
<td>School unable to support staff attending external CPD during school hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses during school working time often not supported by school</td>
<td>Feeling that don’t have the right to attend daytime CPD courses due to being new staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of class cover if attend CPD during school hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School not permitting new teachers to attend promotion related courses
Applications for CPD rejected by line managers as timetable too full
Lack of targets for CPD during reviews despite requests
Ethos and attitude in school
Focus in school is on extra-curricular involvement rather than CPD
Unhelpful faculty heads
Time consuming internal process involved in gaining permission to attend
CPD limited to that which meets school development plan rather than personal needs
School does not permit/discourages attendance at CPD due to cost

| Finding the time to fit CPD into everyday teaching | Undertaking CPD during school hours | Time constraints |
| Planning cover lessons requires a lot of extra time and effort | |
| CPD clashing with in school commitments | |
| Feeling guilty about leaving class | |
| Finding time for CPD | |
| CPD clashing with family commitments | |
| Finding time to identify available CPD | |
| Having no time to share CPD experience with colleagues | |
| Having lack of time to put information learned in CPD into practice | |

| Lack of support/access due to not being in stable employment | Employment status | Accessibility |
| Difficulties enrolling on courses due to frequently changing schools | |
| Courses not always accessible as not in promoted position | |
| Being placed in an order of priority based on length of service | Location |
| Inconvenience and cost associated with having to travel to attend CPD | Inconvenient timing |
| Too far to travel after the school day | |
| Difficulties getting through traffic when CPD is held in city centre | |
| CPD courses beginning before/shortly after work has finished | |
| Do not wish to attend courses that run beyond 6pm at night | |
| Feeling too tired for CPD after a day’s work | |
| Weekend CPD courses not suitable | |
| Course only offered on one date so cannot attend if clashes with other commitment | |
| Having to attend CPD in own time | |
| Twilight or distance learning courses much easier to participate in | |
Courses get booked up very quickly/limited spaces  
Longwinded nature of booking local authority CPD  
Courses often over subscribed  
Difficulties with local authority’s online booking system  
Lack of information on available CPD  
Inefficient flow of information from CPD co-ordinator  
No access to CPD online so cannot access courses  
Registration difficulties  
Longwinded nature of booking local authority CPD  
Courses often over subscribed  
Difficulties with local authority’s online booking system  
Lack of information on available CPD  
Inefficient flow of information from CPD co-ordinator  
No access to CPD online so cannot access courses  
Registration difficulties  
Courses get booked up very quickly/limited spaces  
Longwinded nature of booking local authority CPD  
Courses often over subscribed  
Difficulties with local authority’s online booking system  
Lack of information on available CPD  
Inefficient flow of information from CPD co-ordinator  
No access to CPD online so cannot access courses  
Registration difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of variety of courses available</th>
<th>Limited variety of CPD opportunities</th>
<th>Availability of CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of CPD opportunities outside of in service days</td>
<td>CPD not available in area of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of varied online or distance CPD</td>
<td>Local authority CPD very limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of CPD on ‘the basics’</td>
<td>Lack of availability of subject specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses are often cancelled, sometimes at short notice</td>
<td>Courses being cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of longer courses with qualification at end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one person per course is permitted to attend per establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repetition and poor presentation of CPD causes a barrier</th>
<th>Not finding CPD useful</th>
<th>Content/format of CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD often repetitive or too generalised to have any impact</td>
<td>Problems with one-off courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of motivation to attend CPD due to CPD not directly assisting teaching</td>
<td>Format of CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being able to follow-up learning achieved in on-off sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-off sessions tend to lack in-depth information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ‘hands on’ work offered by presenters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD seen to be often ineffective due to lecture style form of presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD is often theory driven and lacks practical utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to attend CPD where could ‘set own agenda’ rather than tutor led</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online CPD is complicated and time consuming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD undertaken at school does not count towards CPD</th>
<th>Recognition for informal/in school CPD</th>
<th>Recognition for informal/in school CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time consuming nature of ‘ad hoc’ learning often not recognised as CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregnancy and having young children</th>
<th>Personal circumstances</th>
<th>Personal circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties attending twilight courses due to having young children and the expense of childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No barriers to CPD</th>
<th>No further barriers</th>
<th>No further barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EPD in Scotland:Teachers in years 2-6  
Faculty of Education  
University of Strathclyde
### Question 15: Please add any other comments you would like to make about CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific theme</th>
<th>Intermediate theme</th>
<th>General theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like CPD for probationers, having time set aside for CPD for fully qualified teachers</td>
<td>CPD provision</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make CPD available to supply teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of more CPD at Faculty of Education, University of Strathclyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subject specific CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to what CPD is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a catalogue of all CPD courses available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide follow-up sessions / sessions presented in blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More varied selection of CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a framework in place for career progression</td>
<td>Support in planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having someone to review and plan CPD</td>
<td>CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved methods for recording and storing CPD participation</td>
<td>Evidencing CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example file to demonstrate how to collect and evidence CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities to share good practice and visit other teachers</td>
<td>Interactive CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More practical ‘real life’ experience rather than notes and presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of wider variety of practical teaching courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consistent use of CPD online across schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff should be permitted by management to attend promotion related CPD</td>
<td>Better support from school management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD needs to be part of the school and local authority culture to ensure individual development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising personal research projects as CP</td>
<td>Recognising and defining work as CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having undertaken work that is not recognised as CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most aspects of teaching is ongoing CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading LTS bulletins is useful, not all CPD is course based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More guidance on what activities qualify as part of 35 hour requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most useful CP takes the form of personal reading or discussions with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having CPD explained during initial teacher training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for CPD to be dictated by individual needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD should be linked to personal more than school development</td>
<td>Individualisation of CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific theme</td>
<td>Intermediate theme</td>
<td>General theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad feelings about CPD due to lack of consistency across local authorities on expectations for participation</td>
<td>Negative views relating to CPD requirements</td>
<td>Negative views relating to CPD requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting hours of CPD is insulting and detracts from reason for participating in it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of CPD gets lost with constant introduction of new paperwork and initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD seen as a paper/’ticking box’ exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD attended during class time should still count towards 35 hour requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy CPD</td>
<td>Positive views on CPD</td>
<td>Positive views on CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD is essential and helpful</td>
<td>Positive views on CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD has been worthwhile and useful in career development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD is valuable and offers excellent opportunities for networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD is effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority offers early CPD based on feedback from previous years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regular in-house after school CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions that work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Briefing paper used in consultations with stakeholders and distributed to headteachers across Scotland

Teacher Development:
The CPD needs of teachers in years 2-6 of their careers

This project, commissioned by Learning and Teaching Scotland and carried out by a team from the Universities of Strathclyde, Aberdeen and Glasgow, explores the views of teachers in years 2-6 on their continuing professional development (CPD) needs. The research objectives are as follows:

1. To seek the views of teachers in the post-probationary period of years two to six of their professional life on effective CPD they have received and to identify best practice modes and models of delivery;
2. To seek their views on their CPD needs;
3. To seek their views on the relative priorities of their CPD needs;
4. To seek their views on barriers to their participation in CPD and make recommendations on how these barriers might be overcome;
5. To compare the views of these teachers with the views of other stakeholder groups such as head teachers, local authority employers and experts in CPD;
6. To develop recommendations that can be used by LT Scotland to guide the development of future programmes of CPD support.

METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

The overall methodological approach used a variety of complementary methods to ensure as representative a range of views as possible. Three distinct data collection phases were identified, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data. The three phases are outlined below and are matched to the research objectives stated above:
This briefing paper has been developed for the purpose of Phase 3 – the consultation with stakeholders. It seeks to outline some of the key findings and to suggest some initial recommendations resulting from the data.

RESULTS OF PHASE 1:

Phase 1 used nominal group technique (NGT) to identify both the range of views and the strength of views of a sample of year 2-6 teachers in four local authorities. In total, 59 teachers took part in 10 group interviews. The data from all ten interviews were analysed together to identify the overall range of CPD needs expressed as well as to identify the relative priority attached to particular CPD needs. In terms of the range of needs the following were identified:

| The Curriculum for Excellence |
| Career guidance & progression |
| Pedagogy                      |
| Subject or topic specific CPD |
| ASN                           |
| Behaviour management strategies|
| CPD mode or delivery          |
| Management & leadership       |
| ICT                           |
| Inclusion                     |
| Sharing practice              |
| Broadening experience         |
| Observation and shadowing     |
| Professional terms and conditions|
| Exam issues and moderation    |
| Personal & interpersonal development|
| Stage or context specific CPD |
| Practical CPD                 |
| Research, development & scholarship|
| Planning                      |
| Pastoral care & guidance      |
| Mentoring and coaching        |
| Working with others           |
| Access                        |
| Collegiate CPD                |
| Ethos                         |
| Transitions                   |
| National initiatives          |
| Extra-curricular opportunities |
| Familiarisation with resources|

Table 1: Range of CPD needs identified
When it came to identifying the relative priority of the CPD needs listed, the following items were rated as being of highest priority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Curriculum for Excellence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career guidance &amp; progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject or topic specific CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD mode or delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional terms and conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Relative priority of CPD needs

PHASE 2: NATIONAL SURVEY

A survey was designed drawing on the data from Phase 1 together with data gleaned from literature about barriers to teachers’ participation in CPD. An email containing a link to the electronic survey was sent to all headteachers in Scotland, with a request that they pass it on to teachers in years 2-6 of their careers. A total of 707 teachers responded to the survey.

CPD Needs

Respondents were asked to rate various CPD needs according to how important they were, using a scale from 1 to 5, whereby 1 = Not important at all and 5 = Very important. The following table shows the average rating for each item, indicating its relative priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 10: CPD NEEDS</th>
<th>Average rating of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up to date with teaching strategies in order to meet specific pupils’ needs (e.g. formative assessment, cooperative learning, active learning)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing more about the <em>Curriculum for Excellence</em> and how it will impact on my practice</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject or topic specific CPD</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management strategies</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater variety of modes of CPD delivery (e.g. accredited programmes, sustained progressive learning rather than one off courses, networking with other teachers)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and supporting specific learning difficulties</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional training in Support for Learning</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and guidance on career progression</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing greater awareness of contractual rights and responsibilities in a range of areas</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: CPD needs identified in survey
Barriers to CPD
In terms of barriers to CPD, respondents were asked to indicate how they felt about a range of potential barriers to their participation in effective CPD, whereby 1 = Not a barrier at all and 5 = Very much a barrier. The following table indicates the average rating for each item, again indicating the relative strength of view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 13: BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN CPD</th>
<th>Average rating of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority course provision which is not sufficiently flexible or varied</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD that is not directly linked to career progression prospects</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My geographical location</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances and difficulties with work-life balance</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policy on CPD entitlement</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD culture in my school</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being in stable employment (i.e. long-term/permanent contract)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Barriers to CPD identified in survey

Effective CPD
The survey also asked respondents to describe effective CPD that they had undertaken. A number of key themes were identified as having been the focus of effective CPD:

- CPD specifically for probationer teachers
- Career progression
- Children’s needs (psychological, physical, educational)
- Subject/sector specific CPD
- National priorities
- Pedagogy
- ICT/new technologies
- Health and safety training
- Mentoring/coaching
- Strengthening links with the wider school community
- Pastoral care/guidance

Comments also revealed the forms or modes of CPD that respondents had found to be useful and included the following:

- Practical/collaborative CPD
- Presentations/seminars
- In-house CPD
- Shadowing
- In-service
In summary, the survey analysis indicates the following:

CPD needs:
- CPD needs identified in the survey paralleled those identified in the NGT sessions, i.e. ICT, assessment, subject related, pupil support (including ASN), extra-curricular opportunities, career progression and national initiatives (particularly the CfE).

Best models of delivery:
- Practical/interactive sessions (e.g. workshops, small groups)
- Job shadowing/co-teaching
- Demonstrations, particularly with role play
- Opportunities for teachers to practice new strategies during the session
- Follow-up sessions where tutor visits school to support implementation of strategies

Timing/duration:
- CPD that is delivered over multiple sessions, not ‘one-offs’, allowing time between for consolidation and reflection
- Ensure that after school sessions allow time for teachers from later finishing schools to travel to venue
- No one time will please everyone but twilight sessions appear to be the most convenient

Content:
- CPD should be practically relevant and include strategies/resources, hints and tips that can be implemented immediately
- CPD should aim to address contemporary issues and provide contemporary resources that are proven to be effective and versatile

Local authorities:
- Maximise budgets
- Ensure availability of adequate variety of opportunities, as well as subject specific CPD
- Ensure that booking systems are quick and simple to use
- Ensure that adequate places are available
- Ensure communication between schools and CPD coordinators is strong
- Make CPD available to all staff, regardless of employment status
- Ensure CPD addresses individual and not just local authority needs

Schools:
- Make CPD policies as supportive as possible and develop a supportive CPD culture
- Consider how best to address difficulties in getting supply cover to release teachers for CPD
- Ensure CPD addresses individual and not just school needs

Access:
- Consider providing a greater variety of flexible options for accessing CPD (e.g. DVD, online resources)
CPD guidelines:
- Provision of a clear framework for career progression and guidelines for reviewing and planning CPD
- Clarity on contractual requirements for CPD and improved methods or recording and storing information on CPD participation
- Clarity on definition of CPD, including informal development undertaken

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data from the NGT sessions and the survey, together with evidence gathered from the literature review, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The year 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. **Year 2-6 teachers have different needs and work in different contexts, therefore differentiated CPD opportunities should be provided.**

2. Those year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. Therefore **local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.**

3. The transition between the induction year and year 2 is important, and the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. Thereafter it is **crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process.** There might be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

4. Participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicate that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. However, **mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.**

5. Year 2-6 teachers want **CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation.** In particular, they want this to focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular the CfE).

6. Informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit. CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers. Therefore **opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.**

The Principal Investigator for this LTS commissioned project is Dr Aileen Kennedy. Please direct any queries about this briefing paper to her at: aileen.kennedy@strath.ac.uk
Appendix 5: Collation of responses from stakeholder consultations

Stakeholder consultation response:
Collation by recommendation

RECOMMENDATION 1
The year 2-6 category is borne out of structural concerns and does not signify one homogenous developmental stage. It is therefore vital to recognise that there will not be one solution to supporting effective CPD for all year 2-6 teachers. Year 2-6 teachers have different needs and work in different contexts, therefore differentiated CPD opportunities should be provided.

- I agree.
- Agreed. This comment is also true for effective teachers in later service. Many staff take breaks from service for personal reasons while others continue CPD over a substantial time span. This leads to an ongoing requirement for differentiated CPD.
- I agree with this. The breadth of programme needed to meet all needs requires co-operation between schools and authorities to provide an appropriately varied set of options for staff (at all levels). Our feedback supports the importance of mentoring and also collaborative activities.
- One solution which is common to all year 2 teachers would be a review of the level of non class contact time in the induction year, which at the moment, has no formal recommendation for gradual decrease to better prepare teachers for the level of class contact, delivery & preparation in year 2. This is a critical factor in properly preparing NQTs. Thereafter, differentiated support is as necessary to years 2-6 as any other teacher, due to changing contexts, both nationally, locally and personally (i.e. staff who change establishments and discover gaps between their CPD and that of the team they join). It is essential that action points agreed at the end of the induction year are properly transferred to the CPD plan for year 2, and perhaps added to in response to the new context in which the teacher finds him/herself. The key support any school would require in relation to supporting any programme of differentiated support for CPD is that of management and leadership time. A well led and managed CPD programme takes both skill and time.
- As follows for any team of staff differentiation is always the case. In the majority of cases however teachers in this category tend to be the most enthusiastic, co-operative and adaptive to change, developments and driving the improvement agenda.
- Sharing final profile targets with line manager on entry to new post important.
- Shared responsibility of year 2 teacher/line manager to discuss needs/targets of coming year. Issue of final profile targets being confidential and no requirement to share. Could be converted into PRD targets.
- Identified year 2 programme to bridge. Mentoring could further support.
- Links to recommendation 4.
- How do we create a framework that is not too rigid?
- What is the role/focus of this in connection to SIPs and DDPs – which is the driver of CPD?
- I agree. In our school we already offer CPD based on different staff needs. Our authority also offers support that staff can opt into according to needs.
- Good recommendation and recognise validity of statement.
- See a need for progression (in addition to differentiation) in years 2-6. Continuity from ITE + probationary year – yrs 2-6.
- For secondary teachers progression in teaching other years/groups; more advanced subject content, e.g. Advanced Higher, necessary.
- For primary teachers opportunity to take advantage of opportunities to add to skills for different subjects and age groups.
- Would be helpful for teachers to know where pupils are ‘coming from’ and ‘going to’ academically.
- At what point in a teacher’s career do we start to identify ‘leadership potential’? Need to ensure that yr 2-6 development includes opportunities for leadership/leadership training.
Universities may have a role in providing cross-authority opportunities for CPD that is differentiated. Useful for small authorities.

Need to create opportunities for EPD teachers to ‘bank’ evidence/qualifications for APL claim for Chartered Teacher for example.

Agreed. Teachers will always have different strengths and development needs and will work in a wide variety of contexts. It is essential to provide a wide and varied range of CPD opportunities.

Schools within learning communities offer a wide range of opportunities for teachers to visit, observe and learn from other colleagues as part of effective CPD. It should be more than attending courses.

I agree wholeheartedly with this. It is reflected in the wide range of targets that appear on Final Profiles. In addition, I am piloting a ‘coaching/mentoring’ scheme with our post-probationers (year 2) this year and in our initial discussions, while there are some common features in their needs (eg coming to terms with the bigger workload of a full timetable), they all have particular needs and targets. Some still require more regular mentoring while others have already a higher level of competence and confidence and want to try out other ideas.

Given that we are piloting a mini-version of what you are suggesting, I feel that some of this is achievable within the school but there has to be a clear recognition that there is a time/workload factor not only for the year 2-6 teachers but also for those mentoring. Training would also be vital for those mentoring as a different range of skills is required at this stage. I am currently doing such in-service to improve my own skills.

I believe that there is scope for local authorities to take this forward in the way that they offer authority-wide probationer programmes. Funding and provision of trained staff for particular courses would be easier to access for larger groups rather than the small numbers within an individual school.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

Those year 2-6 teachers not in permanent full-time employment may have particular difficulties in accessing appropriate CPD. Therefore local authorities and schools should work towards developing systems for identifying and supporting year 2-6 teachers not in stable employment.

Agree.

Strongly agreed.

Again I agree with this recommendation. We believe that all staff (including part time and supply colleagues) should have access to meaningful and relevant CPD. It is also important that staff who are not involved with formal Review procedures know how they can apply for appropriate development CPD.

The most effective CPD combines input of theory supported by the ongoing opportunity to transfer learning into action, with subsequent reflection and development. The lack of stable employment therefore becomes the main issue of concern. Without this, any investment of time and energy is vastly dissipated, if not completely wasted. National planning should consider how best to ensure such employment. In this way, a skilled profession is developed and sustained.

This is very important especially when teachers are moving on a supply basis from school to school. Although they gain valid experience from the variety of stages and catchment areas something needs to be done to formalise an effective CPD system.

Important to be offering opportunity to the profession.

Permanent supply staff have access to authority CPD opportunities with course paid by LA. Nominated officer within LA.

Direct mailing to inform non-permanent supply staff of opportunities?

E-learning coordinated by LTS/GLOW? Collaborative working requires commitment from supply staff.

It is quite feasible to offer CPD to supply teachers who are in school at the appropriate times.

Funding for this initiative: Finance for CPD for teachers is school based, therefore, where can these teachers get funding from?
- How do authorities develop the systems to engage and support these teachers, i.e. they do not normally engage in the PRD process.
- Engaging these teachers would reduce teacher fall off as they move to other professions or employment.
- This recommendation is very worthwhile provided the necessary funding is made available.
- This is important for ensuring that newly qualified teachers continue to develop and keep abreast of current developments if they are not in permanent full time employment.
- Local authorities should run training sessions ensuring that they are widely advertised and are held at various times which would be suitable – afternoon, evening, weekends.
- Again, I agree with this recommendation. This is the very group of people who regularly miss out because they are not in 1 school. They have the very same needs but they are compounded by the fact that they need to adjust to different schools and different systems. They don’t have the same opportunity to try out different initiatives or to get involved in whole-school developments.
- Here, the local authority has a potentially greater role to play as often, given the short ( or even longer ) time they spend in school, they school is not aware of how far into their teaching career these people are. They do not always volunteer the information.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

The transition between the induction year and year 2 is important, and the final profile should be seen as a key document in supporting a smooth transition. Thereafter it is crucial that early career teachers have a positive experience of the PRD process. There might be implications here for the development of reviewers’ skills in supporting this process.

- Mentors and reviewers need adequate training and time out to support teachers early in their careers.
- The induction year mentoring is crucial to this process, initiating a positive PRD process. Both mentoring and reviewing skills need further support in schools.
- I totally agree with this recommendation. School ethos and relationships are very important if this is to be achieved.
- It is critical that school leaders and managers are properly trained in the effective leadership and management of CPD, at the core of which is effective, focussed PRD processes. It is as critical for experienced teachers to experience positive PRD processes as any other. Without this, negative attitudes develop, resource is wasted and all staff – and as a result, the young people we serve - fail to achieve their potential.
- Now that East Ayrshire are using the same criteria as the induction process for PRD, I don’t see a problem here. After all when we cover monitoring & evaluation/ observation of classes we use the same paperwork, guidelines, etc for ALL staff.
- Streamlined PRD process to support smooth transition from final profile to PRD.
- Coaching/leadership training for reviewers and reviewees.
- Focused/SMART targets which will take school plan forward.
- Why profile not feeding PRD process?
- When is the profile getting to be used – why is it not seen as a key document towards the start of the session – and time needs to be made.
- More development/training of managers – some do not let managers conduct PRD until trained.
- It would be normal for the reviewer at PRD sessions to have a supporting and mentoring role for the reviewee. They would, therefore, be well placed to give guidance in a positive manner if they were good leaders and managers.
- Need to look at standardising provision for PRD policy and procedures.
- Training for reviewer and reviewee.
- Shared understanding of purpose and outcome of PRD.
- Closer liaison/collaboration between LEA/school and university to match need to demand.
- PRD – Head Teachers and Depute Head Teachers are very experienced in PRD or what used to be known as Staff Development and Review. Newly qualified teachers have to see the link between the final profile and the big world of real teaching. There should be no problem of a smooth transition if the induction training has been successful.
Once more, I believe that this is essential, especially if we are trying to get teachers to understand the purpose of CPD. The targets for the Final Profile cannot be simply seen as completing documentation to satisfy the GTC. The targets must be relevant and specific although sometimes they may need to be adjusted in the light of the teacher finding him/herself in a new school maybe even in a different authority in August of year 2.

I also agree, as already stated, that there needs to be training to help develop the reviewers’ skills.

RECOMMENDATION 4
Participants in the research project, together with evidence from the literature, indicate that continuing mentoring in some form into the early professional development stage would be valuable. However, mentors need to be committed, well-trained and endorse a collaborative learning approach.

- Mentors and reviewers need adequate training and time out to support teachers early in their careers
- Agreed as above comment states. (The induction year mentoring is crucial to this process, initiating a positive PRD process. Both mentoring and reviewing skills need further support in schools.)
- I also agree with this. Our experience supports the importance of mentors/coaches. A trained cohort of personnel in the school is a valuable resource. It also allows participants to choose a person with whom they feel comfortable.
- The calibre of the mentor is critical. They must be interested and motivated in the role of mentoring and thereafter, properly trained and supported in that role. A key part of this will be to ensure they are given adequate time to dedicate to their charges. Ensuring a standardised approach to key aspects of the role is also important e.g. awareness of the SFR, knowledge & understanding of the major initiatives/developments in education today, how best to encourage continuing development (i.e. learning through self and shared reflection/evaluation/feedback). A collaborative learning approach is therefore essential. Selection of willing mentors is also important. Good interpersonal skills, including communication and active listening, coupled with emotional intelligence and pedagogical skill are paramount.
- This is certainly true but mentors/supports can also highlight/pinpoint ‘key people’ within the establishment who can help to maintain a high standard of support/advice. After all a ‘team effort’ and collaborative approach is what we are all aiming for.
- Standard for mentors?
- Minimum training requirement
- What defines a good mentor?
- A good mentor finds others who do things better than mentor at times
- I totally agree. This happens in my school.
- Continue mentoring beyond year 1.
- Mentors need the tools to be able to do their job well.
- Mentors role needs to be recognised in a way which rewards the mentor on a personal basis e.g. financial recognition, professional recognition.
- Could the training which mentors undertake be linked to CT programme as a means of rewarding mentors with a salary enhancement?
- Explore links between mentors and leaders, e.g. often mentors go on to be school leaders.
- Agreed. Schools should all be able to offer a member of staff to mentor new teachers. This is part of good management and leadership.
- I fully endorse this recommendation as can be recognised from my earlier comments.
**RECOMMENDATION 5**

Year 2-6 teachers want **CPD which is relevant to their own classroom context and which supports active experimentation.** In particular, they want this to focus on: ICT; assessment; subject-related work; pupil support; extra-curricular opportunities; career progression; and national initiatives (in particular the CfE).

- CPD should be relevant to classroom, school and national initiatives.
- This is vital, but since career opportunities may involve frequent changes of schools and teaching the whole child, CPD experience should have a wider context than ‘their own classroom context’.
- CPD provision is always going to have to be a balance between school/authority, departmental and personal needs. It is important that systems are able to provide for this spectrum of needs. At authority level we feel that it is important that, under career progression, a Leadership CPD Pathway can be developed.
- All teachers prefer, and deserve, CPD which is relevant to their current context (as do ALL learners, regardless of age). It is through such CPD that teachers manage change and deliver what is expected of them – nationally and locally. An effectively managed and resourced CPD school policy is capable of delivering this.
- This may be true but obviously it’s down to individual strengths/needs/developmental needs. Current issues in education are always highlighted for all staff to take forward through PRD and the improvement plan process.
- Link to recommendation 1
- Surprised about this recommendation – too classroom based
- Much of the above CPD can be offered and is offered currently by the education authority.
- Relevance is a key feature. Teachers want something that can see a use for.
- ‘Supporting active experimentation’ needs further definition. It should be supported by ‘evidence’ and be within the school’s development/improvement plan. It shouldn’t jeopardise children’s learning or experiences.
- Clear guidance for year 2-6 teachers and support within school from mentor/line manager as to nature and acceptability of ‘active experimentation’ necessary.
- Balance of risk-taking (as in CfE) and welfare of pupils.
- Possible links between ‘experimentation’/‘experimenters’, this could be inter-authority to evaluate and share ideas and/or be web-based. This might help manage the process.
- Yes. Not much difference there from any other teachers!
- Once more, this appears to be an excellent recommendation which is borne out by discussions with year 2-6 teachers and an examination of the targets they set.
- Clearly all schools and local authorities already offer development opportunities in these areas. It will be the case of ensuring that new staff into a school in August are able to access these programmes, many of which are made available in the May to June of the previous session.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

Informal learning, and the associated emotional and social elements, should be recognised and be made more explicit. CPD for early career teachers should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses, for example: mentoring; observing; peer coaching; and networking. Collaborative CPD in pairs or small groups has been shown to have a greater impact on professional development and learning than individually oriented forms of CPD, and is valued by year 2-6 teachers. Therefore **opportunities to work in pairs/small groups should be encouraged.**

- This is already happening in our school
- Agreed where practical.
- Feedback from colleagues in our school also indicates the importance of collaborative CPD. Some degree of action research (or curriculum development) can also be useful. It can help to develop a ‘feel good’ factor.
- I wholeheartedly agree with all of this, but again, believe it is equally necessary for all teachers. Such approaches are critical to the effectiveness and outcomes of any school’s CPD policy.
• I would totally commend the above comment. Within our establishment we ensure that collegiate activities are based around a critical skills approach in order to promote these kinds of group activities.
• PRD to produce more creative solutions than just a list of courses
• I agree.
• Good idea, but management might be difficult.
• Powerful learning model.
• Yes. As already mentioned, schools in learning communities offer many opportunities for staff development through shared learning and collaborative approaches in local and neighbouring schools.
• Again, I am delighted to see this recommendation and having read the accompanying document, I hope to take forward some of the ideas suggested with my pilot group.

OTHER COMMENTS
• I really appreciate having access to the research findings. They very much support feedback from our own staff. This is very reassuring.
• Given that it is through CPD that schools will transform their practice and performance, ‘getting it right’ is critical. This will only happen when a technical understanding of the key elements and principles of CPD policy is coupled with effective school leadership. They are interdependent. Without this, there is a high risk that CPD effort, resource, and potential outcome, are undermined.
• Learning communities where all needs are met – not just years 2-6
• Recommendations are true of all good CPD arrangements for all teachers at all stages of development/experience.
• PRD is central to this. The quality of PRD is variable and indeed poor in some places.
• There are inherent tensions between school and personal development needs
• Ethos and culture are important. CPD can often be about jumping through hoops.
• What is different about years 2-6 compared to year 7 onwards?
• It is noted from the briefing paper that there appears to be minimal concern about barriers to CPD for this group of teachers.
• The data presented in the briefing paper mirrors our own perceptions.
• The recommendations are helpful and we agree with them.
• LTS could perhaps take on a greater coordination role
• Overall there is a clear need for CPD for years 2-6
• This is a very important development for the future of the profession.
• I think the Scottish government should be doing more to make sure that newly qualified teachers are employed in teaching and their talents, interests and expertise put to work in schools. There still seems to be a refusal to acknowledge that a teacher crisis is coming. Many teachers will retire in the next five years. We should be getting new teachers in now! We need new blood now! Many older teachers are needing to get out of teaching and make way for the new teachers. Many would be willing to go if retirement packages were offered. Local authorities are unable or unwilling to do this because of the cost. I question what they spend the money on instead. In my opinion it is a false economy and a waste of good training not to buy up new teachers now!
• I am delighted to see this research being carried out and such clear recommendations being made. I have coached and mentored student and probationer teachers for 17 years and have long believed that there is still a place for supporting teachers in the early years of their career – sometimes it is just a supportive chat, sometimes it is advice on career advancement, sometimes it is a cajoling to try their wings.
• I look forward to reading the outcomes of this further research.
Appendix 6: Items coded under each node during analysis of NGT data

Accessible and well-advertised CPD
Lower cost CPD
Easy to access

Node: Curriculum for Excellence
Advice on cross-curricular teaching and planning in the CfE context
CfE – implementing
More input of the CfE and opportunities to see good practice
Integrate topics across the CfE
Play opportunities in infant class/P1 and linked in with the CfE
The CfE and changes this will mean for practice
CfE
Cross-curricular learning
How to fully implement the CfE
Information on contextualised learning, e.g. learning through play
Ongoing support coinciding with CfE outcomes
CfE
Development of science 3-18 curriculum

Node: ASN
CPD for specific learning difficulties - practical (i.e. strategies, pedagogy and resources)
Spotting of learning difficulties
Practical ideas for poorer ability children or the other way
More Learning Support information
Support for Learning with a specific focus
CPD to cover special needs; dyslexia, Asperger’s, autism
Clearer guidance on ASN legislation
Training in identifying SEN
Training in supporting/learning about specific needs of pupils
Training in learning support for whole school remit
Training/information re specific learning difficulties
Additional support (classroom assistants) for children with learning difficulties
Learning support across classroom context
Support on IEPs

Node: Behaviour management strategies
Handling violent behaviour (pupils’)
Behaviour management strategies
Behaviour management
Restorative practice
Strategies for managing classroom behaviour
Training in physical restraint, e.g. CALM
Behavioural support
Restorative practices

Node: Broadening experience
Knowledge about other sectors in education
Opportunities for exchanges
Subject-specific courses, more experience of different stages
Opportunities for secondments/transfers
Experience in bigger/smaller schools
Experience of upper/infant

Node: Career guidance and progression
More information on Chartered Teacher/Principal Teacher
Advice/guidance on career after year 6 (e.g. Chartered Teacher)
Advice on career pathways including preparations
Interview skills for promoted posts
More information on framework for professional recognition
Career paths
Advice/guidance on leadership career potential
Information about professional career paths, roles, responsibilities
Preparing for interviews/application forms for career progression
CPD that is useful in the classroom and for career progression
Opportunities to lead projects in school
Career advice; what should I be doing if aspiring to a PT post in the future
Professional development in relation to career guidance
Sharing criteria for interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: Collegiate CPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamworking (promote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cluster CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole school issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More collegiate activity within schools/departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for in-school, collegiate, structured CPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: CPD mode or delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured modular CPD that provides continuity and progression and recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of delivery modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of some aspects of probation CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses that provide opportunities for progressive development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn from current incidents involving children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less repetition of courses covered in ITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited home-study programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training which recognises resources realities and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting together with other teachers to share ideas and this being recognised as legitimate CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development I can get my teeth into and build on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More availability of twilight courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts coming into school to model good practice in current initiatives in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits/feedback (on own teaching) from experts from outwith the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting in-services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: Ethos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a positive ethos through language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: Exam issues and moderation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More SQA moderation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in marking Modern Studies Higher essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of certificate courses and preparing pupils for exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational sessions at SQA for practical subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing exam papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: Extra-curricular opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular (sports coaching etc.) opportunities to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to allow me to run after-schools clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular activities guidelines on boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: Familiarisation with resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops knowledge of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific/limited list of reading/resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node: ICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More experience of ICT (SMART Board etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use ICT in cross-curricular subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher and intros to innovative technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ICT in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in film-editing software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximising use of SMART Board in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training in computer animation
Focus on advanced formula for spreadsheets, preferably Excel
Setting up electrical and electronic equipment, e.g. basic technical jobs
More in-depth knowledge of ICT, i.e. resources etc. specific to early years
Updated with ICT
More advanced ICT skills

Node: Inclusion
Practical solutions to help with inclusion
Dealing with inclusion in the classroom
Inclusion strategies for dealing with learning, behavioural and socio-emotional difficulties

Node: Management and leadership
Training for departmental management responsibilities
Leadership development
Project-based CPD leading to management
Developing skills by giving managerial/leadership responsibilities
Leadership development
Leadership training
Early introduction to management training to aid understanding of roles and responsibilities
Management strategies and leadership development
Management skills

Node: Mentoring and coaching
Peer mentoring in a non-threatening environment
Opportunities to link to a mentor
Opportunity to be a mentor
Mentoring teachers new to school/region (not new probationers)
Coaching courses
Mentoring/coaching

Node: National initiatives
Exploring educational policies
Support in implementing National Priorities
Range of mandatory courses for 2-6; teaching, national testing
Structured input about educational initiatives
Mandatory courses for national initiatives

Node: Observation and shadowing
Opportunity to spend quality/lengthy time in other schools
Opportunities to see creativity in practice linked to curriculum
How to manage multi-composite class – see in practice
Opportunities to observe teachers within sector
Modelling of new resources
Observation/shadowing
Shadowing other areas of expertise

Node: Pastoral care and guidance
Guidance
Training in pastoral care and pupil support
Guidance and whole school care

Node: Pedagogy
Ideas for interactive teaching and active learning
Raising boys’ achievement
AiL strategies
How to develop more active learning
How to use mind-mapping effectively with classes
Challenging high achievers
Critical skills
Formative assessment
Update on new teaching techniques
Training in child-led/child-centred learning approaches (e.g. PLODs)
Time to adapt and develop resources to meet specific pupil needs
Dealing with ‘please takes’
Cooperative teaching
Classroom management strategies
Fun elements for lessons (e.g. maths)
Formative assessment
Cooperative learning
Target-setting for pupils
Update on teaching approaches
Active learning

Node: Personal and interpersonal development
Personal time to develop skills
General personal development
Time management
Developing skills in communicating with parents

Node: Planning
Advice on planning using differentiation
How to manage planning
Support with short, medium and long-term planning
Familiarisation with different levels of attainment

Node: Practical CPD
‘Hands-on’ time at courses
Practical CPD observing real-life situations (including videoing)
Practical ideas for poorer ability children or the other
Practical ideas for outdoor education
Practical to classroom life
CPD produced by other teachers

Node: Professional terms and conditions
Professional rights and responsibilities especially with regard to violent pupils
Clearer information about terms of contract
Risk assessment
Clarity about CPD funding and entitlement

Node: Research, development and scholarship
Opportunities to participate in research
Subject development and policy writing
Time to develop areas of the curriculum and review/develop materials
Assistance in publishing own resources
Opportunities to see leaders in their field, e.g. Tony Buzan, Shirley Clark, Trevor Hawes
Accessing funding outwith normal channels

Node: Sharing practice
Sharing good practice in context
Opportunities to share with teachers at same stage as you
Sharing ideas/resources (e.g. on website)
Creating groups of subject teachers to meet in networks to share/swap our resources
Sharing good practice
Networking opportunities

Node: Stage or context specific CPD
Relevant to school context
CPD related to particular class
‘Introduction to P1’ course
Focus on early intervention (reading and writing)

Node: Subject or topic specific CPD
Subject-specific CPD
Input on reading and writing in Early Years
Practical language activities
More in-depth Expressive Arts training
Subject-specific courses for secondary teachers
How to make lessons fun for Modern Studies
Teaching Science in the primary classroom
Enterprising activities
Expressive Arts ideas
Aesthetic subjects
Teaching Science
Familiarisation with aspects of the course/syllabus/curriculum
More information on literacy across the curriculum to raise attainment
Opportunities for fieldwork
Development of subject skills
Continuing updating of curriculum knowledge
Opportunities to develop knowledge in specialist areas, e.g. music
Opportunities to share experiences about assessing and recording
Practical workshops in expressive arts; drama, gymnastics, PE
Ideas of enterprise projects
Maths activity for lower ability groups
Development of international education
Training in circle time
Subject specific training to advanced Higher level
Foreign language teaching
Training to take a lead in school working towards eco-award
Subject-based training
Additional subject training
Language course (including EFL)
Cooperative learning subject-specific training
Teaching English as 2nd language
Writing
Foreign language teaching
To take forward specialist subject (chosen as part of BEd)

Node: Transitions
Transition from Nursery to P1 and P7 to High School
Primary-Secondary links
Nursery-Primary transition
Experience in transition (Primary-Secondary)
Learning about transition stages and what is expected of teachers
Transition from Primary to Secondary

Node: Working with others
Involved in meetings with other professionals, e.g. psychologists
Working with people from other agencies
Working with classroom assistants/SEN auxiliaries
Appendix 7: Diagrammatic representation of connecting nodes

1: Curriculum for Excellence  
2: Career guidance & progression  
5: ASN  
10: Inclusion  
15: Exam issues and moderation  
17: Stage or context specific CPD  
27: Transitions  
22: Mentoring and coaching  
7: CPD mode or delivery  
13: Observation and shadowing  
25: Collegiate CPD  
23: Working with others  
28: National initiatives  
8: Management & leadership  
11: Sharing practice  
16: Personal & interpersonal development  
17: Sharing practice  
22: Mentoring and coaching  
27: Transitions  
28: National initiatives  

CPD Needs

Appendix 8
Appendix 9

Barriers to CPD