The value of third sector organisations' provision of global learning CPD in English schools

Clare Bentall & Frances Hunt

Published online: 02 Mar 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ⬏

Article views: 100

View related articles ⬏

View Crossmark data ⬏

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLE

The value of third sector organisations' provision of global learning CPD in English schools

Clare Bentall 🆔 and Frances Hunt

Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment, UCL Institute of Education, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Third sector organisations have been providing continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers in the UK in the field of global learning over decades. Given the patchy provision within initial teacher training, these organisations are the main source of support for teachers in helping their pupils engage with and respond to global issues. Drawing on qualitative and quantitative data from the Global Learning Programme in England (GLP-E 2013–18), this article investigates what teachers identify as valuable from the global learning CPD they received from organisations on the programme. Teachers value the specialist expertise, both in terms of global learning knowledge and pedagogy, the relationships they develop with global learning organisations, and the willingness of these organisations to collaborate for the benefit of schools. The findings demonstrate that there is potential for a greater contribution to teachers' global learning professional development within schools, but this requires more consistent, engagement with global learning organisations over the longer-term. To facilitate this, policymakers need to ensure a sustained funding environment both for schools and the global learning sector if teachers are to be sufficiently supported for working in an increasingly global and rapidly changing world.

Introduction

Third-sector organisations have been working with schools and teachers internationally to support education about international development issues since the 1960s (Bourn 2014, Tarozzi and Inguaggiato 2018). This educational approach, known as global learning, 'is both an educational field and a pedagogy of global social justice' (Bourn 2020, p. 11). Although global learning in schools has at times been UK government funded, it has not consistently been incorporated in national education policy. Provision within initial teacher training has therefore been patchy (Bamber *et al.* 2016), despite some evidence that pre-service teachers consider it important (Strachan 2020). The continuing professional development (CPD) offered by third-sector organisations is therefore the main opportunity for UK teachers to develop their global learning knowledge and skills. It is essential for ensuring teachers feel equipped to support pupils' responses to global issues, like climate change, COVID-19, or the Black Lives Matter movement.

There has been little research into what value global learning third-sector organisations bring to teachers' professional development. There are studies examining relationships between organisations and schools, such as Harrison's (2008) work on Oxfam and Mundy and Manion's (2008) research in Canada. There are studies on pupils' engagement with global learning organisations' resources (Tallon 2012, Bergmüller 2016) and teacher engagement through school linking (Edge and Khamsi 2012, Morrison 2020) or study visits (Martin and Griffiths 2012). Brown (2018) and

---

CONTACT Clare Bentall ✉ c.bentall@ucl.ac.uk 🖳 UCL Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, WC1H 0AL London

Bullivant (2020) have considered the perspectives of global learning practitioners, and Bamber *et al.* (2016) have investigated global learning in initial teacher training, but none of these studies focuses specifically on the CPD these organisations provide.

This article addresses this gap by analysing the experiences of schools and teachers on the UK government funded Global Learning Programme (GLP 2013–18). The programme in England (GLP-E) included funding for teachers to undertake global learning CPD offered by over 70 third-sector organisations. In answering our research question: 'What do teachers identify as valuable when working with third-sector organisations for their professional development in global learning?', we draw attention to the often, hidden role of these organisations in supporting schools and teachers, offering educational practitioners and policy-makers insights into the relationships between the two and their significance for the implementation of global learning within schools.

We first define global learning CPD, then discuss the nature of the involvement of global learning third-sector organisations in education and CPD. Next, we outline the CPD provision in GLP-E and explain our data collection methods and analysis. We then present our findings thematically and conclude with a discussion of the implications of those findings.

Global learning CPD

Global learning is an educational approach that promotes critical engagement with global and development issues, with GLP-E emphasising four key elements: developing a 'global outlook', 'recognition of power and inequality in the world', 'belief in social justice and equity' and 'commitment to reflection and dialogue' (Bourn 2014, p. 5). By challenging learners to think about 'issues to do with power, equity and social justice' (Scoffham 2018, p. 136), global learning educators help learners understand how relationships between marginalised and powerful voices are manifest globally (Andreotti 2010, Foghani-Arani and Hartmeyer 2010). Global learning focuses on learners' personal responsibility and agency in taking action towards global social justice (Scheunpflug 2008), with learning facilitated through participatory methods that encourage critical thinking. Given the connection between effective professional development and pupil learning outcomes (see Timperley *et al.* 2007), support for teachers following global learning principles is important. In this article, we refer to this support for teachers as CPD, as this was the term employed on GLP-E. We recognise, however, that there is debate in the literature over terminology, and the reality of much global learning professional development is that it is both 'initial' and part of a 'continuing' process of professional learning.

We define global learning CPD in line with Day's (1999, p.4) definition, drawing particular attention to his emphasis on teachers' reflection on the 'moral purposes of teaching'. This involves a focus on teachers' learning (Avalos 2011), through critical reflection on their professional and personal identity, values and beliefs. Such learning is both individual and socially situated (see Boylan *et al.* 2018) and therefore complex (Opfer and Pedder 2011). The development of teachers' knowledge about global issues, relevant pedagogical skills, reflection, and collaboration are important elements (see De Vries and van de Grift 2013, Cordingley *et al.* 2015) if teachers are to develop their practice towards a global and social justice-based approach. Global learning CPD aims to be transformative (see Kennedy 2014, Tarozzi 2020), as teachers are also asking learners to transform (Scheunpflug 2011, Kadji-Beltran *et al.* 2014). As global learning is not discipline specific, nor government mandated, CPD is better characterised as professional support (see Bolam 1993), with a recognition of teachers' professional autonomy and agency, and their roles as change agents (Bourn 2016).

Third sector organisations and global learning CPD

Global learning third-sector organisations involved in UK education include the Consortium of Development Education Centres (CODEC), other NGOs, specific issue organisations and individual consultants. Their involvement in supporting schools and teachers reflects increasing third-

sector engagement in education worldwide (see Trujillo 2014, Williamson 2014), often prompted, as with global learning, by identification of a social gap in provision (Eden 2012). Relationships between such organisations and schools are often unquestioned (Eyal and Berkovich 2019), therefore scrutiny of their work through research is important.

Global learning organisations are usually non-profit, relying on public or charitable funds, operating with a high degree of autonomy and specific interest focus (see Woulfin *et al.* 2018, Yemini 2018). In contrast to some other organisations working in education, they are not primarily concerned with mediating between government policy and school practice, particularly in England with the lack of policy and curriculum focus on global learning. Despite this relative autonomy, their work with teachers through global learning CPD is not without its challenges. These organisations have had to initiate and promote their work to schools, creating a 'CPD marketplace', which can make collaboration between organisations difficult (Wermke 2012, p. 618).

In this marketplace, teachers have choice over which organisations to work with, so trust is important. As (Wermke 2012, p. 65) concludes, 'actors who are able to generate a climate of trust, characterised through competence, respect and understanding, gain access to the schools and therefore have better chances at influencing teacher practice'. To generate that trust, global learning organisations must offer effective CPD. Although Coburn (2005, p. 35) found that external actors can help teachers engage 'in ways that tended to have greater intensity, greater proximity to the classroom, greater depth', other examples of external experts imparting information unconnected to teachers' working contexts are rightly criticised (Richter *et al.* 2011). Schools therefore may choose to run CPDs themselves, which has the potential advantage of being delivered by 'highly skilled and well-regarded teachers' (Swaffield 2009, p. 505). This is not so easily achieved with global learning, as relevant expertise and experience are not evident in all schools.

The quality of global learning expertise teachers can access is therefore important. Global learning practitioners have different levels of experience in providing professional development (Büker and Schell-Straub 2017). They need both 'provider pedagogical content knowledge' (Timperley *et al.* 2007, p.xxix), and global learning expertise, and to be able to recommend teaching approaches relevant for teachers' contexts. They need to present different perspectives and provide 'the kind of critical friendship that offers challenge and support and stimulates new thinking' (Stoll *et al.* 2012, p. 5). As global learning organisations want to empower teachers to act for a more socially just world, practitioners need to take a 'value-based approach which is in essence transformational' (Tarozzi 2020, p. 141). Transformation involves longer-term support (El-Deghaidy *et al.* 2015, De Paor 2016), with collaborative relationships between organisations and schools where teachers' deeply held beliefs and existing global learning practices can be challenged and developed.

CPD on the Global Learning Programme-England (GLP-E)

The GLP-E supported global learning in English schools at Key Stages 2 and 3. Approximately 30% of schools in England (7822) were recruited onto the programme. Schools joined for a 5-term period and were organised into local networks, supported by 16 local and 4 national advisors. The GLP-E aimed to improve the quality and quantity of global learning within schools, supporting pupils to better understand their role in a globally independent world and to engage critically within it (Hunt and King 2015). To this end, the GLP-E concentrated on promoting effective professional development to deliver global learning, to encourage improvements across schools, leading to more globally aware and critically engaged pupils. One of the forms of professional development was externally provided CPD, which is the focus of this article.

To access the externally provided CPD, registered schools received £500 of e-credits on completion of a Whole School Audit (WSA1) to spend on courses run by third-sector organisations, or 'CPD providers'. The WSA1 helped schools identify learning priorities and provided baseline data for monitoring purposes. Over time, schools completing their second Whole School Audit (WSA2) that had spent their £500 e-credits were eligible to apply for further CPD support.

Courses submitted by third-sector organisations needed to meet GLP-E programme aims, be facilitated by experienced trainers and use appropriate training methods. Seventy-one organisations had their approved courses booked by schools. Courses, priced between £45-£500, were offered on various topics, both in-school and off site, as: whole-school courses; full-/half-day, after school courses; courses leading to an award or accreditation and conference packages.

Of the 7822 English schools registered, 4124 (53%) completed their WSA1 and were eligible for CPD e-credits and 2483 (60%) of those eligible schools sent teachers on courses, equating to 11,977 teacher attendances. In total, approximately 10% of all English schools had received externally provided CPD in global learning by the end of the programme.

Methods

We base this article primarily on data collected through interviews with teachers specifically focused on their experiences of externally provided CPD, supported by wider quantitative and qualitative programme data that we collected in our roles as GLP-E CPD and Research and Evaluation Leads.

Teacher interviews

Towards the end of the GLP-E, we undertook semi-structured interviews with 8 GLP Lead Teachers. The majority of the 2483 schools engaging with CPD sent teachers on courses only once (n = 1742)(see Table 1). These schools provided little additional formal feedback on the CPD beyond course evaluations. Therefore, to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between schools and third sector organisations, we purposively sampled schools that had experienced CPD more often. Of the 741 schools that sent teachers on more than one course, 27 (at the time of sampling) had made specific requests for additional CPD funds, suggesting a continuing motivation to work with CPD providers. We therefore invited all 27, and from 10 positive responses, 8 Lead Teachers consented to participate. This was a small sample, but it allowed us to explore the perspectives of teachers with the most experience of working with third-sector organisations. These interviews covered all aspects of their CPD experience, including what did or did not work (which we cover elsewhere, see Bentall 2020), as well as their relationships with the providers.

Table 2 provides information on the interviewed teachers and the number of courses with different providers they attended. The sample is predominantly female, possibly as more primary schools requested extra funding.

These teachers were offered telephone or Skype interviews, due to their geographical spread and busy teaching schedules. All chose telephone, which removed the possibility of reading body language, but the distance encouraged the teachers to speak openly about their experiences. Telephone interviews can encourage discussion of more sensitive topics (Glogowska *et al.* 2011, Lechuga 2012), and reduce social desirability bias (Nandi and Platt 2017). The teachers, given

Table 1. Number of CPD courses attended by schools.

CPD courses per school	Number of schools sending teachers on 1 or more CPD courses	Total number of CPD courses teachers attended
1	1742	1742
2	473	946
3	170	510
4	59	236
5	32	160
6	5	30
7	2	14
Total	**2483**	**3638**

Table 2. Interviewed teachers and the number and types of CPD courses undertaken.

Teacher	School Level	Geographical Area	Number and type of CPD courses undertaken	Number of CPD providers teacher worked with
Barbara	Secondary	Yorkshire and the Humber	1 individual teacher accreditation, 2 whole-school courses	3
Susan	Primary	Yorkshire and the Humber	1 individual teacher accreditation, 1 whole-school course	1
Gail	Primary	Southeast	1 individual teacher accreditation, 2 whole-school courses	1
Nicola	Special	West Midlands	2 whole-school courses	2
John	Primary	West Midlands	3 whole-school courses	2
Heather	Primary	East Midlands	2 whole-school courses	1
Wendy	Primary	Yorkshire and the Humber	1 individual teacher accreditation, 5 whole-school courses, 1 externally held day training.	4
Evelyn	Primary	Yorkshire and the Humber	1 individual online course, 1 whole-school course, 1 follow-up visit.	2

pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality, consented to being recorded and checked interview transcripts. The teachers and CPD providers who worked with them were offered the opportunity to comment on the findings. Ethics approval was granted by Institute of Education Ethics Review Committee.

Wider programme data

To contextualise these eight teachers' experiences, we supplement the interview data with wider programme data (referred to as 'programme data'):

- CPD booking and attendance statistics
- Whole School Audit data (WSA1 and 2)
- Evaluation impact data (teacher interviews in 13 schools) (EI)
- Teacher evaluations of courses delivered by 30 providers (Eval)

This programme data is supplementary as it was not generated specifically for this research, but for programme monitoring and evaluation, focusing on which GLP-E activities were most effective, and what influenced the impact of the programme in schools. A sample of courses delivered by 24 providers was also observed for quality assurance purposes. Though this shed light on the quality of the CPD, it did not generate specific data related to our research question.

Data analysis

The analysis of the interviews followed qualitative content analysis principles (Cohen *et al.* 2018), with an inductive approach to initial coding and openness to the generation of new codes in iteration with the literature. Our aim was to interpret, discover commonalities or differences and thereby understand the teachers' perspectives of their experiences. We made notes of immediate impressions to inform subsequent interviews (Layder 1998), and, given the small sample, detailed coding was undertaken when all interviews were complete.

As Thomas (2006) suggests, we prepared the data, highlighted text relevant to the research question, moved from coding and categorising and identifying links between categories, through to generating findings. Coding started with open coding, identifying descriptive codes, such as 'personality of trainer' or 'trainer knowledge'. These were refined (Saldana 2016), for example,

grouping several codes reflecting teachers' perceptions of trainer expertise, until they were synthesised into broader themes. The analysis involved examining each individual teacher's experience and generating meaning across the group of interviews (see Cohen *et al.* 2018).

The programme data, which had been previously analysed for the final programme report, was revisited in relation to the interview findings, to find similarities and contradictions. We examined the statistical data for trends in CPD bookings with individual providers. We read through the qualitative data and undertook keyword searches to identify relevant excerpts, leaving out any data where we were uncertain of which GLP-E professional development activity teachers were referring to. These excerpts were then categorised in relation to the interview codes.

We recognise the potential consequences of our focus on what teachers identified as valuable. We took steps to present a range of perspectives (see Lincoln and Guba 1985), such as asking the teachers what did not work, and searching for alternative views in the programme data. Despite this, we found that, where teachers had responded, teachers' CPD experiences across the GLP-E were overwhelmingly positive. For example, schools were asked to choose up to 2 programme elements that they found most beneficial, with 67% of n = 801 respondents indicating that the externally provided CPD was 1 of their 2 top rated GLP activities (WSA2). Criticisms of the CPD mainly concerned programme design, not relationships with CPD providers, such as schools reporting difficulties in accessing specific CPD or the programme website (WSA2). This positive picture is partly explained by the difficulty of eliciting responses from teachers un-engaged with the programme. We therefore do not claim to provide generalisations of teachers' experiences on GLP-E, but rather to offer possibilities for transferability of findings (Lincoln and Guba 1985), by providing insights into why some teachers particularly valued CPD provided by external organisations.

Findings

The findings, organised thematically, shed light on the relationship between global learning CPD providers and schools and offer insights into how those relationships can be developed. We have included data from each interviewed teacher, including in their own words. These quotations are chosen to illustrate our findings and underpin our interpretations of the data (see Eldh *et al.* 2020).

The importance of external expertise

The first theme is the value the interviewed teachers placed on the CPD providers' expertise. They highlighted various aspects of the providers' knowledge, covering both subject and pedagogical subject knowledge:

- Knowledge of (including theory) and passion for global learning (John, Heather, Evelyn)
- Knowledge of training approaches, such as providing space for discussion, or experimenting (Evelyn, Susan)
- Knowledge of how to apply global learning in the curriculum (Barbara, Nicola, Gail, Evelyn)
- Knowledge of the use of, and ability to recommend, resources and practical examples to use with pupils (Gail, John, Heather, Wendy and Evelyn)

This valuing of expertise is also reflected in the programme data:

- 'So, we have . . . brought in the experts as well, which has helped me to learn a huge amount.' (EI)
- 'X is an excellent DEC worker in the Y area. She communicates well and has a genuine passion and enthusiasm for global learning that it would be impossible for some of this not to "rub off" on anyone who attends her meetings/CPD training.' (WSA2)

- 'The support given by the DEC is crucial both to partner schools and the expert centre as they bring a wealth of ideas and knowledge, as well as resources.' (WSA2)

The interviewed teachers valued the providers' knowledge and expertise as their own confidence and expertise in global learning varied. Many teachers on the programme were incorporating global learning in their schools but did not feel qualified to train others (Hunt and Cara 2015). Only 16% of GLP-E school respondents had at least one teacher confident to lead training in global learning and 51% reported having had no previous CPD on global learning (WSA1). Though some teachers may have had knowledge from practice, this does not necessarily indicate knowledge of how to cascade ideas within a school.

There were occasional gaps in provider knowledge and experience, with consequences for teachers' learning. For example, in the programme data, one school reported: 'We . . . asked that we have our e-credits used towards specific CPD for SEN students. Disappointedly, the CPD offered did not focus on SEN and, in fact, was for higher ability students . . . I am still not confident about how to offer GLP to SEN students' (WSA2). Another felt the 'taster' courses for Philosophy for Children were not particularly effective: 'We were charged a significant amount of e-credits for very minimal impact CPD on a Philosophy for Children Taster. Better and more impartial advice could've been offered about this' (WSA2).

To become confident global educators, teachers require sufficient knowledge of how global learning links to practice (Bentall 2020, Hunt 2020). In the course evaluations, teachers praised the balance between theory and practice and being introduced to resources and practical activities they could use. They also recognised the value of providers' expertise on how to implement ideas, embed them in teaching and action plans, and in how to engage other staff with global learning.

Status of external expertise

In the interviews, teachers reported that this expertise was accorded greater status because the CPD was run by an external organisation, echoing Coburn's (2005) findings. As Nicola said, 'I think if you're buying in something like CPD and you're buying an outside person in, they [staff] sometimes take it more seriously . . . a new voice just gives it an extra importance'. Although there are advantages of school-run CPD (Swaffield 2009), there is value in an alternative perspective. Gail also said engaging an external provider 'just has a profound impact'.

As many English schools run their own CPD, it can be rare for an external provider to visit, as Barbara noted. The GLP-E offered this opportunity and most of the teachers interviewed chose to invite the provider into school, rather than attend an external course. By using an external provider, senior staff were relieved of having to deliver the CPD, particularly where they lacked confidence. This led to greater collaboration, with senior staff and class teachers having their ideas and beliefs challenged together. As John said, it allowed him to learn, and saved him feeling 'like a teacher just one step ahead of the pupils'. Susan also pointed to the benefit of learning together as a school, compared with her trying to cascade learning from an off-site course.

Challenging teachers' thinking

External facilitators can challenge teachers' thinking by providing space for reflection and critical examination of teachers' different understandings, which is essential in global learning (Scheunpflug 2011). The interviewed teachers reported that providers were able to facilitate conversations amongst staff and suggest alternative interpretations to school orthodoxies (Stoll *et al.* 2012). Gail said her staff appreciated 'being given the space to talk'. Nicola also noted how teachers understand ideas differently, 'so when somebody outside comes and does it [CPD] with you, they can pick up on all those things'.

Similar points were made in the course evaluations, with 'thought provoking' being a recurring comment. The evaluations also included other comments on the challenge to teachers' thinking, in response to being asked what they had learned, such as:

- 'Opened your eyes to how to address areas that people shy away from.'
- 'Really helpful to start us thinking about what we already do and what we need to do to develop further.'
- 'How to change the mindset of staff in school towards global perspectives.'
- 'Found it very interesting and made me consider many things I have not before, from a teaching and personal point of view.'
- 'It has opened my eyes to what children are capable of and what we can do to encourage them to be thoughtful and enquiring.'

One example of challenging thinking and helping teachers develop a critical approach related to government policy on teaching Fundamental British Values (FBV), which was made mandatory in 2014 (https://www.gov.uk/government/news/guidance-on-promoting-british-values-in-schools-published). Although the CPD providers were not primarily responsible for mediating between government policy and practice, they responded by developing courses to support schools with this agenda. These were popular, accounting for 10% (1259) of all teacher CPD attendances across GLP-E. Providers created safe(r) spaces for teachers to reflect critically on 'British' values in a global context, in relation to their own and their schools' values, and explore how to encourage pupils do the same. Nicola commented that this helped her school engage with their values through choice, not obligation. Similarly, Heather, who had seen the results of prescriptive implementation of FBV in other schools, chose this CPD 'to make sure that it was meaningful, rather than an OFSTED tick in a box'. In the WSA2 data, one headteacher similarly stated: 'The whole-school staff training session on British Values has been very useful in bringing greater clarity as to the school's interpretation of this area as part of the ethos'.

As Coburn's (2005) research indicates, the engagement of an external intermediary allows teachers space to engage more deeply with issues and voluntarily incorporate them into their practice. Although many of the providers would question notions of exclusively British values, their critical engagement with this agenda helped schools make connections between their priorities and government policy.

Developing relationships with external providers

The second theme centres around the trust interviewed teachers felt towards providers and the longer term relationships they developed that supported their schools' development.

The interviewed teachers identified the following as influencing their decisions about booking specific providers:

- Being able to meet the providers in person and get to know them in advance (Barbara, Gail, Nicola, John, Heather, Wendy, Evelyn)
- The willingness of providers to discuss schools' needs and develop bespoke CPD (Susan, Gail, Nicola, John, Wendy, Evelyn)
- The flexibility and adaptability of providers, and their speed and willingness to communicate (Susan, John, Wendy)
- The range of options CPD providers offered (John, Wendy, Evelyn)

The teachers clearly valued the personal contact they had, the time providers took respond to schools' needs and the range of CPD they could offer. As John said, 'it always helps if you see the face and that made everybody's decision easier. It was a case then of, right, we're happy to go with [provider]'.

In the programme data, some teachers also indicated they had chosen CPD based on knowing the provider, in some cases from having already established relationships prior to joining the GLP-E (WSA1). Comments included:

- 'Because it was a cutting edge, UK leading organisation, whose courses I had attended before and knew the quality would be good.' (Eval)
- 'Having worked with W on many occasions, I knew that she would be the right person to lead this training, engaging the staff and giving them good direction.' (Eval)
- 'I came on X's other course and it was very good.' (Eval)
- 'I know Y leads a good course.' (Eval)
- 'It was only just because Z had suggested this training I thought, great; we'll do that . . . ' (IE)

The ability of providers to develop bespoke CPD tailored to schools' needs was also invaluable, and respected teachers' agency in how they implemented global learning. Interestingly, given the knowledge gap around SEN approaches, Nicola emphasised the importance of providers understanding her special school's context:

'If you send one person on a course somewhere else, you have to take the course as it's delivered. But in all the instances of what we used, they actually talked to us about our school, about what we were looking for, and tailored what they offered in that course . . . because . . . we are a special school and we're very different to other special schools and we're different to primary schools just by the way we work'.

Susan and Evelyn appreciated locally based CPD providers being able to offer courses in two parts or follow-up support, an important element in effective teacher development (De Paor 2016). Being local meant some providers were able to offer day-long, whole-school CPD, which increased the potential impact. The programme data also includes some specific comments on this model:

- 'They came here. It was a whole day . . . with really good activities that we could use, and they left us with quite a lot of activities as well . . . that was really a benefit.' (IE)
- 'The whole staff training received as a result of the GLP training has had a very positive impact across the school.' (IE)

This is not to say that off-site courses are not valuable. As Wendy noted, attending courses in her local provider's resource centre provided opportunities to meet and collaborate with teachers from other schools.

There are similar reasons given by teachers in the programme data as to the importance of relationships with providers, including how CPD related to their schools' goals:

- 'We have developed links with local schools and the DEC, which has been very valuable.' (WSA2)
- 'Our local DEC has been so supportive in making sure that our school gets the full benefit of our partnership.' (WSA2)
- 'Due to our location . . . it is best for us to do CPD at school supported by our local centre.' (IE)
- 'CPD provided by [provider] has kick-started the improvement priority and allowed us to apply for and gain funding to help to provide resources for outdoor learning so impacting on the children's awareness of environmental learning and issues.' (WSA2)
- 'We had in school training for all staff through GLP e-credits which was very supportive.' (WSA2)

- 'Currently working with [provider] to begin to embed Global Learning into different areas of the curriculum across the school through training in staff meetings.' (WSA2)

In understanding these relationships, it is important to realise that GLP-E schools tended not to have a strategic plan for global learning, as one teacher indicated in this evaluation impact data excerpt: 'I realised with the 500 credits I could do a UNICEF course on the Rights Respecting. So, this is how we started . . . ' (EI). Teachers would consider the direction of their school, see what CPD GLP-E offered, choose something that fitted, evaluate, consider next steps and repeat. As Nicola explained, 'it was making use of what was available in the programme but tying it into a school need'. Trusted providers therefore worked in a support role, helping teachers decide which CPD might be appropriate at each stage of their learning.

Not all schools took advantage of the opportunity to develop relationships with providers. Many engaged only once (see Table 1), and one-off CPD is one of the potential disadvantages of externally provided CPD, being less effective than longer term engagement (El-Deghaidy et al. 2015). However, where schools did engage over the longer term, there are clear indications that some, including those represented by the interviewed teachers, developed close relationships with individual providers. As Table 3 indicates, of the 741 schools that booked CPD more than once, 19 booked CPD with the same provider 4 times, and a different 18 schools used the same provider 5 times.

Although schools that booked could choose subsequent courses from any provider in their area or nationally, Table 4 shows that, of the 741 schools, 473 (64%) re-booked CPD with their initial provider. Indeed, 1387 (73%) of 1896 courses booked by these 741 schools were with their initial providers.

Although other factors might have affected choice of providers, such as some areas having less on offer, it is unlikely a school would re-book if they did not trust the provider's expertise and ability to address the school's needs.

Interestingly, the providers booked by the interviewed teachers, and those who worked with schools 4 or 5 times, were the longer established providers. In contrast to some of the smaller and newer organisations, they offered a range of courses, and bespoke courses developed in consultation with schools. They were particularly able to build trust, underpinned by their willingness to engage directly, assess the schools' needs and offer follow-up support. These personal relationships were key in encouraging teachers to engage with CPD and continue to develop their approaches to global learning. As Wermke (2012) argues, providers that engender trust are more likely to work with schools and have an influence on teacher development.

Table 3. Number of times schools booked CPD with the same provider.

Number of times schools booked CPD with the same provider	Number of schools
2	405
3	88
4	19
5	18
Total	**741**

Table 4. Number of times schools re-booked with their initial CPD provider.

Number of times schools re-booked with their initial CPD provider	Number of schools
0	268
1	357
2	78
3	19
4	19
Total	**741**

Collaboration between providers

The global learning CPD sector exists as a loose community of practice (Bullivant 2020), and the interviewed teachers found the willingness of some providers to collaborate and recommend each other's CPD contributed to the sense of support they felt.

The longer established providers have years of experience sharing expertise in global learning, including the 'provider pedagogical content knowledge' that is essential for externally provided CPD (Timperley *et al.* 2007, p xxix). This meant that some providers were concerned the creation of a GLP-E CPD marketplace would leave them competing, and the programme did generate some tensions, as Wermke (2012) predicts. Despite this, providers did collaborate, recommend each other's courses and share expertise. For example, some providers attended a programme run workshop to discuss how to respond to the British Values agenda, presenting their approaches, sharing materials, and identifying how best to tackle this from a global learning perspective.

John particularly valued this willingness to collaborate. He chose two providers that he trusted and knew would work together for a day's CPD. 'We thought X can do a bit of this, Y can do a bit of that: and they liaise with each other as well . . . to avoid duplicating ideas.' Gail also described one provider becoming her main contact for advice on which providers could deliver specific courses: 'Z, who I contacted to organise it all, she was very good at working out who would be facilitating it and where. That was a bit tricky to work out on my own'.

Although the value teachers placed on provider collaboration is not our main finding, it is an important one, as collaboration between third-sector organisations is rarely documented in other CPD research. It is a specific strength of how some global learning organisations work, despite the challenges of funding their own organisations. Their willingness to do so comes from a commitment to the ethics and practices of global learning, and results in additional value to teachers and schools.

Discussion and implications

The experience of GLP-E teachers illustrates that there is additional value for teachers and schools from working with third-sector organisations to develop their global learning practice.

Where there is longer-term and regular teacher engagement with organisations, organisations can provide responsive professional support, rather than one-off training (see Bolam 1993), developing bespoke CPD which recognises teachers' autonomy and agency in applying their learning in their school contexts.

Approaches where organisations run whole-school CPD on site allow senior and other staff to learn together, and foster collaboration, an essential element of effective CPD (Cordingley *et al.* 2015). These approaches also provide collective opportunities for gaining knowledge and reflecting critically (De Vries and van de Grift 2013) on what teachers and schools want to achieve, encouraging both individual and socially situated learning in the school context (see Boylan *et al.* 2018). There is also some evidence from the British Values example that third-sector organisations can bridge the gap between government policy and implementation by offering a space for critical examination of policies in the light of individual school priorities.

It is hard to conclude precisely how transformative the experience of working with third-sector organisations was for individual GLP-E teachers and schools (see Kennedy 2014), and the degree to which this led to action for social justice (Scheunpflug 2008). However, there is evidence that these third-sector organisations did help teachers examine their beliefs, not just about global issues, but about the purposes of teaching (Day 1999).

Teachers' learning needs to lead to implementation for the benefit of pupils, and although there were aspects of the CPD experience on GLP-E that were not ideal, where teachers did work with providers, they generally report a positive impact on their global learning practice.

There is therefore potential for these organisations to make a greater contribution to teachers' global learning professional development, if schools' access to longer-term, consistent engagement with global learning CPD providers can be facilitated. It is therefore concerning that current trends are adversely affecting the support global learning organisations can offer schools.

One trend is an increasingly constrained funding environment for global learning in England. Global learning has historically been funded by the UK international aid budget and current pressures mean the GLP successor programme has far fewer funds available to schools for purchasing CPD. Global learning organisations are also affected by other funding constraints (Bamber *et al.* 2016), such as reduced European funding opportunities, post-Brexit. For example, in and around the time of GLP-E, 7 DECs and the sector's umbrella organisation, Think Global, closed. Though other organisations have emerged, and some previous DEC members are working freelance, thereby ensuring some continuity, the ability of the sector to work as a larger community of practice nationally is being undermined.

English schools are also increasingly providing CPD in-house, which poses a particular challenge for teachers' development of global learning expertise. Although offering in-house updates on policy or subjects in which teachers have already been trained is valuable, it is less useful for embedding global learning, which involves challenge to existing orthodoxies and critical reflection on individual values and actions. This requires external expertise, and the support organisations can provide, particularly if the deficit in initial training is not addressed.

Trends in the focus and quality of CPD are also concerning. Historically, teachers in England have struggled to access high-quality CPD (Opfer and Pedder 2010) and during the time of GLP-E, UK schools were reporting on average fewer than 5 days' CPD annually (Cordingley *et al.* 2015). Much CPD seems to have an increasingly narrow focus on accountability and standards, which does not prepare teachers for working in an increasingly global context and helping their pupils engage with complex issues. Once schools meet mandatory CPD requirements there are few opportunities for more challenging and motivational CPD, even if it is fully funded.

These challenges have implications for schools and teachers. This restricted environment for global learning and CPD is detrimental to the embedding of global learning within schools, and detrimental to teachers' development and motivation, important factors in teacher retention. Our findings highlight the value of engaging external providers for global learning CPD, particularly where they develop longer term relationships with schools. Not only are teachers motivated to engage with experienced and passionate trainers, but the CPD has the potential to provide teachers with renewed commitment to their profession (Bentall 2020, Hunt 2020). If such transformative CPD experiences are missing, schools may struggle to support teachers who are interested in developing and adapting their practice for the requirements of a rapidly changing and complex world (Sprott 2019), with consequences for the quality of pupils' learning.

There are important questions for policymakers about future funding of global learning within schools, and how to ensure consistent and widespread professional development for teachers in their global learning practice. Relationships between third-sector organisations and schools need to be nurtured and promoted. This could be encouraged with greater promotion of third-sector organisations' global learning CPD offers through relevant national networks. Greater collaboration with professional associations, local authorities and academy chains could also ensure such CPD connects more closely to school priorities locally. Continued collaboration between global learning organisations can also ensure more consistent offers nationally. Given global learning's relevance as an approach for addressing sustainability and climate change within education, there are also opportunities within Department for Education (2021) draft strategy to include promotion of and funding for global learning CPD.

Finally, more research is needed internationally. Relationships between third-sector organisations and schools in other non-UK contexts, where global learning is more embedded (see Tarozzi 2020), may offer more insights into how global learning can be effectively incorporated into teacher professional development.

Biographical note

Clare Bentall is a Lecturer in Education and Associate Director Development Education Research Centre, IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and SocietyI. Her research interests are in development education and global learning, learning and teaching within higher education, and the education of professional educators.

Fran Hunt is a Senior Research Officer in the Development Education Research Centre, IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society. Her research focuses on topics, such as global learning and global citizenship education. She also has experience in survey design and analysis, with a focus on impact evaluation.

ORCID

Clare Bentall http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5371-4814

References

Andreotti, V., 2010. Global education in the '21st century': two different perspectives on the 'post-' of postmodernism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2 (2), 5–22.

Avalos, B., 2011. Review: teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 10–20. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007

Bamber, P., *et al*., 2016. A comparative review of policy and practice for education for sustainable development/ education for global citizenship (ESD/GC) in teacher education across the four nations of the UK. *Management in Education*, 30 (3), 1–9. doi:10.1177/0892020616653179

Bentall, C., 2020. Continuing professional development of teachers in global learning: what works? *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. London: Bloomsbury, 356–368.

Bergmüller, C., 2016. Global education and the cooperation of NGOs and schools: a German case study. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 7 (3), 47–62. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.07.3.04

Bolam, R., 1993. Recent developments and emerging issues. *In* GTC, *The continuing professional development of teachers*. Papers presented by M. Williams and R. Bolam for the General Teaching Council, London, Department for Education and Skills, 17–41.

Bourn, D., 2014. *The theory and practice of global learning*. Research paper 11 for the Global Learning Programme, London: Development Education Research Centre, Institute of Education.

Bourn, D., 2016. Teachers as agents of social change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 7 (3), 63–77. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.07.3.05

Bourn, D., 2020. The emergence of global education as a distinctive pedagogical field. *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. London: Bloomsbury, 11–22.

Boylan, M., *et al.*, 2018. Rethinking models of professional learning as tools: a conceptual analysis to inform research and practice. *Professional Development in Education*, 44 (1), 120–139. doi:10.1080/19415257.2017.1306789

Brown, E.J., 2018. Practitioner perspectives on learning for social change through non-formal global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 13 (1), 81–97. doi:10.1177/1746197917723629

Büker, G. and Schell-Straub, S., 2017. Global how? – Linking practice to theory: a competency model for training global learning facilitators. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 9 (2), 71–83. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.09.2.02

Bullivant, A., 2020. *From development education to global learning: exploring conceptualisations of theory and practice amongst practitioners in DECs in England*. Thesis (PhD). Lancaster University.

Coburn, C.E., 2005. The role of non-system actors in the relationship between policy and practice: the case of reading instruction in California. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 27 (1), 23–52. doi:10.3102/01623737027001023

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K., 2018. *Research methods in education*. 8th. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Cordingley, P., *et al.*, 2015. *Developing great teaching: lessons from the international reviews into effective professional development*. Teacher Development Trust.

Day, C., 1999. *Developing teachers: the challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer.

De Paor, C., 2016. The impact of school-based continuing professional development: views of teachers and support professionals. *Irish Educational Studies*, 35 (3), 289–306. doi:10.1080/03323315.2016.1192482

De Vries, S. and van de Grift, W.J.C.M., 2013. Teachers' beliefs and continuing professional development. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51 (2), 213–231. doi:10.1108/09578231311304715

Department for Education, 2021. *Sustainability and climate change. A draft strategy for the education and children's services systems*. London: Department for Education.

Eden, D., 2012. 'Whose responsibility is it?': the third sector and the educational system in Israel. *International Review of Education*, 58 (1), 35–54. doi:10.1007/s11159-012-9272-x

Edge, K. and Khamsi, K., 2012. International school partnerships as a vehicle for global education: student perspectives. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 32 (4), 455–472. doi:10.1080/02188791.2012.739964

El-Deghaidy, H., Mansour, M., and Alshamrani, S., 2015. Science teachers' typology of CPD activities: a socio-constructivist perspective. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 13 (6), 1539–1566. doi:10.1007/s10763-014-9560-y

Eldh, A.C., Årestedt, L., and Berterö, C., 2020. Quotations in qualitative studies: reflections on constituents, custom, and purpose. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 19, 1–6. doi:10.1177/1609406920969268

Eyal, O. and Berkovich, I., 2019. Ethics in third sector–school partnerships: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57 (4), 345–360. doi:10.1108/JEA-08-2018-0143

Foghani-Arani, N. and Hartmeyer, H., 2010. Global learning in Austria: towards a national strategy and beyond. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 2 (3), 45–58. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.02.3.04

Glogowska, M., Young, P., and Lockyer, L., 2011. Propriety, process and purpose: considerations of the use of the telephone interview method in an educational research study. *Higher Education*, 62 (1), 17–26. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9362-2

Harrison, D.G., 2008. Oxfam and the rise of development education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 3 (3), 5–28.

Hunt, F., 2020. Characteristics of a global learning school. *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. London: Bloomsbury, 342–355.

Hunt, F. and Cara, O., 2015. *Global learning in England: baseline analysis of the global learning programme whole school audit 2013–14*. DERC Research Paper no. 15 for the GLP. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Hunt, F. and King, R.P., 2015. *Supporting whole school approaches to global learning: focusing learning and mapping impact*. DERC Research Paper no. 13 for the GLP. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Kadji-Beltran, C., *et al.*, 2014. Mentoring as a strategy for empowering education for sustainable development in schools. *Professional Development in Education*, 40 (5), 717–739. doi:10.1080/19415257.2013.835276

Kennedy, A., 2014. Understanding continuing professional development: the need for theory to impact on policy and practice. *Professional Development in Education*, 40 (5), 688–697. doi:10.1080/19415257.2014.955122

Layder, D., 1998. *Sociological practice: linking theory and research*. London: Sage.

Lechuga, V.M., 2012. Exploring culture from a distance: the utility of telephone interviews in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25 (3), 251–268. doi:10.1080/09518398.2010.529853

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E., 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Martin, F. and Griffiths, H., 2012. Power and representation: a postcolonial reading of global partnerships and teacher development through North-South study visits. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38 (6), 907–927. doi:10.1080/01411926.2011.600438

Morrison, A., 2020. Global South-North school linking. *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. London: Bloomsbury, 292–313.

Mundy, K., and Manion, C., 2008. Global education in Canadian elementary schools: an exploratory study. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 31 (4), 941–974.

Nandi, A. and Platt, L., 2017. Are there differences in responses to social identity questions in face-to-face versus telephone interviews? Results of an experiment on a longitudinal survey. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20 (2), 151–166. doi:10.1080/13645579.2016.1165495

Opfer, V.D. and Pedder, D., 2010. Access to continuous professional development by teachers in England. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21 (4), 453–471. doi:10.1080/09585176.2010.529680

Opfer, V.D. and Pedder, D., 2011. Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 81 (3), 376–407. doi:10.3102/0034654311413609

Richter, D., *et al.*, 2011. Professional development across the teaching career: teachers' uptake of formal and informal learning opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27 (1), 116–126. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.07.008

Saldana, J., 2016. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. 3rd. London: Sage.

Scheunpflug, A., 2008. Why global learning and global education? An educational approach influenced by the perspectives of Immanuel Kant. *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *Development Education Debates and Dialogues*. London: Institute of Education, University of London, 18–27.

Scheunpflug, A., 2011. Global education and cross-cultural learning: a challenge for a research-based approach to international teacher education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 3 (3), 2–44.

Scoffham, S., 2018. Global learning: a catalyst for curriculum change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 10 (2), 135–146. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.10.2.03

Sprott, R.A., 2019. Factors that foster and deter advanced teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 321–331. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2018.11.001

Stoll, L., Harris, A., and Handscomb, G., 2012. Great professional development which leads to great pedagogy: nine claims from research. *In*: *Research and development network national themes: theme two*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Strachan, A., 2020. An exploration of how teachers' attitudes to global learning can be used to inform primary science education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 12 (2), 121–132. doi:10.14324/IJDEGL.12.2.04

Swaffield, S., 2009. The international state of professional development (Editorial). *Professional Development in Education*, 35 (4), 505–509. doi:10.1080/19415250903226751

Tallon, R., 2012. Emotion and agency within NGO development education; what is at work and what is at stake in the classroom? *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 4 (2), 5–22. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.04.2.02

Tarozzi, M., 2020. Role of NGOs in global citizenship education. *In*: D. Bourn, ed. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Global Education and Learning*. London: Bloomsbury, 133–148.

Tarozzi, M. and Inguaggiato, C., 2018. Implementing global citizenship education in EU primary schools: the role of government ministries. *International Journal for Development Education and Global Learning*, 10 (1), 21–38. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.10.1.03

Thomas, D.R., 2006. A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Education*, 27 (2), 337–346.

Timperley, H., *et al.*, 2007. *Teacher professional learning and development best evidence synthesis iteration [BES]*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education, Box 1666.

Trujillo, T., 2014. The modern cult of efficiency: intermediary organizations and the new scientific management. *Educational Policy*, 28 (2), 207–232. doi:10.1177/0895904813513148

Wermke, W., 2012. A question of trustworthiness? Teachers' perceptions of knowledge sources in the continuing professional development marketplace in Germany and Sweden. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28 (4), 618–627. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.12.006

Williamson, B., 2014. Mediating education policy: making up the 'antipolitics' of third-sector participation in public education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62 (1), 37–55. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.857386

Woulfin, S.L., Jones-Lawal, B., and Gabriel, R., 2018. The terrain of intermediary organizations' professional development offerings. *Professional Development in Education*, 44 (2), 302–306. doi:10.1080/19415257.2017.1299030

Yemini, M., 2018. Conceptualizing the role of non-profit intermediaries in pursuing entrepreneurship within schools in Israel. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 46 (6), 980–996. doi:10.1177/1741143217720458