

What do we know about school workforce development?

A summary of findings from recent TDA-funded research projects

Sara Bubb and Peter Earley
Institute of Education

s.bubb@ioe.ac.uk, p.earley@ioe.ac.uk

The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) commissioned research to inform different aspects of its role in relation to school workforce development. The most recent projects are summarised in Table 1. The aim of this paper is to present in a summary form the main findings from these commissioned research projects. In so doing we hope to gain a better understanding of the current knowledge base concerning staff development¹, which should in turn be able to inform and guide the TDA as it moves into its next phase of development and implements the Children's Workforce Development strategy. The main research findings are presented under the following headings:

1. Importance of staff development
2. Leadership and management of staff development
3. How needs are identified
4. Meeting needs
5. INSET days
6. Evaluating impact
7. Barriers to staff development.

1. Importance of staff development

The research projects found that the school workforce considered training and development of great importance. For eight in ten teachers, staff development is an important factor when considering both their future in their current school and in the teaching profession (TO and TVO 2008a). The State of the Nation (SoN) research concluded that 'Teachers do not need to be persuaded of the importance of professional learning for supporting their pupils' learning'. This project identified a number of reasons for teachers choosing the training and development they did, namely to:

- work with other colleagues
- improve their professional abilities
- address immediate school needs
- gain more information
- have a positive impact on pupil learning
- improve academic achievement
- follow up previous CPD activities
- address immediate classroom needs
- gain a better understanding of national curriculum requirements.

¹ *Staff development* is the term mainly used in this report but *professional development* and *continuing professional development* (CPD) are also deployed as reported in the original research projects.

Three-quarters of survey respondents indicated that accreditation was 'not important' or 'of limited importance'. Teachers in the highest school achievement band identified addressing immediate school needs as being less important than teachers in less successful schools.

The Staff Development Outcomes (SDO) study found a positive association between school outcomes and staff development: the high performing case study schools mostly had strong staff development. Staff turnover was low and morale was high at the case study schools with strong staff development. The researchers could not be certain about whether low turnover and high morale was the result of effective staff development processes but felt that they were a contributory factor. They concluded that school ethos was fundamental to staff development. In the case study schools where it was strong, leaders fostered, and all staff felt, a sense of both entitlement to and responsibility for their own development and learning closely linked to benefits for the pupils. The SoN report also emphasised the importance of school ethos: 'any effort to understand continuing professional development for teachers, its impacts, barriers and affordances, must not consider teachers as individual learners but teachers situated within the school as a learning environment'.

The Testbed research found that where staff development projects were successful, 'the senior leadership had a vision of, and a commitment to, whole school training and development that was reflected in school policies and supported by a strong developmental culture, in which:

- people trusted the vision and purpose of the leadership
- people were open to change
- risk taking was accepted
- there was a general ethos of openness, participation and support
- teamwork was widely observed across the school
- motivation and morale were high'.

The Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances research found that only one in ten teachers and one in eight heads thought that they were very likely to apply to a school facing challenging circumstances in the next five years, because 'many felt that they simply did not have the experience or skills to cope with the issues they would face'. Strong emotional and practical support and training ('enhanced CPD') were found to be what would make working in a SFCC more attractive. The SDO research found an association between the quality of their case study schools' staff development and level of pupil deprivation. Schools with low numbers of pupils entitled to free school meals were more likely to have strong staff development than those with high numbers. The findings from the SFCC and SDO studies suggest that specific attention needs to be given to ensuring that staff development is effective in schools located in areas of deprivation.

Terminology

The research projects used different terminology: training and development, staff development and CPD. Although similar, these terms have slightly different meanings. For instance, the SDO research found differences in the language used between groups of staff in some case study schools. Teachers talked of courses, CPD, INSET and professional development, whereas support staff used more specific language, referring to courses, training, and qualifications and, in the context of performance management, reviews or appraisals. In the strongest schools, language was developmental, formative and inclusive: terms like learning, professional development, entitlement, opportunities, enhancement, stepping forward, peer mentoring and guidance infused the discourse of staff at all levels. The SFCC research found 'strong

evidence of just how polarising 'CPD' as a term can be' because people interpreted it differently.

2. Leadership and management of staff development

All the projects found that the leadership of staff development was important. The Testbed project research found that the effectiveness of people holding key roles was a crucial variable. Researchers highlighted successful leaders' 'personal dynamism, commitment, understanding, and an awareness of how change works'.

Who leads staff development?

All the research projects found that responsibility for staff development lies with senior leaders. The CPD Leadership project found that 96 per cent were part of the senior leadership/management team. The Staff Development Outcomes study found that staff development was led by a deputy or assistant head teacher in secondary schools but in primary and special schools, the head teacher had the most significant staff development leadership role. Both studies found that schools have identified a need for more than one person to assume CPD responsibilities for staff: a range of people (e.g. Sencos, bursars, office managers, ICT coordinators) were involved in supporting the leadership, especially of support staff development.

What levels of experience do staff development leaders have?

The average length of service in schools was 25 years; the average length of time leading CPD was five years (CPD Leadership project). The Staff Development Outcomes study found that in the highest achieving schools, people had been leading staff development for a long time and had many years' experience, not only in teaching but also in leadership roles. In less successful schools, the people leading staff development were relatively new to the role and some were new to leadership more generally. In several cases, the current postholder had taken over with varying degrees of willingness from someone who had been ineffective or absent.

What levels of knowledge do CPD leaders have?

The Staff Development Outcomes research of 35 case studies found that nobody had been trained in leading and managing staff development but many felt that they have been aided by general leadership training such as NPQH. A few said they had benefited from local authority CPD conferences and publications but nobody mentioned using the GTC **Connect** network and very few used the TDA website. For the most part, they didn't know what they didn't know.

The CPD Leadership research found that staff development leaders kept up-to-date on current developments for support staff far less frequently than they kept up-to-date for teachers. The HLTA research found that candidates were disappointed that schools were not made more aware of the HLTA training and assessment process and consequently were not in a position to offer them more support. This was the picture in 2006 but in 2008 the Staff Development Outcomes study found considerable confusion about the relative status of different support staff courses and qualifications, and their link to career and pay progression.

Is staff development strategic?

The State of the Nation research found that 'Organisation of CPD tends not to be strategic and struggles to address the wide range of teachers' professional development needs'. Staff development was strategic in the most successful of the Staff Development Outcomes case study schools and closely linked to school self-evaluation and improvement plans. Strategy was the factor that was missing in weaker schools: individuals were doing their own thing but not contributing to planned improvement linked to school priorities.

How much time does the role take?

The CPD Leadership research found that deputy headteachers spent slightly more of their time (10%) on their CPD role compared to those who were headteachers (8%) or those in other roles (5%). The Staff Development Outcomes study found that people could not easily say how much time they spent leading and managing staff development because it was part and parcel of their leadership role. The person who spent longest was a secondary deputy: she spent about four days a week on staff development.

What barriers do CPD leaders face?

The CPD Leadership research found that capacity factors such as time and workload issues were greater barriers than operational factors such as awareness of opportunities available or cultural factors, such as the status of the CPD leader's role. Where staff development was weak in the Staff Development Outcomes case study schools, it was led by someone who had many other roles and so devoted little time to it. They had little administrative support and tried to do too much themselves.

How much of the budget is spent on staff development?

In all but three of the 35 Staff Development Outcomes study case study schools funding for staff development was not a concern. Indeed, people found it hard to work out what percentage of the school budget was used on staff development, because it was not something they were used to doing. Their estimates ranged between 0.5 and five per cent of the total school budget.

The role of governors

The State of the Nation research found that 'Governors regularly visited and enquired about what was happening, why and when - important facets of strategy'. However, the Staff Development Outcomes study found little evidence of governors having a role in the strategic management of staff development or in overseeing the link with school improvement: their role was to endorse decisions made by the staff development leader.

3. How needs are identified

In the Staff Development Outcomes case study schools where staff development was most effective, procedures such as performance management (PM) for identifying individual and team needs were well thought through and long established. Flexible systems allowed for needs to be identified and met as they arose without losing the impetus on original priorities. Of the 38 Testbed schools that had a performance review system in place, 22 included all staff in the system, 11 involved just teachers and five involved just teachers and teaching assistants. In all but one training and development were linked to performance reviews.

How are support staff needs identified?

The survey for the Staff Development Outcomes study found that seven out of ten support staff were included in some sort of performance management or appraisal and that they found this useful. However, nine per cent of support staff in the survey

said that the needs were not identified. The Support Staff research project found the same: 76 per cent said that there were systems to help them identify needs but 'just under a tenth of support staff said that no-one helped them to identify their training and development needs'.

In the SDO case study schools with strongest staff development, much effort was put into identifying the needs of support staff based on an understanding of opportunities and career frameworks. The CPD Leadership research found that a range of people led support staff development but that technicians, library staff, catering staff, people dedicated to extended services provision and volunteers were the least likely to have anyone taking responsibility for identifying the needs.

Is performance management helping identify teachers' needs?

The Staff Development Outcomes study found that performance management was going well. In its national survey, around half of senior staff and teachers considered performance management 'useful' and around one fifth 'very useful' for their career development, skills development, ability to do the job better, and in boosting self-esteem. However, up to a quarter of teachers and senior staff considered that PM was 'not useful'. The State of the Nation research concluded that 'It was usually happen chance if CPD arose out of a PM interview: CPD outcomes were seen as very fragmented and ad hoc and there was no expectation that discussion about this would be part of the process'.

How useful is the TDA Framework of Teacher Standards?

The findings from all the research projects suggest that:

- use is limited because not everyone has heard of the **Framework**
- those who have used it, value it
- senior staff use, or say they use, the standards more than classroom teachers
- the standards are seen more as a means of supporting PM than to aid forward planning such as identifying CPD needs or career planning.

It is clear that there is a significant number of teachers who are unaware of the **Framework of Teacher Standards**. This is of concern given the central importance of the standards in career progression and pay. The scale of the problem isn't however, clear, with research projects finding different percentages of teachers who had **not** heard of the **Framework**:

- Staff Development Outcomes (Feb-July 08) - 45 per cent of teachers (25% in secondary, 60% in primary and 67% in special schools)
- Stakeholder Tracking Survey (Jan-Feb 08) - 23 per cent of teachers, 16 per cent of senior leaders
- Teacher Voice Omnibus (Nov 08) - 13 per cent of teachers, 2 per cent of senior leaders
- Teachers Omnibus (Nov 07) - 3 per cent of teachers.

It is hard to account for the differences in the research findings. The timing of the research may be a factor: the Teachers Omnibus survey was carried out when there was much publicity about the standards and this coincided with statutory changes to performance management. The research methods might also be a factor: as well as different phrasing of questions and response options it must be noted that honesty and accuracy are easier to gain in face to face interviews than through questionnaires or telephone interviews.

Use of the Framework of Teacher Standards

The Staff Development Outcomes qualitative study found that the **Framework** was being used by just a quarter of teachers in 35 case study schools – it had been read by a further five per cent, seen by 13 per cent and a tenth had just heard of it. It was used most in secondary schools, by just under half of people asked, but only by a fifth of people in special schools and a tenth in primaries. Those people who did use the **Framework** were positive about it.

Two-thirds of senior team respondents to the Staff Development Outcomes questionnaire survey said they used the **Framework** in agreeing teachers' PM objectives but only 43 per cent of teachers said that this was the case. The Teacher Voice Omnibus (2008a) found a similar ratio: 78 per cent of senior leaders used the standards for PM, compared to 59 per cent of classroom teachers. The earlier Teachers Omnibus survey found that 69 per cent of teachers used the standards for PM and 61 per cent for identifying CPD needs. However, less than half used the standards for career planning.

4. Meeting needs

Do support staff feel their needs are met?

The Staff Development Outcomes study found that support staff who were most positive about how their school helps their development referred to the school ethos ('personal and professional development are highly regarded') and the benefits of specific training. Where support staff were less positive and even negative, it was because they felt that they had few training and development opportunities. There were four main reasons for this: financial constraints in which they felt they were at the bottom of priorities; a lack of time; poor or non-existent performance management systems; and contractual issues such as only being paid for after school training or INSET days.

The HLTA research found that people reported an increase in their level of skills, knowledge and confidence as a result of HLTA training and preparation, and that this had had a positive effect on their relationship with pupils and colleagues. Success in Testbed projects aimed specifically at support staff took care to identify their perceptions and needs and took account of individuals' or groups' needs and concerns. The demonstration effect was powerful: successful experiences of individuals gave strong encouragement for others to follow.

The Support Staff research found that they felt supported by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Three fifths said they felt 'very well supported' and around a third 'fairly well supported'. Very few (under one in ten) said that they did not feel supported by their school. However, whilst the majority (75%) had received some form of professional development in the 12 months preceding the survey, a quarter (24%) had not. Almost all (97%) who had had training rated its quality highly. Those who said they did not have a formal/written contract, staff aged 55 and over, and those working part time were most likely not to have had training and development. The majority of support staff agreed that they would prefer training and development to be held 'at or near' their own school.

Do teachers feel their needs are met?

Almost all teachers (86% SDO, 85% TVO 2008a) feel that their professional development needs are met to some extent. The Staff Development Outcomes survey found that 46 per cent of teachers reported that their school helped with their professional development 'greatly' and the Teacher Voice Omnibus (2008a) found that a quarter of teachers said they were met fully. Teachers felt that these needs

fitted in with school improvement plans. Overall, senior leaders in secondary schools were the most satisfied with their staff development, while classroom teachers in primary schools were the least satisfied. A significant minority (14%) of teachers maintained that their staff development needs had not been met. This was likely to be where personal needs did not match school priorities. The State of the Nation research concluded that more attention should be paid to teacher personal development and wellbeing in an educational climate of escalating performance demands.

What approaches to development did teachers use?

The State of the Nation survey found that teachers participated in a wide range of development activities, the most common of which were:

- in school workshops (77%)
- out of school workshops (60%)
- mentoring or related activities (52%).

Gaining accreditation was not seen as by teachers as important. Few participated in university courses (7%), teacher study groups (12%) or non-university accredited courses (14%). From this research it was judged that 'Most teachers' approaches to CPD tend not to be collaborative or informed by research. Current approaches tend to involve passive forms of learning and tend not to be sustained or embedded'.

The SFCC research found that there was a comparatively low level of interest among teachers in other forms of CPD beyond that which was practical in helping with classroom and behaviour management. The SoN research found that teachers placed most value on approaches to learning that involved experimenting with classroom practices and adapting what they do in the light of feedback from their pupils and colleagues and their own reflections and self-evaluation. Secondary teachers were provided with more varied opportunities for staff development than primary teachers. They found that teachers in the highest achieving schools were more likely to participate in development opportunities for collective reasons than other schools: they were more likely to attend conferences and participate in mentoring, coaching, lead teaching or observation activities. Teachers in the lowest achieving schools were offered more in school workshops.

Where staff development was strongest in the Staff Development Outcomes case studies, needs were met in the most effective way chosen from a wide menu of opportunities, many of which were school based. Most considered that their schools offered a wide range of opportunities, including professional dialogue, peer mentoring and action research as well as external and in school training sessions. The Staff Development Outcomes study found that few people used reading or watching Teachers TV programmes to help them develop: support staff were more likely to do so than teachers. Similarly, the SoN research found that teachers were unlikely to read research as a source for reflecting on or improving practice. The Testbed project found that 'Interventions that gave individuals the opportunity to reflect on their own training and development led in many cases to a range of positive outcomes'.

Mentoring and coaching

The majority of the teachers responding to the TVO (2008a) survey had been or were involved in mentoring or coaching in some form, most commonly as a mentor. Being trained in mentoring or coaching, however, was not commonly reported. The NFER literature review on mentoring and coaching suggests that these benefit new staff most and increase reflection for mentees/coachees, mentors/coaches and for organisations. These forms of development also encourage the sharing of improved

knowledge and skills. Only ten per cent of respondents were aware of and had used the National Framework for Mentoring and Coaching. Those that had, found it useful.

Involvement in staff development

The Staff Development Outcomes study found that staff in primary and special schools spent more time on development activities than their secondary colleagues. The State of the Nation research found that teachers with 20+ years of experience and those at the upper end of the career stages were involved in fewer CPD activities than are offered to them.

5. INSET days

How are INSET days used?

The Staff Development Outcomes study found that in spite of time being deemed to be the greatest barrier to staff development, not all the five INSET days were being used. Only 19 of the 35 case study schools and four out of ten senior staff and teacher questionnaire respondents used their INSET days as five whole days, with more primary (50%) than secondary (20%) so doing. Replacing INSET days with twilight sessions was said to allow more flexibility and a more personalised provision and longer staff holidays. Only a third of respondents said that the whole of their last INSET day had been spent on training and development. A fifth of support staff stated that they had not taken part in training at INSET days in the last 12 months.

How valuable are INSET days?

The Staff Development Outcomes and Teacher Voice Omnibus (2008) research found very similar views of INSET days. Three-quarters of staff found them useful to a degree but a quarter of teachers said that they were 'of little use'. Primary staff and senior staff in all phases were more content with INSET days. The range of views was most different in secondary schools.

6. Evaluating impact

Is the impact of training and development activities evaluated?

The research indicates that impact is evaluated, although to varying extents. The CPD Leadership research found that most respondents (96%) indicated that their school either 'always' or 'sometimes' evaluated impact. The majority of teachers (95%) surveyed in the TVO (2007) said that staff development was evaluated with one third judging that it happens 'a great deal' in their school. However, the TVO (2008) found that 36 per cent of teachers stated that their school did not evaluate much or at all. The Staff Development Outcomes survey data show that 95 per cent of senior staff but only 70 per cent of teachers and a half of support staff reported that the impact of their training and development was evaluated.

How is impact evaluated?

Senior staff at many of the SDO case study schools recognised the importance of the impact of staff development as a weakness, and welcomed advice on effective systems. Impact evaluation was conducted mainly through discussions with staff, evaluation forms, lesson observation and performance management reviews. The CPD Leadership research found that evaluation was most commonly made as part of the performance review/appraisal process for support staff and the PM process for teachers.

Impact on staff

Teachers in the State of the Nation research reported significant impact on their own knowledge and practices but little on ethos and belief for student and school practices. The Staff Development Outcomes study found that projects and courses spanning a

term or more, with activities to tribr research and involving purposeful collaboration, made most impact overall on school improvement and pupil outcomes. Senior staff identified networks and coaching and mentoring as the activities that had been most useful for their own leadership development.

In the Support Staff survey, over two-thirds of respondents said the training and development they received had helped support them in carrying out their role. One in seven felt they had gained confidence but one in 20 (5%) said that there had been no benefits. In a quarter of Testbed schools, training and development had resulted in support staff 'feeling and being regarded much more as part of the school, more equal, and more valued'. The HLTA research found that people who had undergone training for HLTA felt that their teaching practice had improved, particularly in managing a class and in behaviour management. In about a quarter of the 45 Testbed schools there was 'evidence of impacts on general confidence/self confidence or improved self esteem for support staff working with children (almost always TAs)'. The researchers considered that what was meant by 'confidence' needed to be specified more precisely in terms of dispositions and behaviours, such as willingness to take on new responsibilities.

Impact on pupils

In all the research projects people found it hard to prove that development activities were making a positive difference to pupils. Teachers in the Staff Development Outcomes survey said the impact that training and development had on pupils was 'better learning' (55%), 'greater motivation' (38%) and greater confidence (28%). Only 15 per cent thought their training and development had resulted in better test results. The State of the Nation research found that most teachers do not perceive that current CPD has an impact on raising standards or narrowing the achievement gap. The Testbed project found that it was difficult for schools to provide evidence that their interventions were having an impact on pupils. This was due to the nature of most interventions, which had a focus on making changes to systems and staff, with expected longer term effects on pupils.

Arrangements for covering lessons while staff undertook training varied. Pupils in ten of the SDO 35 case study schools felt strongly that staff absence for training had a disruptive and negative effect on their education and wellbeing. Many support staff and sixth form teachers were concerned that their work was not covered by anyone when they were absent for training – and that pupils suffered as a consequence.

Evaluating cost effectiveness

The research projects found few instances of schools evaluating cost effectiveness with any degree of rigour. The State of the Nation research found that school leaders perceived that school based and classroom based activities provided better value for money than external events, so for example in school workshops, mentoring and teacher networks were rated highly and accredited courses lowly. Secondary schools spent far more on external courses than primary schools.

Dissemination

Research found that dissemination and sustaining development were weak. Staff at different levels in the Staff Development Outcomes case study schools identified these as areas that could and should be improved. The State of the Nation research also found that training has little impact beyond the individuals involved despite teachers generally reporting a significant amount of sharing of learning from CPD activities. This was because activities were not sustained, continuous or embedded over time. They also lacked a coherent focus.

7. Barriers to staff development

Who experienced barriers?

The picture varies between teachers and support staff, with barriers being greater for the latter. The Staff Development Outcomes survey found that 44 per cent of support staff and 35 per cent of teachers had experienced barriers to their training and development. The Support Staff research found that two-thirds (65%) of support staff identified a range of factors which they said prevented them from taking part in training and development. In two-thirds of the State of the Nation research schools the emerging view was that there were no insurmountable or significant barriers to accessing the CPD that was identified as meeting a professional need and which would help children to progress in their learning. However, custom and practice understandings of budgets and time available resulted in self-regulation by teachers and a strong sense of what it was 'reasonable' to request in this area of school life.

What were the barriers?

The barriers most frequently mentioned in all the relevant research were related to time, finance and support. The resource constraint most commonly identified in the Testbed project was time, with finance mentioned in a few cases. A third of the SDO survey support staff and a quarter of teacher respondents said that funding was a barrier. A fifth of teachers said that time was a barrier: they did not feel they had time to look at opportunities, to undertake activities and reflect. People also mentioned poor performance management, restricted promotion opportunities and difficulties with cover, as well as issues around their status and contracts. Respondents said that they would have much more staff development if money were no object: they wanted time to develop thoroughly.

The Teacher Voice Omnibus (2008) found that the main barrier teachers faced was gaining time out of the classroom to attend training (66%). Other barriers, noted by over 40 per cent of teachers in each case included the suitability of available development activities, cost or availability of supply cover, and funding. More primary than secondary teachers indicated that cover issues and the suitability of available development activities were barriers. Cover and funding issues were, on the whole, more of a barrier for classroom teachers than for senior staff. Time was a particularly pressing issue for senior secondary staff. Other barriers included pursuing areas of personal interests said to be blocked; the priorities of the head/school were not the same as those of the respondent; issues of workload, and a feeling that part-time staff did not necessarily have the same priorities as full-timers.

The Support Staff research found that just under a third of support staff said that other commitments and demands on their time prevented them from taking part in training and development. Lack of funding was also identified as a barrier by one in seven of support staff. The following groups identified a significantly greater number of barriers to taking part in training and development:

- staff who said they did not have a formal/written contract compared to those with a permanent contract
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- learning support staff compared to site staff
- staff with a qualification in English compared to those without such a qualification
- teaching assistants compared to site staff
- staff in secondary schools compared to those in primary schools
- staff aged 45 - 54 compared to those aged 34 - 44.

A fifth of support staff respondents did not know where to obtain information about training and development. Both the SDO and HLTA research found that support staff felt that their development and achievements went unrecognised: they were often not reflected by a change in role or increase in pay.

Table 1: Summary of TDA research projects

Project reports can be found at www.tda.gov.uk/about/research.aspx

<i>Project and contractor</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>What</i>
Staff Development Outcomes study (SDO), Institute of Education	Feb-Jul 08 Sep-Oct 08	Case studies of 35 schools: interviews with 198 teachers, 181 support staff, 100 pupils, 6 governors Questionnaires from 397 senior team, 466 teachers, 749 support staff
State of the Nation (SoN), Cambridge and Open Universities	Jan-June 08	Questionnaires from 1,126 teachers Focus groups and interviews with 129 teachers in 12 schools
Teachers Omnibus (TO 07), Ipsos/MORI	Nov 07	Telephone interviews with 1,000 teachers
Teacher Voice Omnibus (TVO 08a), NFER	June 08	Questionnaires from 1,479 teachers
Teacher Voice Omnibus (TVO 08b), NFER	Nov 08	Questionnaires from 1,361 teachers
CPD Leadership project NFER	Feb-Mar 08	Questionnaires from 1,509 CPD leaders
Mentoring & Coaching for Professionals NFER	Oct 08	Literature review
Stakeholder Tracking Survey Wave 3, BMG	Jan-Feb 08	Telephone interviews with sample of 2,529 schools, 208 LAs and 82 ITT providers
Support Staff Experiences of Training & Development, NFER/Ipsos MORI	Autumn 06	Telephone interviews with 3,156 support staff in 366 schools A desk study of 17 relevant documents
Evaluation of the HLTA Training & Assessment Prog, Pye Tait	Feb-Nov 05	Telephone interviews with 272 candidates from 36 providers Focus groups of 65 HLTAs Interviews with 15 HLTA training providers
Developing the Whole School Workforce : an Evaluation of the Testbed Programme, Sheffield Hallam Univ	Spring 06 - Summer 07	Case studies of 45 schools involving 3 visits per school (included interviews, documentation and other sources) over 4 terms
Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances, Jigsaw Research	Mar-May 08 May 08 June-July 08	Case studies of 16 schools - approx 60 staff 6 focus groups: 2 with experienced teachers, 2 NQTs & 2 trainees (numbers not specified) Telephone survey of 154 heads, 253 teachers and 72 trainees