



NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus June 2009 Survey

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) TDA

This report was written by: David Teeman and Katie Pyle

Please direct all questions about this report to Katie Pyle, Project Manager of the Omnibus at the NFER (k.pyle@nfer.ac.uk).

July 2009

Contents

Introduction	1
Context	1
Analysis of findings	3
The sample	3
Revised professional standards for teachers	3
Performance management and improvement plans	4
The impact of CPD	5
Forms of CPD	7
Conclusions and implications for the client	13
Supporting information	15
How was the survey conducted?	15
What was the composition of the panel?	15
How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?	15
How accurately do the findings represent the national position?	19

Introduction

Six questions about Continuing Professional Development (CPD) were submitted by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) to NFER's Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey in June 2009. The questions covered CPD for teachers and the revised professional standards for teachers. The questions addressed the following specific topics:

- whether teachers use the professional standards for identifying CPD needs and for performance management
- whether schools link CPD to performance management and the school improvement plan, and the extent to which the impact of CPD is assessed
- how important teachers feel that CPD is when planning their future careers
- the extent to which CPD involves all school staff.

This report provides an analysis of the responses to the questions, along with supporting information about the survey. Results are presented by school phase (primary and secondary) and by teacher seniority level (classroom teachers or senior leaders). This report forms one part of the output from the Omnibus Survey. The analysis is also presented in more detail in a set of interactive web-based tables provided separately (in Pulsar Web).

Context

The importance placed on the CPD of school staff has been recently emphasised in the new White Paper *Your child, your schools, our future: building a 21st century school system* and its sister paper dealing with the specific issue of school report cards. The first of these papers emphasises and reinforces the importance placed on workforce development, promising the development of a world class school workforce - with the Masters in Teaching and Learning (MTL) occupying centre stage - and improved training and development for support staff. It is also clear that the introduction of the revised performance management and performance review arrangements, and the introduction of the new professional standards for teachers and support staff from 2007, make this an appropriate time for considerations of support for CPD leadership. The publication of the 'Children's Plan' and 'Being the best for our children' with proposals for a Masters-level profession have further served to reinforce the significance of CPD and its leadership.

The TDA is the national agency and recognised sector body responsible for the training and development of the school workforce in England. In 2004, the remit of the TDA was enhanced to include the training and development of the wider school workforce. This was further extended the following year when the Agency was asked by the Government to take forward work focusing on continuing professional development for teachers. Consequently, the key purpose of the TDA became ‘To raise children’s standards of achievement and promote their well-being by improving the training and development of the whole school workforce’.

In 2007, the TDA introduced the new revised professional standards for teachers¹, which provide a clear framework of the skills, knowledge and attributes that teachers need to perform their role effectively at all stages of their teaching career. The standards form a back-drop to the new performance management arrangements which were implemented in schools in autumn 2007² to enable the more effective review of teachers’ performance and development needs. The standards are intended to be used as a reference point during the performance management process. Schools are also expected to link performance management to their school improvement plans, integrating staff development with the development of the school as a whole.

The revised professional standards should form an integral part of career planning and the identification of CPD needs. The standards also have implications for teachers’ career progression and pay, as teachers will need to be able to demonstrate how they meet the standards in order to progress. On this basis, it is very important that teachers are both aware of the standards and are using them to plan their future careers and CPD needs. Research conducted by NFER on behalf of the TDA in October 2008 suggested that while some teachers were using the professional standards as a reference point for career planning, identifying CPD needs and performance management, their use was not yet universal. Further, one in ten classroom teachers (11 per cent) appeared to be unaware of the standards.

The TDA (with partners in the other three UK countries) have also developed the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools to encompass the much broader range of roles that support pupils’ learning in schools; including cover supervision, pastoral and welfare roles, supporting English as an Additional Language (EAL), support to children with special educational needs (SEN),

¹ Training and Development Agency for Schools (2007). *Professional Standards for Teachers. Why Sit Still in Your Career?* London: TDA [online]. Available:

http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/standards_a4.pdf [23 July 2009].

² <http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/professionalstandards/using.aspx> [23 July 2009]

stemming from remodelling and other policy initiatives. Developed in parallel with the new and revised standards for teachers and HLTAs, this new framework of professional and occupational standards, which was introduced in 2007, collectively describes the role of all classroom practitioners.

In this context it was useful, in this round of the Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey, to continue to seek information about whether teachers use the professional standards for performance management and identifying CPD needs. Respondents were also asked about the extent to which CPD in their school is linked to individual teachers' needs, the school's improvement plan and whether CPD is evaluated to assess its impact. Further, teachers were asked how important CPD is to them when considering their future careers and to what extent CPD applies to all staff working in their schools.

Analysis of findings

The sample

The survey was completed by a sample of over 1,400 teachers and the sample was weighted to ensure representativeness. The sample included teachers from a wide range of school governance types and subject areas. Sample numbers were sufficient to allow for comparisons between the primary and secondary sectors. Detailed information about the sample is given in the supplementary section of this report.

Revised professional standards for teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they had used the new professional standards for performance management and identifying CPD needs; similar questions had also been asked in the October 2008 and February 2009 NFER Omnibus Surveys and, where possible, responses are compared. As in the previous two surveys, the findings suggest that teachers view the standards as more of a means of supporting performance management than as a means of forward planning, i.e. identifying future CPD needs, as can be seen from Table 1:

- around two-thirds (68 per cent) of respondents had used the standards for performance management, which was similar to the proportion responding in this way in February (71 per cent)
- just over a third (36 per cent) reported having used them for identifying CPD needs, a noticeably lower proportion than those who responded in this way in February (58 per cent).

Table 1.

Have you used the revised professional standards for teachers that were introduced in June 2007 for any of the following?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Performance management	68%	67%	69%
Identifying CPD needs	36%	33%	39%
Other	13%	11%	14%
Have not used	22%	24%	20%
Local base (N)	1404	725	678

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

There remains about a fifth of respondents who reported that they had not used the standards at all (the figures were 22 per cent of all respondents in June 2009, and the same proportion, 22 per cent in February 2009). Clearly, the proportion of staff using the standards to identify CPD needs has dropped and the proportion not using the standards at all remains static.

Broadly, findings did not differ between teachers from the secondary and primary sectors. There were, however, some differences in the responses from senior leaders and classroom teachers:

- a higher proportion of senior leaders than classroom teachers had used the revised standards for performance management (83 per cent) and identifying CPD needs (53 per cent) compared to 65 per cent and 32 per cent respectively among classroom teachers
- a smaller proportion of senior leaders had *not* used the revised standards at all, eight per cent compared to 25 per cent of classroom teachers.

This is perhaps unsurprising, as senior school staff are likely to make greater use of the standards in their role of supporting staff CPD generally.

Performance management and improvement plans

The next question in the survey asked teachers about the extent to which CPD was linked to their school's performance management and school improvement plan. The responses suggest that, in most schools, CPD *was* linked to the schools' performance management and improvement plan. As Table 2 shows, more than eight out of ten teachers reported that a link existed, at least to some extent ('a great deal' 42 per cent or 'a fair amount' 43

per cent). The responses to a similar question in the October 2008 survey, but asking only about the link to the school improvement plan, were very similar.

Table 2.

To what extent is CPD in your school linked to performance management and the school improvement plan?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	42%	41%	42%
A fair amount	43%	43%	41%
Not very much	14%	14%	14%
Not at all	2%	1%	3%
Local base (N)	1404	725	677

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

The overall pattern of findings was similar in both primary and secondary schools. There were some differences, however, in the responses from senior leaders and classroom teachers:

- more than nine in ten senior leaders said that CPD was linked to their school’s performance management and improvement plan to some extent (‘a great deal’ 56 per cent and ‘a fair amount’ 37 per cent) compared to 83 per cent of classroom teachers who said the same
- less than one in ten senior staff (seven per cent) reported that CPD was not linked to their school’s performance management and improvement plan (very much or at all), compared to 18 per cent of classroom teachers who said the same.

This may be due to either (a) senior leaders having a better overview of their school’s CPD strategy, and/or (b) senior leaders providing the ‘desirable’ response to this question. Classroom teachers’ responses may therefore reflect the perception of the relationship between CPD and the two strategic plans from the perspective of those with less direct involvement with strategy.

The impact of CPD

The next series of questions in the survey asked teachers to what extent and by what means, CPD in their schools was evaluated to assess impact.

The responses, presented in Table 3, show that about two-thirds of teachers (64 per cent) said that their school had evaluated the impact of CPD either ‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair

amount’, while just over a third (37 per cent) reported that impact was evaluated ‘not very much’ or ‘not at all’. These findings are very similar to those noted in October 2008 and in February this year and therefore suggest that there has been little change in reducing the small proportion of schools who are *not* evaluating the impacts of CPD.

Table 3.

To what extent is CPD in your school evaluated for impact?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	17%	16%	18%
A fair amount	47%	49%	45%
Not very much	30%	30%	30%
Not at all	7%	6%	8%
Local base (N)	1402	724	676

*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009*

Broadly, responses from primary and secondary school staff were similar; however there were some differences in the responses from senior leaders and classroom teachers. For example, over three-quarters of senior leaders (79 per cent) reported that their school evaluated the impact of CPD either ‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair amount’ compared to about three-fifths of classroom teachers (61 per cent) who said the same.

These findings may illustrate the reality that senior staff often, by the nature of their responsibilities, have a better strategic overview than do classroom teachers, whose awareness of evaluative activity is understandably not as well informed as their more senior counterparts. Having said this, it is clear that there is some room to improve the evaluation of the impact of CPD in a substantial minority of schools.

Respondents were also asked to briefly describe the methods that were used to evaluate the impact of CPD. Responses were analysed and coded and Table 4 presents the ten most frequently mentioned evaluation methods. Responses differed slightly across school phases:

- it would seem that secondary schools are more likely than primary schools to use paper-based and targeted methods to identify impact such as evaluation sheets and questionnaires
- primary schools are more likely than secondary schools to use less paper-based methods such as school-based meetings and reviews, links to SDP/SIP and evidence of impact on pupil progress.

Broadly, responses from senior staff and classroom staff were similar, however, they were found to differ in two respects: although based on small numbers of respondents, it appeared that higher proportions of senior leaders than classroom teachers mentioned links to SDP/SIP (14 per cent compared to six per cent) and evidence of new strategies/ideas adopted by teachers (13 compared to six per cent) as ways they used to measure impact.

Table 4.

Describe briefly the methods used to evaluate impact*	All	Primary	Secondary
Feedback in department/staff/ department meetings/INSET	23%	27%	19%
Evaluation sheets from courses	19%	10%	27%
Performance management	16%	18%	13%
Lesson observations	13%	15%	11%
Termly/annual staff reviews/interviews	11%	10%	11%
Questionnaires/surveys	11%	6%	16%
Senior Leadership Team discussion/evaluation	8%	9%	6%
Links to School Development Plan/School Improvement Plan	8%	11%	5%
Evidence of new strategy/ideas being used by teacher	7%	9%	5%
Impact on pupil progress	7%	11%	3%
Local base (N)	1063*	551	511

**Top 10 responses as given by 'all teachers'. All responses are available in Pulsar Web.*

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Forms of CPD

The next series of questions in the survey asked teachers about how useful they had found different types or forms of CPD (or whether they had undertaken them at all) and about the extent to which CDP in their schools had involved the whole staff.

Responses from staff in secondary and primary schools about their experience of different forms of CPD were very similar, but in some respects those from senior staff and classroom teachers differed noticeably. Overall, while 'courses' were the most mentioned form of CPD, CPD related to what might be termed 'collegiate' support were consistently rated as useful by large proportions of respondents, these types of CPD accounting for

three of the four most mentioned forms/types of CPD. On the other hand, online CPD was amongst the least used form of support, suggesting that there is some way to go to fully develop the potential of this form of professional development (and perhaps make it more relevant and attractive to staff).

These Omnibus Survey questions also provided an opportunity to ask teachers about their ratings of the usefulness of particular forms of professional development. The key findings emerging from Tables 5 to 11 are summarised below. In considering these tables, it is worth emphasising that the proportion who were able to comment on the usefulness of the CPD approach was related to the proportion who had experienced each approach. For example, 71 per cent had not used online study, while only ten per cent had not attended courses. Consequently, comparisons between the percentages indicating the usefulness of an approach should not be made between approaches. The tables show that in relation to:

- **attending courses** – nine out of ten respondents (91 per cent) had undertaken CPD courses, and over four-fifths (85 per cent) of *all* respondents had found this form of CPD to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’; only three per cent of all respondents had found CPD courses ‘not very useful’ or ‘not at all useful’ (see Table 6); a larger proportion of senior leaders had found attending courses ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ (92 per cent) compared with classroom teachers, 83 per cent of whom said this had been ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’
- **working collaboratively with others** – just under nine out of ten respondents (88 per cent) had undertaken this form of CPD, and four-fifths (80 per cent) of *all* respondents had found this to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’; only three per cent of all respondents had found working collaboratively ‘not very useful’ or ‘not at all useful’ (Table 8); a larger proportion of senior leaders found working collaboratively ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ than did classroom teachers (95 per cent compared to 77 per cent)
- **observing colleagues** – over three-quarters of respondents (78 per cent) had undertaken this form of CPD, and nearly three-quarters (72 per cent) of *all* respondents had found this to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ (Table 7); a larger proportion of senior leaders found observing colleagues ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ than did classroom teachers (94 per cent compared to 67 per cent)
- **coaching and mentoring** – seven out of ten respondents (70 per cent) had undertaken this form of CPD, and three-fifths (59 per cent) of *all* respondents had found this to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’; only four per cent of all respondents had found coaching and mentoring ‘not very useful’ or ‘not at all useful’ (Table 5); a larger proportion of senior leaders found coaching and mentoring ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ than did classroom teachers (88 per cent compared to 53 per cent)
- **online study** – less than a third of the sample (29 per cent) had experienced online study as a form of CPD and opinions on the usefulness of this form of CPD varied: 16 per cent of all respondents had found it to be ‘very’ or ‘quite

useful’, but nine per cent were ‘unsure’ and four per cent found it ‘not very useful’ or ‘not at all useful’ (Table 10); a larger proportion of senior leaders found online study useful than did classroom teachers (32 per cent compared to 13 per cent)

- **Masters level study** – just under one in four of the sample (23 per cent) had undertaken Masters degree level study and, again, opinions on the usefulness of this form of CPD varied: 13 per cent of all respondents had found it to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’, but seven per cent were ‘unsure’ and three per cent found it ‘not very useful’ or ‘not at all useful’ (Table 9); a greater proportion of senior leaders reported that Masters-level study had been ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ (20 per cent) than was the case among classroom teachers (12 per cent)
- **other forms of CPD** (including ‘in house training’ and ‘collaboration with other schools’) – around one in five respondents (18 per cent) reported undertaking other forms of CPD: about one in ten (12 per cent) of all respondents had found these to be ‘very’ or ‘quite useful’ (Table 11).

Overall, responses suggested that senior leaders were more likely to have experienced the various forms of CPD explored and to have found them useful.

Table 5.

	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	25%	26%	25%
Quite useful	34%	32%	36%
Unsure	7%	7%	6%
Not very useful	3%	3%	4%
Not at all useful	1%	1%	1%
Have not undertaken	31%	32%	29%
Local base (N)	1327	678	648

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 6.

How useful was attending courses as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	35%	35%	36%
Quite useful	50%	53%	46%
Unsure	3%	3%	2%
Not very useful	2%	2%	2%
Not at all useful	1%	1%	1%
Have not undertaken	10%	6%	14%
Local base (N)	1385	720	662

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 7.

How useful was observing colleagues as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	36%	36%	36%
Quite useful	36%	32%	40%
Unsure	3%	3%	3%
Not very useful	3%	3%	3%
Not at all useful	<1%	<1%	<1%
Have not undertaken	22%	26%	18%
Local base (N)	1363	704	659

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 8.

How useful was working collaboratively with others as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	42%	45%	39%
Quite useful	38%	38%	39%
Unsure	5%	3%	7%
Not very useful	2%	1%	2%
Not at all useful	1%	0%	1%
Have not undertaken	13%	13%	12%
Local base (N)	1359	703	655

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 9.

How useful was Masters level study as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	6%	5%	8%
Quite useful	7%	5%	9%
Unsure	7%	5%	9%
Not very useful	2%	1%	2%
Not at all useful	1%	<1%	1%
Have not undertaken	77%	84%	71%
Local base (N)	1258	640	618

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 10.

How useful was online study as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	3%	3%	4%
Quite useful	13%	12%	13%
Unsure	9%	8%	11%
Not very useful	3%	3%	3%
Not at all useful	1%	1%	<1%
Have not undertaken	71%	73%	69%
Local base (N)	1262	647	615

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table 11.

How useful was anything else you or your staff did as a form of CPD for your development or the development of your staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
Very useful	7%	6%	8%
Quite useful	5%	6%	4%
Unsure	5%	5%	6%
Not very useful	1%	<1%	1%
Not at all useful	<1%	<1%	0%
Have not undertaken	82%	82%	82%
Local base (N)	689	364	322

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Respondents were asked about the extent to which CPD in their schools had involved the whole staff. Responses in Table 12 show that most teachers (82 per cent) thought that CPD had involved the whole staff ‘a great deal’ (36 per cent) or ‘a fair amount’ (46 per cent). However, about a fifth (18 per cent) of staff did not agree, suggesting that, for a minority of staff, there is scope for their schools to further develop a whole-school approach.

Responses from secondary and primary school staff were very similar; however, those from senior leaders and classroom teachers differed notably; almost all senior leaders (98 per cent) said that CPD had involved the whole staff, comprising 60 per cent who said it

did ‘a great deal’ and 38 per cent who said it did ‘a fair amount’, compared to 79 per cent of classroom staff who said the same. This suggests that the perceptions of senior leaders are possibly not matched by those of a large proportion of classroom staff, albeit not in the same schools.

Table 12.

To what extent does CPD in your school involve the whole staff?			
	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	36%	35%	38%
A fair amount	46%	48%	44%
Not very much	17%	16%	17%
Not at all	1%	2%	1%
Local base (N)	1401	724	675

*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009*

Conclusions and implications for the client

As with previous Omnibus Survey findings, the June 2009 findings suggest that the professional standards are being used by some teachers, but use is still yet to become universal. Hence, there is still potential for further progress in all of the areas explored in this most recent survey. Further, there was little difference in responses from secondary and primary school teachers, while the opposite was generally true when comparing senior and classroom staff responses. Broadly, senior leaders tend to return higher frequencies of use and experience of CPD, and tend to be more positive about CPD than their classroom counterparts. In some ways this is not surprising, as CPD is a central part of senior staff responsibilities; however, contrasts in perceptions about use and take up of CPD, for instance, in relation to whole staff involvement in CPD, may be worth exploring further.

More specifically, the findings suggest that teachers view the professional standards as more of a means of supporting performance management than for identifying CPD needs, suggesting perhaps that the standards need better orientating or making more relevant for CPD purposes.

The majority of respondents indicated that CPD was linked to the school's performance management and improvement plan to some extent. However, more than one in ten teachers expressed a view that CPD was not clearly linked to their school's performance management and improvement plan. This suggests that there has been progress towards achieving a whole-school approach to CPD in which individuals' development is linked to the school development plan, which research suggests can contribute to better quality teaching and learning³, but this approach is not yet universal.

About a third of teachers reported that the impact of CPD was not evaluated 'very much' or 'at all'. This finding is very similar to those noted in October 2008 and February this year and therefore suggests that there continue to be a minority of schools which are *not* evaluating the impacts of CPD. Formal/paper-based methods of evaluation seem more predominant in secondary schools, whereas less formal conversational methods are used more in primary schools, perhaps reflecting differences in school size in the two sectors.

While 'courses' were the most-frequently mentioned form of CPD, CPD formats related to collegiate support were rated as useful by large proportions of respondents. On the other hand, online CPD was amongst the least used forms of support, suggesting that there is still scope to fully develop the potential of this form of CPD. There may be value in exploring teachers' reasons for making more use of particular types of CPD and less use of other types. This could examine whether, for example, this is related to the extent to which they can build it into their working day, or have protected time to attend a course, or whether they need to identify additional time in which to undertake CPD.

Most teachers thought that CPD did involve the whole staff, however, about a fifth did not agree, suggesting that there may be value in exploring further whether this view is particularly prevalent among staff in specific roles.

The findings as a whole suggest that there is very good take up of various forms of CPD, and most respondents find most forms of CPD useful. It is reasonable to say, however, that there remain some areas for improvement. Further improvements to evaluation, communications and awareness of CPD provision may go some way, for example, towards addressing the 'gap' between senior leaders' and classroom teachers' views and helping to ensure that strategic views are more closely attuned to the realities of frontline teachers.

³ Office for Standards in Education (2006). *The Logical Chain: Continuing Professional Development in Effective Schools*. [online]. Available: [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Leadership/Management/The-logical-chain-continuing-professional-development-in-effective-schools/\(language/eng-GB](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Leadership/Management/The-logical-chain-continuing-professional-development-in-effective-schools/(language/eng-GB) [25 November 2008].

Supporting information

How was the survey conducted?

This is data from the June 2009 survey. The survey was completed in June 2009 by a panel of 1,431 practising teachers from 911 schools in the maintained sector in England. The survey was conducted online and teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire between 19th June and 1st July. During the survey period all ‘open’ questions (those without a pre-identified set of responses) were coded by a team of experienced coders within the Foundation.

What was the composition of the panel?

The panel included teachers from the full range of roles in primary and secondary schools, from headteachers to newly qualified class teachers. Fifty-one per cent (726) of the respondents were teaching in primary schools and 49 per cent (705) were teaching in secondary schools.

How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?

There was an under-representation of schools in the highest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals in both the sample of primary schools and the sample of secondary schools. The sample of secondary schools also had an over-representation of schools with low eligibility for free school meals. To address this, weights were calculated using free schools meals factors to create a more balanced sample. Due to the differences between the populations of primary schools and secondary schools, different weights were created for primary schools, secondary schools and then for the whole sample overall. The weightings have been applied to all of the analyses referred to in this commentary and contained within the tables supplied in electronic format (via Pulsar Web)⁴.

Tables S.1, S. 2 and S.3 show the representation of the weighted achieved sample against the population. Table S.4 shows the representation of the weighted teacher sample by role in school.

⁴ *The sample was not weighted for missing free school meal data*

Table S.1 Representation of (weighted) primary schools compared to primary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by KS2 2007 data)	Lowest band	16	17
	2nd lowest band	17	18
	Middle band	18	19
	2nd highest band	20	21
	Highest band	21	24
	Missing	8	1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	21	21
	2nd lowest 20%	21	21
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	19	20
	Highest 20%	18	18
	Missing	1	0
Primary school type	Infant/First	15	9
	Primary/Combined	76	75
	Junior	8	15
	Middle/other type	<1	<1
Region	North	31	23
	Midlands	32	28
	South	37	49
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	13
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	18
	English Unitary Authorities	18	20
	Counties	51	49
Number of schools		17044	587

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table S.2 Representation of (weighted) secondary schools compared to secondary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by GCSE 2007 data)	Lowest band	19	13
	2nd lowest band	19	23
	Middle band	19	23
	2nd highest band	18	24
	Highest band	17	16
	Missing	9	<1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	13	14
	2nd lowest 20%	24	25
	Middle 20%	25	26
	2nd highest 20%	21	21
	Highest 20%	14	14
	Missing	3	0
Secondary school type	Middle	7	<1
	Comprehensive to 16	37	27
	Comprehensive to 18	47	68
	Secondary Moderns	<1	<1
	Grammar	5	4
	Academies	4	0
Region	North	29	26
	Midlands	34	30
	South	37	45
Local Authority type	London Borough	13	13
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	23
	English Unitary Authorities	19	22
	Counties	47	42
Number of schools		3328	324

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100. Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent. Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table S.3 Representation of all schools (weighted) compared to all schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (By KS2 2007 and GCSE 2007 data)	Lowest band	17	16
	2nd lowest band	18	19
	Middle band	18	21
	2nd highest band	20	22
	Highest band	20	22
	Missing	7	<1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	21	22
	Middle 20%	21	21
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	17	18
	Missing	1	0
Region	North	30	24
	Midlands	32	29
	South	37	48
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	13
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	19
	English Unitary Authorities	18	21
	Counties	50	47
Number of schools		20372	911

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009

Table S.4 Comparison of the achieved (weighted) sample with the national population by grade of teacher

Role	Primary schools		Secondary schools	
	population	weighted sample	population	weighted sample
	%	%	%	%
Headteachers	10	7	2	1
Deputy Headteachers	7	10	3	3
Assistant Headteachers	4	5	6	9
Class teachers and others	79	78	89	86

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Sources: NFER Omnibus Survey June 2009, DCSF: School Workforce in England (including pupil: teacher ratios and pupil: adult ratios), January 2009 (Provisional)

<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000844/index.shtml> (July 2009)

How accurately do the findings represent the national position?

Precision is a measure of the extent to which the results of different samples agree with each other. If we drew a different sample of teachers would we get the same results? The more data that is available the more precise the findings. For all schools and a 50 per cent response, the precision of that response is between 46.7 per cent and 53.3 per cent. For secondary schools the same precision is + and – 5.4 percentage points and for primary schools it is + and – 4 percentage points.

With the weightings applied to the data, we are confident that the omnibus sample is broadly representative of teachers nationally and provides a robust analysis of teachers' views.