



national remodelling team: evaluation study (year 2)

final report

Claire Easton
Rebekah Wilson
Caroline Sharp

Published online in July 2005 by the
National Foundation for Educational Research
The Mere, Upton Park
Slough, Berkshire SL1 2DQ
www.nfer.ac.uk

© NFER 2005
Registered Charity No. 313392
ISBN 1 905314 06 X

Designed by Stuart Gordon at NFER
Page layout by Patricia Lewis

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgements | vi |
| Executive summary | vii |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 The National Agreement | 1 |
| 1.2 The National Remodelling Team | 1 |
| 1.3 The future of the NRT | 2 |
| 1.4 Report structure | 3 |
| 2 Aims and methodology | 4 |
| 2.1 Evaluation aims | 4 |
| 2.2 Methodology | 4 |
| 3 Findings from LEA Remodelling Adviser survey and interviews | 6 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 6 |
| 3.2 Survey to LEA Remodelling Advisers | 6 |
| 3.3 LEA Remodelling Adviser interviews | 7 |
| 3.4 LEA Remodelling Adviser role | 8 |
| 3.5 Involvement in the remodelling process | 10 |
| 3.6 Number of schools involved in remodelling across the LEA | 14 |
| 3.7 Working with others | 16 |
| 3.8 Effectiveness of NRT training | 24 |
| 3.9 Achievements and challenges | 28 |
| 3.10 Further developments | 31 |
| 3.11 Further comments | 34 |
| 4 Findings from NRT Regional Trainer survey and interviews | 35 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 35 |
| 4.2 Survey of NRT Regional Trainers | 35 |
| 4.3 Regional Trainer interviews | 36 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 4.4 | The Regional Trainer role | 38 |
| 4.5 | Training and support | 39 |
| 4.6 | Working with others | 42 |
| 4.7 | Delivery of training | 45 |
| 4.8 | Further comments | 51 |
| 5 | Findings from Regional Adviser interviews | 53 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 53 |
| 5.2 | Regional Adviser interviews | 53 |
| 5.3 | The Regional Adviser role | 54 |
| 5.4 | Working with others | 55 |
| 5.5 | Training and support | 59 |
| 5.6 | Opportunities and challenges | 61 |
| 5.7 | Impacts and achievements | 62 |
| 5.8 | Further developments | 64 |
| 6 | Findings from interviews with Regional Centre Directors and Programme Managers | 67 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 67 |
| 6.2 | Methods | 67 |
| 6.3 | Background | 68 |
| 6.4 | Involvement in the remodelling process | 69 |
| 6.5 | Training and support | 70 |
| 6.6 | Working with others | 72 |
| 6.7 | Regional Centres and the NRT | 74 |
| 6.8 | Achievements and challenges | 75 |
| 6.9 | Future developments | 77 |
| 6.10 | Further comments | 79 |
| 7 | Summary of key findings and issues for consideration | 80 |
| 7.1 | Introduction | 80 |
| 7.2 | NFER evaluation studies | 80 |
| 7.3 | The change process | 81 |
| 7.4 | Working with others | 81 |
| 7.5 | Training and support | 82 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 7.6 | Achievements | 84 |
| 7.7 | Challenges | 84 |
| 7.8 | Future developments | 85 |
| 7.9 | Main conclusion | 85 |
| 7.10 | Issues for consideration | 86 |
| 8 | Recommendations for future evaluation | 87 |
| 8.1 | Introduction | 87 |
| 8.2 | Recommendations | 87 |
| | References | 88 |
| | Appendix 1 Interview schedules | 89 |
| A1.1 | Interview schedule for LEA Remodelling Advisers | 89 |
| A1.2 | Interview schedule for Regional Trainers | 90 |
| A1.3 | Interview schedule for NRT Regional Advisers | 92 |
| A1.4 | Interview schedule for Regional Centre Directors and Programme Managers | 93 |
| | Appendix 2 Questionnaires | 95 |

Acknowledgements

The NFER team would like to thank all the respondents who participated in this evaluation study. We are most appreciative of their views and insights, which form the basis of this report.

Special thanks to Emma Scott and Emma Whittinger for their statistical support, to Graham Taylor for conducting several interviews, to Jennifer Jupp for administering the questionnaire surveys, to Penny Stephens for her coding work, and to Neelam Basi and Karen Durbin for their administrative assistance.

In addition, the NFER team would like to thank the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) and National Remodelling Team (NRT) for their support and guidance.

Executive summary

Introduction

In early 2003, *Raising Standards and Tackling Workload: a National Agreement* [ATL *et al.*, 2003] was signed by the Government, employers and all but one of the school workforce unions, with the aim of raising standards in schools by addressing teacher workload issues. The agreement comprised three phases of change to teachers' conditions of service, to be implemented in all maintained schools over three years.

- Phase one (September 2003) considered the work/life balance of teachers, reducing their administrative burdens and introduced leadership and management time for those with management responsibilities.
- Phase two (September 2004) put a limit on the amount of time teachers can be required to spend covering for absent colleagues.
- Phase three (which comes into effect from September 2005) establishes guaranteed Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time for all teachers, dedicated headship time and removes the requirement for teachers to invigilate examinations and tests.

As a direct consequence of the signing of the Agreement, the National Remodelling Team (NRT) was established to promote the implementation of the National Agreement (known as remodelling) and support schools through the process. The aim of the NFER evaluation was to examine the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT during its second year of operation. This work followed a previous NFER study, which evaluated the NRT's effectiveness and impact in year one (Wilson *et al.*, 2005).

Key findings

The evidence suggests that the NRT has been very effective in supporting the implementation of the National Agreement. It has developed local networks for local education authorities (LEAs) to share and develop practice. According to LEA Advisers, the number of schools involved in remodelling in the NRT's second year was almost double the number involved in its first year.

Using the change process

The development of remodelling in schools was facilitated through the NRT's recommended five-stage change process, which was used by the majority of LEAs at school training events. In some cases, LEAs had adapted the process to suit local contexts and individual school needs. The NRT's flexibility in enabling this was appreciated.

Working with others

A key element of the NRT's role was to provide advice and support to schools across the country via a network of regional stakeholders – LEA Advisers, Regional advisers, Regional Trainers, Directors of Regional Centres (formerly known as Affiliated Centres) and Programme Managers. The stakeholders reported very positive relationships with the NRT and one another.

Regional networks and meetings provided stakeholders with the opportunity to discuss progress, share ideas and raise concerns. They valued the ability to draw on the perspectives and experiences of colleagues from different backgrounds. LEA advisers said that they had established closer working relationships with other local authority departments (for example, human resources and finance) through remodelling.

Collaborative working within and across LEAs, with Regional Advisers and Regional Centres was identified as one of the key factors in the successful implementation of the National Agreement. Regional Advisers reported good relationship with most LEAs. Where LEAs had not yet fully embraced remodelling, additional guidance and support was offered. Regional Advisers felt relations with these LEAs were improving due to this increased contact and support.

LEA and Regional Advisers reported good relationships with Regional Centres and interviewees from the Centres felt their relationships with LEAs had improved due to their involvement in remodelling. All stakeholders agreed that Regional Centres had provided an effective base for the regional delivery of remodelling.

Training and support

All stakeholders viewed the national training provided by the NRT and the regional training provided by the Regional Centres to be of a high standard.

However, a small number of respondents considered the training period to be too intensive. Most stakeholders agreed the NRT's training materials were invaluable in supporting the roll-out of remodelling, with web-based support being viewed as particularly helpful. Stakeholders described the NRT's Core Team as supportive and quick to respond.

Main achievements

Regionally delivered training ensured an understanding of local issues and an acknowledgement of the challenges faced by individual schools.

LEA and Regional Advisers commented on the impact remodelling was starting to have in schools. Although still in its infancy, advisers said that school staff were beginning to realise benefits from remodelling, including reduced workload for teachers and more professional development opportunities for support staff.

Main challenges

Stakeholders identified a small number of difficulties in remodelling. They acknowledged the considerable task faced by the NRT in implementing a large educational reform, and felt well supported in their role.

Interviewees were sympathetic to the time pressures placed on the NRT. However, the requirement to arrange or attend training sessions at short notice and at inconvenient times of year was identified as a challenge for Regional Centres, trainers and LEAs.

There was some concern about the reluctance of certain LEAs to embrace remodelling. Respondents also reported that some schools were finding it difficult to see beyond the perceived costs of remodelling.

Future developments

In the immediate future, stakeholders said they would continue to support schools in implementing the National Agreement. Looking ahead, respondents envisaged that the current model could be used to deliver the agenda for *Every Child Matters*, using systems and support networks that had been established through the remodelling programme.

Conclusions/ Recommendations

The cascade model of training seems to have worked effectively in phase two. The high level of support and sharing of information between the NRT, Regional Centres, within and across LEAs was found to be a particularly efficient way of supporting the implementation of remodelling. Key factors that ensured the success of this model included: regional delivery capitalising on local knowledge; high-quality trainers and resources; collaborative working and responsive support networks (both nationally and regionally).

In order to maintain and build on their positive role, the NRT might wish to consider:

- adding to its provision of online case study reports, which respondents found particularly useful
- providing further information on phase three issues, such as managing examination invigilation and dedicated leadership time
- maintaining the use of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) observation to evaluate training and provide trainers with feedback on their practice
- providing LEAs, trainers and Regional Centres with the maximum possible notice of forthcoming training events
- allowing time for reflection between training days
- encouraging LEA and Regional Advisers to draw more comprehensively on the resources, expertise and networks established by Regional Centres
- ensuring that all key players are involved in the early stages of any future developments, especially if the NRT begins to take on the *Every Child Matters* agenda.

About the study

The NFER used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to evaluate the work of the NRT. Quantitative data collection took place in November 2004 and comprised a survey of LEA Remodelling Advisers and Regional Trainers. Questionnaires were completed by 94 LEA Remodelling Advisers (63 per cent response rate) and 48 Regional Trainers (69 per cent response rate). Qualitative

data collection took place between January and March 2005. This involved semi-structured telephone interviews with nine NRT Regional Advisers, nine Regional Centre Directors, nine LEA Remodelling Advisers, seven Regional Centre Programme Managers and five NRT Regional Trainers. Survey data was analysed statistically and interview data was analysed with the help of a computer software package.

1 Introduction

1.1 The National Agreement

In early 2003, *Raising Standards and Tackling Workload: a National Agreement* [ATL *et al.*, 2003] was signed, with the aim of raising standards in schools and addressing teachers' workload issues. Signatories of the agreement, including the Government, professional associations and employer organisations, agreed to set aside time for teachers to concentrate on teaching and learning and spend less time on routine administrative tasks. The agreement limited the amount of time teachers could spend covering lessons for absent colleagues; it gave them guaranteed non-contact time and leadership and management time, provided training for support staff and sought to improve teachers' work/life balance.

The agreement comprised three phases of change to teachers' conditions of service, to be implemented in all maintained schools over three years. Phase one (September 2003) considered the work/life balance of teachers, reducing their administrative burdens and introduced leadership and management time for those with management responsibilities. Phase two (September 2004) put a limit on the amount of time teachers can be required to spend covering for absent colleagues. The third and final phase of contractual change (which comes into effect from September 2005) establishes guaranteed Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time for all teachers, dedicated headship time and removes the requirement for teachers to invigilate examinations and tests. Also, as a direct consequence of the signing of the Agreement, the National Remodelling Team (NRT) was established to promote the remodelling agenda and support schools through the process.

1.2 The National Remodelling Team

The NRT was set up to work in partnership with LEAs, Remodelling Consultants, Regional Centres (RCs)¹, the Workforce Agreement Management Group (WAMG) and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). The NRT offers practical advice and guidance to LEAs and schools on remodelling. More specifically, the NRT supports schools to:

- implement the National Agreement

- focus teachers' time on teaching and learning, rather than spending time on administrative activities
- facilitate the use of new technologies to help improve efficiency
- assist headteachers and school change teams (SCTs) to meet the terms of the agreement
- develop local networks for schools to share and develop practice
- develop solutions for workload issues that are specific to the individual context of the school.

The NRT trained LEA Remodelling Advisers to help advise and support schools during the change management process. In the first year of the programme, the NRT delivered training and support activities direct to LEAs and schools. In year two, nine Regional Centres (RCs) delivered the training and support to LEAs and schools.

In 2004, the NFER conducted an evaluation and impact study of the NRT in year one (NFER, 2005). The evaluation findings reported here explored the change in the delivery of the programme from year one to year two, and the impact and effectiveness of the work of the NRT.

1.3 The future of the NRT

Towards the end of the NFER evaluation period, in February 2005, it was announced that the NRT would join the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) to support its new remit. The TTA, soon to be known as the Teaching and Development Agency, will expand its role from April 2005 to include:

- the wider school workforce, including the provision of training and development for all school support staff
- becoming a partner in representing school staff working with children and young people in response to the *Every Child Matters* Green paper (Her Majesty's Treasury, 2003).

In March 2005, the WAMG provided schools with further information about the role of the NRT in the *Every Child Matters* agenda. WAMG will develop a support programme of work related to the children's agenda. This will include the NRT running a pilot programme involving a range of extended schools. By

working with and supporting these schools, and building on the experience of other schools that have already offered some extended services, guidance will be produced on the practical issues for schools implementing the requirements of *Every Child Matters*.

1.4 Report structure

This report sets out to provide the NRT with comprehensive details on stakeholders' views about the second year of the remodelling programme. This report is divided into nine chapters. Chapter 2 outlines the aims of the evaluation and the methodology used. Chapter 3 describes the findings from the survey of LEA Remodelling Advisers as well as reporting the findings from interviews conducted with a sample of LEA Remodelling Advisers. Chapter 4 reports the findings from the survey of Regional Trainers, and interviews conducted with a sample of them. Chapter 5 describes the findings from interviews conducted with Regional Advisers. Chapter 6 details the findings from interviews with RC Directors and Programme Managers. Findings from each of the key stakeholders involved in the evaluation are compared and summarised in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 raises issues for consideration and Chapter 9 suggests recommendations for future evaluation.

Notes

- 1 Regional Centres were formally known as Affiliated Centres. The name was changed due to the NRT's move from NCSL to the TTA.

2 Aims and methodology

2.1 Evaluation aims

The overall aim of the NFER evaluation was to examine the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT during its second year of operation. The sub-aims of the evaluation were to:

- examine the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT in its second year of operation
- explore the change to the remodelling programme's delivery between year one and two
- examine the supplementary remit the DfES gave to the NRT in year two to provide training to LEA staff to deliver workshops to schools on financial management and implementing PPA time; and the effectiveness of the NRT in adapting to this remit
- explore the effects of regionalisation on the delivery of the programme
- ascertain the number of schools involved in year two.

2.2 Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used to evaluate the work of the NRT. Data collection was split into two phases: phase one, which took place in November 2004, comprised of surveys to LEA Remodelling Advisers and NRT Regional Trainers. The purpose of the surveys was to include a large number of LEA advisers and trainers.

Phase two, which took place between January and March 2005, involved telephone interviews with:

- NRT Regional Advisers
- RC Directors and Programme Managers
- A sample of LEA Remodelling Advisers
- A sample of NRT Regional Trainers.

The purpose of the interviews was to ascertain the views of the key stakeholders on the effectiveness and impact of the NRT. The interviews with LEA Remodelling Advisers and Regional Trainers aimed to explore the survey findings in greater detail.

3 Findings from LEA Remodelling Adviser survey and interviews

3.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the questionnaire survey and interviews carried out with LEA Remodelling Advisers. A questionnaire survey was sent to 150 LEA Remodelling Advisers, one in each LEA, in November 2004. Telephone interviews were conducted with nine LEA Remodelling Advisers, one from each government region, during February and early March 2005. Findings from both sets of data are reported here. Please note that the percentages reported throughout the chapter are based on the responses from 94 individuals (therefore percentages slightly over-represent the actual number of respondents in the sample).

3.2 Survey to LEA Remodelling Advisers

A questionnaire survey was sent to 150 LEA Remodelling Advisers to provide an overview of their views on the effectiveness of the NRT.

3.2.1 Survey design

The questionnaire was designed to elicit a range of information from the LEA Remodelling Advisers. Respondents were asked to comment on six key areas:

- how the change process was being managed with different schools
- whether or not the capacity of LEAs to support schools involved in year two differs from the capacity of LEAs in year one
- whether or not Remodelling Consultants are being used, and if so, in what ways
- the quality, effect and sustainability of training being delivered to regional teams
- how the NRT has trained and supported LEAs, in relation to their role as remodelling facilitators (specifically, the provision of PPA and financial management guidance for schools)
- views on the training and support provided by the NRT.

3.2.2 Survey administration

The NRT provided contact details for each LEA Remodelling Adviser in England. A questionnaire was sent to the lead LEA Remodelling Advisers in each of the 150 LEAs (if no lead was identified, the first named contact was selected). The survey was administered in November 2004 and Advisers were given about three weeks to complete and return their questionnaire. Two email reminders were sent to advisers who had not responded by the end of the second and third weeks.

3.2.3 Response rate to the survey of LEA Remodelling Advisers

A total of 150 questionnaires were despatched. Ninety-four were returned within the administration period – a response rate of 63 per cent. Eleven questionnaires were returned after the closing date. These responses were not included in the analysis. However, the replies given by the late respondents were similar to those that were included.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would like to be involved in subsequent phases of the research that involved telephone interviews with a sample of LEA Remodelling Advisers. Eighty-nine per cent of respondents (84) indicated that they would like to be involved.

3.3 LEA Remodelling Adviser interviews

Telephone interviews were carried out with a sample of LEA Remodelling Advisers. Nine LEA Remodelling Advisers were randomly selected (one from each of the nine government regions), and asked for their views on the effectiveness of the NRT in supporting them carry out their role.

3.3.1 Interview design

The interview schedule was designed to elicit a range of information from LEA Remodelling Advisers. The interviews were semi-structured and were focussed on six key areas of the evaluation:

- the remodelling process
- working with other stakeholders

- training and support
- impacts and achievements
- challenges
- further developments.

3.3.2 Interview administration

LEA Remodelling Advisers who indicated in their questionnaire that they were willing to be involved in the interview phase of the research formed the database from which a random selection of nine advisers was selected. Nine advisers were randomly selected from the database to represent each region. LEA Remodelling Advisers were sent an email inviting them to be involved in the research. Emails were followed up by a telephone call a few days later.

The NFER were unable to arrange interviews with two of the original sample. One person had left his/her post, another did not respond the messages. These respondents were replaced by LEA Remodelling Advisers with similar characteristics from the same region. Nine interviews were conducted in total. Interviews were conducted between February and early March 2005. Each interview took between 20 and 35 minutes to complete.

3.3.3 Interview sample

A total of nine LEA Remodelling Advisers were interviewed. The sample included one representative from each government region in England (Eastern, East Midlands, London, North East, North West, South East, South West, West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber).

3.4 LEA Remodelling Adviser role

LEA Remodelling Advisers have responsibility for developing workforce reform and remodelling with schools in their LEA. In the survey, LEA Remodelling Advisers were asked to specify their job title. Most frequently, they said they were an adviser on workforce reform/remodelling (23 per cent of respondents). Fourteen per cent of respondents said they were an LEA adviser with responsibility for remodelling and the same proportion said they were a school improvement adviser or officer. Two respondents did not answer the question.

Of the nine people interviewed, four were advisers for remodelling or workforce reform, other's job titles included: Remodelling Project Leader, Brokerage and Remodelling Manager, Workforce Remodelling Coordinator, General Inspector for Workforce Remodelling and LEA Remodelling Facilitator. For the purpose of this report, all interviewees will be referred to as LEA Remodelling Advisers.

LEA Remodelling Adviser interviewees had been in post for between three months and two years, five of whom had been in post for about 18 months.

3.4.1 Main roles and responsibilities

When asked about their main roles and responsibilities, all LEA Remodelling Adviser interviewees reported that their principal role was to oversee the roll-out of remodelling and to create an infrastructure to support schools in ensuring they addressed the statutory requirements of the National Agreement. Other key aspects of the LEA Remodelling Adviser role, mentioned by just over half of interviewees, included:

- engaging with other departments within the LEA to ensure collaborative working on workforce reform issues
- engaging with workforce unions and WAMG, working in consultation and partnership to progress with the agenda
- providing training to schools and governors on remodelling issues, for example PPA time
- liaison with and feedback about developments to the NRT
- monitoring the developments of schools' progress with the remodelling programme.

A few LEA Remodelling Adviser interviewees explained they had additional responsibilities to those listed above; these were often roles that were specific to the context of their LEA. For example, two advisers explained that they had responsibility for support staff and/or HLTA development in their LEA. One LEA Remodelling Adviser described how his LEA had actively developed the *Every Child Matters* agenda. He explained how his role as Remodelling Adviser 'will link very firmly to the *Every Child Matters* work to make sure that we do present a coherent children's services structure'.

3.5 Involvement in the remodelling process

One of the aims of the research was to explore the change process LEAs used to develop remodelling with schools. In the survey, Remodelling Advisers were asked to select from a list of items the change process they used. The findings are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Change process advisers followed through with schools

| Process | N | % |
|--|----|----|
| The ‘mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver’ process, utilising tranche events | 75 | 80 |
| The ‘mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver’ process, utilising alternative tranche events | 7 | 7 |
| An alternative process you have developed | 6 | 6 |
| More than one box ticked | 6 | 6 |

N= 94

*A single response item
Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100*

As shown in Table 3.1, the majority of LEA Remodelling Advisers (80 per cent) followed the ‘mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver’ process, utilising tranche events. This is the NRT-suggested process to develop remodelling in schools.

Interviews with the nine randomly selected LEA Remodelling Advisers provided the opportunity to explore why they decided to adopt a specific change process. Six interviewees used the five-stage mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver’ process, utilising tranche events, and three used an alternative approach.

The six interviewed advisers, who used the five-stage process utilising tranche events, explained that the primary reason was because, having attended the NRT training events, they thought it was an effective model to use. One adviser described how his LEA ‘followed the NRT training like a bible’ partly because this model was badged by WAMG and most unions but also so headteachers could grasp the concepts of the remodelling process without worrying too much about the statutory requirements.

All advisers who indicated they used the five-stage process utilising tranche events explained that they did not follow this process ‘religiously’. Where LEAs diverted from the process, they explained that it was only in a minor way. For example, one adviser said she used the five-stage process but did ‘not want to keep harping on about stages’ she used the process without necessarily using exactly the same language. However, another explained that within his LEA they were careful to use the five-stage process with the NRT terminology ‘so whatever literature people used, we have got a common language to describe where we are at’.

Other advisers explained that they used the five-stage process and tranche events but offered additional support to headteachers as well. LEAs wanted to offer a personalised approach that addressed the specific needs of the schools. Two advisers explained that they used the tranche events to introduce the concepts but developed their own programme of delivery, based on the NRT model and material.

One adviser explained that to date she has used the five-stage process utilising tranche events but did not feel it was an effective model for future development of remodelling. She worked for a large LEA and felt the tranche events were too slow for large LEAs to use for all schools. One of the three advisers that adopted alternative change processes gave a similar reason for adopting a different approach. He described the authority as being very large and having a history of very independent headteachers. Due to the size of the LEA he said, ‘It would have taken umpteen years to do this because we have just over 400 schools and [the neighbouring authority] has another 375-plus schools. It just wasn’t a feasible model.’

Another adviser explained his reasons for adopting alternative approaches. He had modified the five-stage process to incorporate headteachers who were already well progressed with the agenda. He used the stages and stressed the importance of a school change team but did not ‘feel the original programme is appropriate for where schools are currently with this work’ especially as PPA was very much on the minds of headteachers.

The third adviser that used alternative events within his LEA explained that the NRT model did not quite fit with how the LEA wanted to deliver remodelling. However, the LEA based their own process on that of the NRT and used the NRT materials. He felt that it was important to use NRT materials when presenting the statutory requirements as these ensured a clear, constant and consistent message.

Two of the LEA Remodelling Advisers that used alternative events, worked with a neighbouring authority to deliver remodelling.

The survey asked LEA Remodelling Advisers, who used different change processes for different schools, how they adapted the processes to suit different schools' needs. As mentioned by interviewees, most frequently survey respondents also customised events to address specific issues (31 respondents). Sixteen respondents specified that they adapted the process so it was phase specific.

Table 3.2 illustrates the survey findings where advisers were asked the extent to which they used different change processes with different schools.

Table 3.2 Extent to which advisers used different change processes with different schools

| | N | % |
|-------------------|----|----|
| To a great extent | 8 | 9 |
| To some extent | 66 | 70 |
| Not at all | 19 | 20 |
| No response | 1 | 1 |

N = 94

A single response item

Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100

- The majority of LEA Remodelling Advisers used different change processes with different schools.
- The nine per cent of respondents who indicated they used different processes with different schools were mainly from regions outside London and the South East.

The survey asked LEA Remodelling Advisers to indicate, from a list of seven items, the extent to which they used the tools and skills provided by the NRT, LEA and NCSL to develop change processes with schools. The findings are presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Usefulness of skills and tools materials provided by the NRT to develop change processes with schools

| | Always | | Nearly always | | Sometimes | | Hardly ever | | Never response | | No | |
|---|--------|----|---------------|----|-----------|----|-------------|----|----------------|----|----|----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NRT Core Team | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 33 | 35 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| NRT Regional Advisers | 4 | 4 | 17 | 18 | 50 | 53 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| LEA Remodelling Consultants | 18 | 19 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 35 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 21 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 | 4 | 4 |
| Regional Centre Regional Trainers | - | - | 2 | 2 | 18 | 19 | 30 | 32 | 39 | 42 | 5 | 5 |
| Headteachers already implementing remodelling | 18 | 19 | 31 | 33 | 43 | 46 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 12 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 76 | 81 |

N= 94

A series of single response items

Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100

- LEA Remodelling Advisers found the skills and tools provided by headteachers already implementing remodelling to be particularly useful. Advisers indicated they utilised the skills of headteachers more than any of the other given options. Just over half (52 per cent) of advisers indicated that they always or nearly always drew upon the skills of headteachers. Remodelling Advisers from Yorkshire and Humber used the skills of headteachers already implementing remodelling more than advisers in other regions. All seven advisers from Yorkshire and Humber indicated they always or nearly always drew upon the skills of headteachers.
- The second most frequently utilised source of skills and tools was provided by LEA Remodelling Consultants. Half of LEA Remodelling Advisers indicated they always or nearly always utilised the skills of Remodelling Consultants. Thirty-five per cent of advisers sometimes used LEA Remodelling Consultants' skills and tools.
- Skills and tools provided by the NRT's Core Team were always utilised by 19 per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers. Advisers indicated that they nearly

always (21 per cent) or sometimes (35 per cent) used to the skills and tools provided by the NRT’s Core Team to develop change processes within schools.

- Over half (53 per cent) of LEA Remodelling Advisers reported sometimes using the skills and tools provided by NRT Regional Advisers.
- The sources least used by LEA Remodelling Advisers were the skills and tools provided by RC Trainers and NCSL Consultant Leaders. Over a third of LEA Remodelling Advisers reported that they never used the skills and tools provided by these sources to develop the change process within schools.
- Other sources of skills and tools utilised by LEA Remodelling Advisers included LEA ‘network’ colleagues (reported by four respondents), independent or external consultants and other LEA Remodelling Advisers (reported by three respondents respectively).

3.6 Number of schools involved in remodelling across the LEA

The evaluation sought to ascertain whether the number of schools engaged in year 2 had increased from year 1. Table 3.4 shows the mean number of schools engaged/expected to be engaged in years one and two within the 94 LEAs.

Table 3.4 Number of schools engaged in remodelling

| | Mean | N |
|------------------------------|------|----|
| Year 1 (from September 2003) | 53 | 86 |
| Year 2 (from September 2004) | 101 | 88 |

A series of single response items

- The average number of schools involved in the remodelling process in year 1 was 53, in the 86 LEAs that responded to the question. In year 2, the responding LEA Remodelling Advisers expected to engage, on average 101 schools.
- For LEAs that expected to engage a greater number of schools in year 2, most frequently explained that this was due to improved advertising and awareness (as selected by 12 respondents). Eleven respondents stated that they used/plan to use a personal approach to individual schools. Eight respondents explained that more tranche events had resulted in increased number of schools engaged.

LEA Remodelling Advisers were asked to rate the usefulness of a given list of training and briefing sessions in helping to engage a greater number of schools as remodelling progressed to year 2. Table 3.5 shows the responses given.

Table 3.5 Usefulness of training to engage greater numbers of schools

| Usefulness | Very useful | Useful | Fairly useful | Not very useful | Not useful | Not applicable | No response |
|--|-------------|--------|---------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Training offered by NRT | 30 | 18 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| NRT run Chief Education Officer Conference | 1 | 9 | 12 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 1 |
| Briefing sessions for LEA staff | 11 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 4 | 5 | - |
| Briefing sessions for wider Local Government staff | 2 | 12 | 17 | 7 | 13 | 15 | 4 |
| Briefing sessions for Diocesa representatives | - | 3 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 33 | 11 |
| Other | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | 5 | 57 |

N= 70

A series of single response items

- Seventy respondents had increased or planned to increase the numbers of schools engaged in remodelling. Over half indicated that they found the training offered by the NRT to be very useful (30 respondents) or useful (18 respondents) in helping to increase the number of schools involved.
- Almost half of respondents selected that the briefing sessions for LEA staff were very useful or useful (11 and 20 respondents respectively) in increasing the number of schools involved.
- Respondents did not consider the NRT-run CEO conferences very useful for increasing numbers of schools involved. However, this was not their main intention. Almost half of LEA Remodelling Advisers indicated that the conference was not very useful or not useful (with 17 respondents selecting each). Advisers from the South West were more likely to rate the CEO conference as not useful.

- Briefing sessions for wider Local Government staff were not found to be particularly useful at increasing number, with only two and 12 respondents respectively selecting very useful and useful in relation to these sessions.
- The briefing sessions for Diocesan representatives was not utilised by almost half (33) of responding LEA Remodelling Advisers. Of those Advisers that did access the sessions, the most common response was that these sessions were not particularly useful in increasing the numbers of schools involved.
- Eight respondents indicated they used other sources of training or briefing to help them increase the number of schools engaged in remodelling. Their strategies were to include it as an item on the governing-body agenda and getting into schools to talk to headteachers (used by three and two respondents respectively).

3.7 Working with others

In the survey, LEA Remodelling Advisers were asked to specify whether they worked with Remodelling Consultants in their LEA. Table 3.6 shows the number of Advisers that worked with Remodelling Consultants.

Table 3.6 LEAs using LEA Remodelling Consultants

| Yes | N | % |
|-----------------------------|----|----|
| LEA Remodelling Consultants | 80 | 85 |
| N= 94 | | |

A series single response item

- Eighty-five per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers (80) worked with Remodelling Consultants in their LEA.
- All responding advisers from East Midlands, North East and Yorkshire and Humber worked with Remodelling Consultants.

Advisers who worked with Remodelling Consultants were asked to specify in what way they worked together. Most frequently advisers mentioned working together at tranche events (28 respondents), at central training events and as support for PPA conferences (17 respondents respectively).

The minority of LEA Remodelling Advisers (15 per cent) who did not work with the Remodelling Consultants were asked to indicate why. Most frequently this was due to having none or not enough Remodelling Consultants in the LEA (four respondents) or to the fact that Remodelling Consultants were unavailable to attend events due to other work commitments or because they were awaiting training. Two respondents said that there was little demand for direct involvement of Remodelling Consultants.

Four of the LEA Remodelling Advisers who were interviewed explained that Remodelling Consultants had been trained and were deployed in the LEA to support schools. One LEA had trained two consultants and planned to train 15 more in the future. These consultants would be practising headteachers who, the adviser hoped, would be given three days a year in which to support other schools. In another LEA, seven Remodelling Consultants from across primary, secondary and special phases had been trained. They offered personalised support to schools that requested it. In addition to the headteacher Remodelling Consultants, six school improvement officers and two human resource personnel had received the training.

Table 3.7 Advisers rate their working relationships with others

| Relationship with: | Very good | | Good | | Fairly good | | Not very good | | Not good | | Not applicable | | No response | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----|------|----|-------------|----|---------------|---|----------|---|----------------|----|-------------|----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| NRT Core Team | 46 | 49 | 35 | 37 | 10 | 11 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| NRT Regional Advisers | 61 | 65 | 26 | 28 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| LEA Remodelling Consultants | 61 | 65 | 24 | 26 | 4 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | 15 | 16 | 23 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 28 | 30 | 5 | 5 |
| RC Regional Trainers | 11 | 12 | 22 | 23 | 18 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 35 | 5 | 5 |
| Other | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 74 | 79 |

N= 94

*A series of single response items.
Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100*

LEA Remodelling Advisers who were interviewed valued the support Remodelling Consultants offered. As illustrated below in Table 3.7, survey respondents also viewed their relationships with LEA Remodelling Consultants positively. Sixty-five per cent of advisers thought they had a very good relationship with the NRT Remodelling Consultants and 26 per cent thought they had a good relationship.

Table 3.7 reports survey respondents' views on their relationship with various stakeholders.

3.7.1 Working with LEA colleagues

The interviews explored how LEA Remodelling Advisers worked with colleagues from other departments within their LEA in relation to remodelling. All but one adviser said they worked with other departments in relation to remodelling. In particular most advisers worked with human resource personnel and the finance department.

A few advisers also met with the following:

- senior officers
- advisers
- school-governance departments
- planning and property department
- schoolimprovement department
- inspectorate
- continuing professional development (CPD) managers
- ICT department.

In the main, LEA Remodelling Advisers would meet with colleagues from other departments. Colleagues either attended LEA-wide meetings or Remodelling Advisers were invited to meetings where workforce reform was an agenda item.

3.7.2 Working with LEA Remodelling Advisers from other authorities

Interviews with advisers sought to ascertain whether they worked with colleagues from other LEAs in relation to remodelling, and if so, in what ways.

Most Remodelling Advisers attended regional events where colleagues from other authorities were present.

Five advisers worked closely with Remodelling Advisers from other authorities within their region. For example, three advisers explained that their LEA had developed the remodelling programme with a neighbouring LEA. Two of these advisers explained that as remodelling progressed, and as more schools became involved; they would not work quite so closely with their neighbouring authority. However, they intended to maintain regular contact and support one another but did not think it feasible to move forward with such large numbers of schools.

In another two LEAs, advisers met regularly with advisers from other authorities, in addition to the regional meetings directed by the Regional Adviser. All advisers valued the opportunity to share ideas and discuss progress with colleagues in other LEAs. One adviser said he found this valuable because, ‘Very often the problem you are facing is one that somebody else has already sorted out’.

He went on to describe the value of working with colleagues from different backgrounds:

My background is as a headteacher, some of these are coming from HR and business, and their particular emphasis and expertise is invaluable from the point of view that we spend quite a lot of their sharing solutions and brainstorming problems to bring in the expertise other people can offer.

This sentiment was shared by other advisers.

3.7.3 Working with Regional Advisers

The majority of survey respondents indicated that their relationship with the NRT Regional Advisers was very good or good (65 and 28 per cent respectively). None of the advisers reported that they had a poor relationship with the NRT Regional Advisers.

Most interviewees were very positive about the relationship they had with their Regional Adviser. They described how they met regularly to discuss progress, issues and concerns. LEA Remodelling Advisers found the relationship they had with the Regional Adviser very supportive. Just under half of LEA Remodelling Advisers explained that they had frank, open and honest dialogue with the

Regional Adviser. This kind of relationship was valued by most LEA Remodelling Advisers, as one described:

We can have a sensible dialogue where you say things to her and be quite confident in what you are saying. You can also agree to disagree with various things but you can have a quite honest dialogue, which is crucial. You don't feel that you have to be careful in any respect.

That said, one LEA Remodelling Adviser explained that even though he personally had a very good and supportive relationship with his Regional Adviser, sometimes headteachers found her to be unsupportive. Some LEA personnel found the Regional Adviser was not familiar with the circumstances of most schools. The LEA Remodelling Adviser envisaged that he may need to talk to the Regional Adviser about this as it caused tension with some headteachers.

In addition to meeting Regional Advisers at either regional meetings or smaller LEA meetings, a small number of LEA Remodelling Advisers also had regular contact via email and the telephone.

One adviser felt that as a result of the Regional Adviser role, she felt 'remote' from the NRT's Core Team. She described the situation where she had a query. In year one, she would have contacted the NRT directly for support. However, in year two, she contacted the Regional Adviser who, in turn contacted the NRT's Core Team on her behalf and the answer fed back through the same process. The LEA Remodelling Adviser thought it would have been more efficient to contact the NRT's Core Team rather than go through such a process.

3.7.4 Working with Regional Centres and trainers

When asked to rate their relationship with Regional Trainers, 35 per cent of survey respondents indicated not applicable, which suggests they did not have a working relationship with them. LEA Remodelling Advisers who did have a relationship with Regional Centre Regional Trainers, indicated it was either good (23 per cent) or very good (12 per cent) (see Table 3.7).

Survey respondents were asked to rate the capacity of RCs to deliver training. Table 3.8 shows their responses.

Table 3.8 Advisers' views on the capacity of the Regional Centres to deliver training

| | N | % |
|---------------|----|----|
| Very good | 8 | 9 |
| Good | 34 | 36 |
| Not very good | 6 | 6 |
| Don't know | 45 | 48 |
| No response | 1 | 1 |

N= 94

A single response item

Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100

- Almost half of LEA Remodelling Advisers felt unable to comment on the capacity of RCs to deliver training.
- About a third (36 per cent) felt the capacity of RCs to deliver training was good and nine per cent felt it was very good.
- Only six per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers indicated that the capacity was not very good. These respondents were from London, North West, South East and South West regions.

Of the nine advisers interviewed, six said they had either no or limited contact with their RC, other than being recipients of training. Four advisers had contacted their RC to organise additional training.

Other advisers made the following comments about their RC:

I've never been there... the RC is based over 100 miles away. We've tended to invite them out to us... when we've put on local events using the expertise from the RC and others in the region.

I don't think I have established the sort of links that I would have liked with the RC. That might change as one of my colleagues has been seconded to the RC... that might have a better way to tap into that resource.

We very rarely have any great need to contact them..I'm not quite sure what they do but the overlap between what I do and what they do is pretty limited.

Three LEA Remodelling Advisers commented on the trainers. One felt that it was easy to tell which trainers came from an education background. However, another described trainers as ‘inspiring’. A third felt that the national trainers were better than the regional trainers. She explained the reason for this assessment. She felt that the national trainers were more fully immersed in the Workforce Reform.

3.7.5 Working with NCSL Consultant Leaders

Thirty per cent of survey respondents indicated not applicable when asked to rate their relationship with NCSL Consultant Leaders, suggesting they had little contact with NCSL Consultant Leaders. Of those that did rate their relationship, 16 per cent indicated it was very good and 25 per cent said it was good. However, seven per cent said it was not very good and three per cent said it was not good.

Interviewees were not asked to comment further on their working relationship with NCSL Consultant Leaders.

3.7.6 Working with the NRT

Almost half (49 per cent) of survey respondents thought they had a very good relationship with the NRT’s Core Team. An additional 37 per cent felt they had a good relationship with the NRT’s Core Team.

Interviewees explained that although contact was limited with the NRT’s Core Team, they were responsive to their needs and were a resource they felt confident to contact for support and advice.

3.7.7 Working with other stakeholders

A small number of survey respondents stated they had positive relationships with others. Four respondents indicated they worked with Remodelling Advisers (although it was not clear whether this referred to NRT or LEA Advisers) and three respondents indicated they worked with independent or external consultants.

Almost all of the advisers involved in the interview phase of the research explained that they also worked with their local WAMG or equivalent. Within one region, WAMG was renamed ‘Union Consultative Group’. Five advisers were pleased to have a National Union of Teachers (NUT) representative at the meetings, as the NUT had not signed the National Agreement.

Other stakeholders involved in remodelling included:

- primary- and secondary-phase representatives
- Sport England
- the newly appointed Director of Children’s Services
- elected members
- governors
- colleagues involved in the professional development of teaching assistants.

3.7.8 What facilitated these working relationships?

LEA Remodelling Advisers involved in the interviews, were asked whether or not anything in particular had helped facilitate their working relationships with the various stakeholders. In particular, advisers valued the regular contact they had with the stakeholders.

A small number of advisers commented that working with people from a variety of different backgrounds, for example, LEA officers, ex-headteachers, human resource personnel, was interesting and beneficial. It enabled stakeholders to gain a wider perspective of the issues that faced the different LEA departments.

A few advisers described honesty and ‘a healthy respect’ for other stakeholders as key to ensuring effective working relationships. They explained that stakeholders respected the position others took but felt confident that they could discuss issues and share ideas as they were all, as one adviser put it, ‘pulling in the same direction’.

A few advisers explained that the NRT resources had been very useful and had helped facilitate working relationships as everyone had the same resources to draw upon. As one adviser explained:

They are always there to draw on so if people ask for information it is very easy to find the information that is relevant and suitable to them. That is a great deal easier than trying to prepare things from scratch.

Another adviser said one of the facilitating factors was that the NRT gave clear messages. However, where there were a few ‘grey areas’, he felt able to contact

the NRT for clarification and was confident that they would provide a quick and relevant response.

One adviser said the unique position of his LEA, was the key factor in making remodelling work. He explained that they had the advantage being free from political constraints so they could work quickly and effectively.

3.8 Effectiveness of NRT training

LEA Remodelling Advisers received training from the NRT to support them in their role. The survey and interviews explored the effectiveness of NRT training in supporting advisers to fulfil their role.

One of the aims of the evaluation was to ascertain how well the NRT supported LEA Remodelling Advisers to roll-out the remodelling programme.

The survey asked LEA Remodelling Advisers four questions about the training and support they had received to develop the remodelling agenda. Firstly, they were asked to rate the usefulness of the NRT's training events and resource packs (see Table 3.9).

- LEA Remodelling Advisers found the training events for LEA Remodelling Advisers, the skills and tools training event and PPA content and delivery training to be most useful, with over half of respondents indicating each was very useful.
- Sixty one per cent of advisers thought the Remodelling Advisers' training event was very useful and 30 per cent thought it was useful. Fifty six per cent of respondents indicated that the skills and tools training event and PPA content and delivery training was very useful with 59 and 23 per cent respectively indicating they were useful.
- Just over half of respondents indicated that the NRT website was very useful. Thirty-three per cent rated it as useful.
- The PPA resource pack and toolkit were viewed positively by LEA Remodelling Advisers, with 39 per cent of respondents indicating it was very useful and 46 per cent that it was useful.

Table 3.9 Usefulness of NRT training and resources

| Training/ resources | Very useful | | Useful | | Fairly useful | | Not very useful | | Not useful | | Not applicable | | No response | |
|---|-------------|----|--------|----|---------------|----|-----------------|----|------------|----|----------------|---|-------------|----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Skills and tools training event | 53 | 56 | 27 | 29 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| LEA Remodelling Adviser training event | 57 | 61 | 28 | 30 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| PPA content and delivery training | 55 | 59 | 22 | 23 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| Cover resource pack and toolkit | 29 | 31 | 44 | 47 | 16 | 17 | 3 | 3 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PPA resource pack and toolkit | 37 | 39 | 43 | 46 | 11 | 12 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Governors' brochure | 31 | 33 | 40 | 43 | 19 | 20 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| NRT brochure- 2021 Shaping our Future | 26 | 26 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Raising standards through remodelling (DVD) | 10 | 11 | 15 | 16 | 26 | 28 | 26 | 28 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| NRT website | 49 | 52 | 31 | 33 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Other | 12 | 13 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 80 | 85 |

N= 94*A series of single response items**Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100*

- Similar percentages of LEA Remodelling Advisers found the Governors' brochure and the cover resource pack to be very useful (33 and 31 per cent respectively) and 43 and 47 per cent respectively rated them useful.
- The NRT brochure *Shaping Our Future* was considered to be fairly useful, useful and very useful by similar percentages of respondents. Respondents from the East Midlands and the North East found this brochure to be particularly useful.
- The DVD on *Raising standards through remodelling* was considered to be the least useful of the given options with 38 per cent indicating it lacked use.

- Another source of support noted by three LEA Remodelling Advisers to be useful was the NRT help line (by three respondents).

The survey also asked LEA Remodelling Advisers to rate whether the quality of the training they received in year 1 was sustained in year 2. The findings appear in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10 Quality of training in year one and two

| Quality of training | N | % |
|---------------------|----|----|
| Better than year 1 | 4 | 4 |
| About the same | 21 | 22 |
| Worse than year 1 | 13 | 14 |
| Don't know | 55 | 59 |
| No response | 1 | 1 |

N= 94

A single response item

Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100

- The majority of LEA Remodelling Advisers did not know whether the quality of training in year 1 was being sustained in year 2.
- Of the LEA Remodelling Advisers that felt able to comment on the quality of training, the most frequently selected it about the same (22 per cent of respondents).
- Four per cent of advisers indicated that the training in year 2 was better than in year 1. However, 14 per cent of respondents felt that training was worse.

The survey asked LEA Remodelling Advisers an open-ended question about the overall effect of the NRT training moving from a national to a regional base. Table 3.11 shows the top four responses to the question.

Table 3.11 Effect regionally based training

| | N | % |
|---|----------|----------|
| More access to/support from Regional Advisers | 30 | 32 |
| No effect | 24 | 26 |
| Regional Team are more responsive to local issues | 14 | 15 |
| Insufficient evidence to make judgement | 13 | 14 |
| No response | 4 | 4 |

An open ended question

More than one answer could be given so percentages do not add to 100

- Thirty-two per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers stated that they had more access to and support from NRT Regional Advisers as a result of training moving from a national to a regional base.
- Twenty-six per cent of respondents did not think the changes had affected them at all.
- Fifteen per cent of Remodelling Advisers said the Regional Team was more responsive to local issues.
- Fourteen per cent of advisers did not feel able to comment, as they felt there was insufficient evidence.

The nine LEA Remodelling Advisers who were interviewed were asked how effective they thought the training they had received from the NRT to fulfil their role had been. All advisers commented on how ‘very good’ or ‘excellent’ the training they received had been. One adviser described his appreciation of the effort the NRT put into the preparing the programme. He noted the value of the materials and resources and of the continuous evaluation. The evaluations ensured the LEA was delivering the programme effectively. Another said ‘I have nothing but praise for the NRT’.

Despite the positive references to NRT training and support, two advisers were not impressed with the financial training delivered by KPMG. KPMG is an international company that provides audits, tax and advisory services to companies. KPMG was commissioned by the NRT to deliver financial training to LEAs and schools. One adviser said he did not recommend the training offered by KPMG to schools as ‘to be honest, it was insulting’. Another said ‘it was embarrassing and people walked out’.

3.8.1 Suggestions for improvement

Advisers involved in the interviews were asked to offer suggestions for improvements to NRT training. No common theme emerged from advisers' responses to the question. The suggestions made by individuals are reported below.

At the skills and tools training sessions, great emphasis was placed on the 'tools'. One adviser explained that the tools are only used 20 per cent of the time so, in his view, more emphasis should be placed on the skills side of the training. However, another adviser said, as a result of the NRT training, he expected to be involved in a great deal more facilitation.

Two advisers thought the NRT should provide documentation for schools to give to parents. One explained that her LEA had tried to produce a newsletter for parents but it proved difficult to create due to political sensitivities. Another described the significant cost implications associated with producing some documentation. Both argued that the NRT should support parents by producing an agreed, standardised newsletter or poster.

One adviser felt that training sessions were too quickly delivered. It was suggested that advisers should be presented with the information over one of two days; they could then be given the opportunity to absorb the information before reconvening to discuss the issues a few days later.

One adviser suggested the NRT should hold sessions for schools on specific issues. For example, this could include a half-day session on how remodelling affects small schools. Another adviser described how his LEA had already developed sessions for small schools so they could come together to share ideas and discuss issues specific to their circumstances.

3.9 Achievements and challenges

LEA Remodelling Advisers encountered benefits and challenges associated with the regional delivery of remodelling. Interviews explored both of these areas.

3.9.1 Achievements

The nine advisers thought the main benefit to the regional delivery of the programme was their knowledge on local issues. Their experience of working with

schools within their LEAs provided an insight into their needs and challenges. As one adviser said ‘we know our people’. This enabled advisers to tailor the training and support to schools’ requirements.

Advisers thought an achievement of involvement in remodelling was raising awareness about the National Agreement in schools. One adviser explained ‘rather than just selling the regulations of what must be done and how [my role is about] ensuring that it’s underpinned with a reason.’

Advisers’ responses to the question extended beyond the advantages of regional delivery. The advantages of the NRT model for schools were perceived to be as follows.

- Provide the time for schools to share ideas and discuss concerns. As one adviser said ‘they can talk to colleagues about what they are doing, exchange ideas about what they have done so far... that is one thing they are very short of time for, sitting around with colleagues having a chat over coffee’.
- A few advisers commented that where schools had implemented a school change team, most had found it very useful. He thought there was a move towards distributed leadership in many schools.
- The benefits of remodelling for teachers and support staff were mentioned by a small number of advisers. They felt that teachers’ workload was already benefiting from the agenda, and that support staff were being invested in, in terms of continuing professional development. However, one adviser said while for the moment headteachers’ workload had increased, as the Agreement rolls out and systems become more fully embedded, they, along with pupils, would benefit.

Advisers highlighted two advantages of the model for the local authority:

- increased communication, information sharing and collaborative working within and between LEA departments
- good relationships with the workforce unions.

Almost all advisers referred to ‘local intelligence’ as the main contributing factors to making remodelling work. Advisers explained the importance of knowing how their schools work, the issues and challenges they faced and how to deal with them. One adviser thought their knowledge of local issues meant that headteachers were not over stretched and were able to deliver the programme within their own constraints and at their own pace.

One adviser made a more general point about the contributing factors to making remodelling work. He described the value of working with colleagues from a variety of backgrounds. He valued the collaborative working between colleagues who had different experiences and were from different backgrounds.

3.9.2 Challenges

The nine LEA Remodelling Advisers involved in the interviews were asked to comment on any challenges they had encountered associated with the regional delivery of remodelling. Although regional challenges were explored, LEA Remodelling Advisers answered the question in broader terms and referred to challenges associated with the remodelling agenda as a whole. In order to address the challenges, most LEAs developed their own strategies and structures to support schools.

Four LEA Remodelling Advisers commented on the challenge of delivering a national message. They explained that headteachers gave positive feedback about the training events, but they were not necessarily happy about Workforce Reform itself. For example, within one LEA, headteachers were reluctant for teaching assistants to take classes. However, the adviser said he stressed the importance of the reasoning behind the agenda. He said: ‘The more they [headteachers] begin to realise this is more about changing cultures and the more stakeholders involved the better.’

A perceived insufficiency of funding to implement PPA time was a challenge faced by four advisers when dealing with schools. Headteachers thought PPA time could not be delivered without additional funding. However, as one adviser explained, headteachers need to be offered alternatives. This adviser said: ‘There are 1001 things schools can do that don’t cost anything or will save money.’

A small number of advisers raised concerns about timescales. They explained that remodelling had made considerable demands at very short notice. They understood this was not governed by the NRT, but nevertheless it was problematic for LEAs and schools.

Two advisers noted their main challenge was with workforce unions, which had signed the National Agreement. One adviser described his relationship with one union as ‘a little bit counterproductive’ and ‘not conducive to the roll-out of the

remodelling agenda'. Another adviser commented on problems with another union about support staff pay structures.

3.10 Further developments

Survey respondents and advisers involved in the interviews, were asked about future developments. Advisers responding to the survey were asked to specify what future support they would like from the NRT to help develop their role. A few months later, the interviews explored advisers' expectations for the future.

3.10.1 Future support

In November 2004, the survey asked adviser to comment on the future support they would like to receive from the NRT to help them to support schools in implementing year 3 of the remodelling programme. Table 3.12 shows the top four responses to this question.

Table 3.12 Future support advisers would like

| | N | % |
|--------------------------------|----|----|
| More case studies | 28 | 30 |
| Guidance on exam invigilation | 24 | 26 |
| Guidance on dedicated headship | 24 | 26 |
| Improved funding for PPA time | 16 | 17 |
| No response | 3 | 3 |

An open ended question

More than one answer could be given so percentages do not add to 100

- Thirty per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers said would like to have access to more case studies with examples of effective practice.
- Guidance on exam invigilation and dedicated headship were areas in which 26 per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers requested future support.
- Seventeen per cent of respondents mentioned they would like improved funding for the implementation of PPA time in Phase 3 of the programme.

The survey asked LEA Remodelling Advisers to indicate from a list of six items what form they would like to receive future support. The findings are reported in Table 3.13.

Table 3.13 Types of support advisers would like

| Support | Yes | | No | | No response | |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|----|----|-------------|----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Training | 69 | 73 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 |
| Briefing | 83 | 88 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| Resource packs and toolkits | 87 | 93 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Written guidance | 79 | 84 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 12 |
| Website | 84 | 89 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| e-Learning | 45 | 48 | 22 | 23 | 27 | 29 |
| Other | 15 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 77 | 82 |
| N= 94 | | | | | | |

*A series of single response items
Due to rounding errors, percentages may not always sum to 100*

- Almost all (93 per cent) responding LEA Remodelling Advisers indicated that they would like to receive more resource packs and toolkits in the future.
- Future support from the NRT website and more briefing sessions were considered useful by respondents (89 and 88 per cent respectively). Eighty-four per cent of respondents would like to receive more written guidance.
- Seventy-three per cent of LEA Remodelling Advisers indicated they would like more training in the future.
- Just under half of respondents indicated that they would like future support in the form of e-learning.
- Two respondents mentioned other forms of support, namely seminars and workshops.

3.10.2 Further developments

LEA Remodelling Advisers who were interviewed by the NFER were asked to comment on how they thought their role might develop in the future. At the time of the interviews, in late February and early March 2005, some uncertainty surrounded the future remit of the NRT, following the announcement about NRT's move from NCSL to the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) from April 2005. This uncertainty was reflected in the responses given by advisers.

In year three of the remodelling programme, almost all advisers believed they would continue to have a substantial role in facilitating the implementation of the National Agreement. Many expected the NRT would have a role in delivering the Children's Agenda, specifically in relation to the *Every Child Matters* green paper. As one adviser commented:

There is no doubt in my mind that if remodelling is going to succeed, it has to be built into the Every Child Matters agenda. We have this resource, these structures in place and they should be used to change the school to become one of these 'extended schools' and integrated centres.

Advisers agreed that the model developed by the NRT to implement the National Agreement would be an effective model to extend to other arenas, particularly *Every Child Matters* and issues surrounding extended schools. Another adviser commented:

It would make an awful lot of sense for the strengths of the school workforce remodelling to be extended further... they [schools] have found the tools from the NRT invaluable. If we can extend that approach on remodelling a positive approach, teamwork and the school change team ethos into the embracing of the ECM agenda, then I can only see that as positive. It seems daft that someone will sit down and reinvent the wheel and probably come up with a very similar programme of vast cost nationally when we already have the NRT in place.

Advisers anticipated that more senior LEA advisers would be involved in remodelling in the future, especially if it moved into developing the Children's Agenda. They anticipate great involvement from senior LEA personnel and other local authority departments, for example health, social services and finance. Advisers highlighted the need for continued professional development for support staff in

schools and for colleagues from other facets of the local authority who may be relatively new to working with the education department.

In terms of future developments in relation to implementing the National Agreement, in Year 3 advisers anticipated they would continue to support schools implement the agreement. They would share ideas and information in order to sustain the programme in the future.

A small number of LEA Remodelling Advisers felt that would have a role in supporting schools with remodelling beyond Year 3. They did not feel it was sustainable without continued support. As one adviser explained:

Remodelling has begun and begun quite well but it is not yet sustainable and not yet culturally within the framework of most people's mindsets, so there will be need for future support for probably a few years to make sure its thoroughly embedded and to make sure it goes into things like teacher training so people come out knowing about what is happening.

3.11 Further comments

Survey respondents were given the opportunity to make any other comments about remodelling or the NRT's Core Team. Seventy-seven per cent of respondents did not respond. Of those who did provide further information, comments most frequently related to the difficulty of implementing PPA time in primary schools, schools needing several more years of support to implement remodelling and the LEA requiring more funding for remodelling (by five respondents in each case).

4 Findings from NRT Regional Trainer survey and interviews

4.1 Introduction

A key element of the NFER evaluation was to explore the views of NRT Regional Trainers on the work of the NRT. This chapter reports the findings from two data collection exercises: a survey of 48 Regional Trainers carried out in November 2004; and follow-up interviews with five Regional Trainers carried out in February and March 2005. It should be noted that, because of the small numbers involved, we have chosen to report on individual Regional Trainer numbers, not percentages.

4.2 Survey of NRT Regional Trainers

A questionnaire survey was sent to 70 Regional Trainers (an average of eight trainers per government region) to collect views on the NRT's training and support.

4.2.1 Survey design

The questionnaire was designed to elicit the views of Regional Trainers on the:

- level and content of the training and support received from the NRT
- effectiveness of the NRT's plan to implement PPA time to schools
- experiences of delivering training to LEA Remodelling Consultants
- capacity of RCs to deliver training
- relationships with LEA Remodelling Advisers and NRT Regional Advisers.

4.2.2 Survey administration

The NRT provided the NFER with contact details for each Regional Trainer. A questionnaire was sent to a random selection of Regional Trainers across nine regions. The survey was administered in November 2004 and trainers were given about three weeks to complete and return their questionnaire. Two email reminders were sent to those who had not responded by the end of the second and third weeks.

4.2.3 Response rate

A total of 70 questionnaires were despatched. Forty-eight were returned within the administration period – a response rate of 69 per cent. Two questionnaires were returned after the closing date. These questionnaires were not included in the analysis. However, the replies given by the late respondents were similar to the majority of views that were included in the analysis.

4.3 Regional Trainer interviews

In order to explore the survey responses in more depth, all Regional Trainers who completed an NFER survey were invited to indicate whether or not they would like to be involved in a follow-up telephone interview. The majority of Regional Trainers (37) indicated they were willing to be involved in the next phase of the research.

4.3.1 Interview design

The interview schedule was designed to elicit a range of information for Regional Trainers. The interviews were semi-structured and focussed on five key areas of the evaluation:

- working with other stakeholders
- training and support
- impacts and achievements
- challenges
- further developments.

4.3.2 Interview administration

The names of Regional Trainers, who indicated they were willing to be interviewed by NFER, were included in a database. From this list, nine trainers were randomly selected. The sample was drawn to include a trainer from each government region and a variety of trainer types (i.e. PPA Trainer, Super Trainer, and Super and PPA²).

The nine selected trainers were sent an email inviting them to be involved in an interview. Emails were followed-up by a telephone call a few days later. Interviews were carried out with five trainers from the original sample in late February and early March 2005. Each interview took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Four trainers from the original sample were not interviewed because:

- Two were unavailable despite regular attempts to contact them.
- One cancelled her interview due to ‘personal reasons’.
- One agreed to an interview, however, was unavailable on the day. (A subsequent interview was arranged, but again the trainer was unavailable on the day. A third date was offered by the trainer, but it was after the evaluation deadline.)

The NFER evaluation team made several attempts to arrange interviews with four substitute trainers. However, due to the following reasons, the attempts were unsuccessful:

- Two trainers did not respond to NFER’s telephone calls.
- One trainer felt she was an unsuitable interview candidate (as she was a recent Regional Trainer appointee).
- One trainer agreed to be interviewed, but was not available until after the evaluation deadline.

4.3.3 Interview sample

Table 4.1 provides information on the characteristics of the interviewees who participated in the follow-up interviews.

Table 4.1 Characteristics of regional trainer interviewees

| | Trainer Type | Job title | Regional Centre |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | PPA | Consultant | South West |
| 2 | PPA | Principal Education Consultant | Yorkshire and Humber |
| 3 | Super and PPA | Headteacher | North East |
| 4 | Super and PPA | Education Development Consultant | West Midlands |
| 5 | Super and PPA | Senior Consultant | North West |

4.4 The Regional Trainer role

The Regional Trainer role was introduced in September 2004 to provide support to LEAs. The role also involved delivering workshops to LEAs on PPA Content and Delivery and/or Remodelling Skills and Tools training.

4.4.1 Type of trainer

As part of the NFER survey, Regional Trainers were asked to specify their job title. Twelve trainers reported being educational consultants, five were headteachers and four were independent consultants. Four respondents did not answer the question. Table 4.1 shows the roles of trainers responding to the survey.

Of the five trainers taking part in follow-up interviews, four were consultants and one was a primary headteacher of a T1 school. Two mentioned they had previously worked as Remodelling Consultants.

Table 4.2 Training received by survey respondents

| | N |
|--|----|
| PPA and Skills/ Tools training to LEAs (Super & PPA Trainer) | 21 |
| Skills and Tools events to LEAs (Super Trainer) | 19 |
| PPA Content and Delivery workshops to LEAs (PPA Trainer) | 7 |
| No response | 1 |
| N= 48 | |

A single response item

- As shown in Table 4.1, just under half of responding Regional Trainers (21) were *Super and PPA Trainers*. Nineteen respondents were *Super Trainers* and seven were *PPA Trainers*.
- Of the five Regional Trainers involved in follow-up interviews, three were *Super and PPA Trainers* and two were *PPA Trainers*.

4.4.2 Roles and responsibilities

Regional Trainers taking part in the survey were asked to specify the number of days they had been contracted to provide training, support or Continuous Quality

Improvement (CQI) observation to LEAs. The median number of days trainers contracted to work was six (most responses ranged from zero to 27 days, although one respondent specified that s/he was contracted to work 50 days).

Regional Trainers taking part in follow-up interviews were asked to describe their main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling. The responses included: involvement in Skills and Tools and PPA training; working alongside LEAs and schools; and delivering CQI.

4.5 Training and support

The Regional Trainers were asked to comment on the usefulness of the training they had received from the NRT, and were given the opportunity to suggest improvements.

4.5.1 Usefulness of training/resource materials

Table 4.3 Usefulness of training/resource materials provided by the NRT to support the Regional Trainer role

| | Very useful | Useful | Fairly useful | Not very useful | Not useful | Not applicable | No response |
|---|-------------|--------|---------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| NRT Remodelling Skills and Tools training | 33 | 6 | 3 | - | - | 3 | 3 |
| NRT PPA Content and Delivery training | 25 | 5 | 3 | 4 | - | 14 | 1 |
| PPA Resource Pack and Toolkit | 21 | 9 | 5 | - | - | 12 | 1 |
| Cover Resource Pack and Toolkit | 10 | 10 | 1 | 1 | - | 20 | 6 |
| Brochures created by NRT | 9 | 24 | 2 | 3 | - | 6 | 4 |
| NRT website | 15 | 21 | 6 | 5 | - | - | 1 |
| Other | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 45 |
| N = 48 | | | | | | | |

A series of single response items

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked to consider a list of training and resource materials provided by the NRT and rate the usefulness of each item. Table 4.2 shows the results.

- Just over two thirds (33) of Regional Trainers indicated that the Skills and Tools training had been very useful in supporting their role as trainer.
- Just over half (25) of Regional Trainers thought NRT PPA Content and Delivery training was very useful. Fourteen trainers indicated this training area not applicable, which suggests they had not been involved in its delivery.
- Almost half of respondents (21) rated the PPA Toolkit and Resource pack as very useful.
- The NRT website and brochures were viewed to be *useful* and *very useful* by the majority of Regional Trainers. The website was thought to be *very useful* by 15 trainers, and *useful* by 21 trainers. Brochures created by the NRT were indicated to be *useful* by 24 trainers and *very useful* by 9 trainers.
- Twenty Regional Trainers indicated *not applicable* to the Cover Resource Pack and Toolkit. This is likely to be because most trainers did not have access to this resource. Of the 22 trainers who had used the resource, ten indicated it was *very useful* and another ten reported it *useful*.
- No one indicated that any of the given training or resource materials were *not at all useful*.
- Two Regional Trainers indicated that they had used other resources. They said that discussions with other trainers had been *very useful*.

4.5.2 Effectiveness of training

The five trainers involved in follow-up interviews were asked to comment on how effective the NRT's training had been in helping them to fulfil their role. Four of the five trainers said it had been effective. One trainer said: 'I certainly felt confident to deliver it, and the feedback from participants would endorse that'.

In particular, the Skills and Tools training was viewed as very thorough. Two interviewees commented that the model of receiving training in a condensed form on the first day and practising it with a range of experienced people on sub-

sequent days was very valuable. One of these trainers said: ‘They [the NRT] have given us the space and time to prepare.’ Another said:

When you get the chance to practise it, you are living the walk. It means the first group you deliver to aren't guinea pigs. You have guinea pigged among friends. I'm sure it is costlier to train people that way, but I thought it was very effective.

A less positive response was, however, received from one interviewee who felt the four-day training was very intensive. He suggested splitting it into two two-day slots, which would give trainers time to reflect on the information. That said, he acknowledged the time issue related to the roll-out of the remodelling programme. Another trainer reported that she had ‘some criticisms and grumbles’ about the way in which the materials were put together and their usability, but had generally found the training to be effective.

4.5.3 Improvements to the training

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked whether or not they felt the NRT training and resources could be improved. Table 4.3 shows the results.

Table 4.4 Views on whether or not the NRT's training/resources for Regional Trainers could be improved

| | N |
|-------------|----|
| No | 27 |
| Yes | 20 |
| No response | 1 |

N= 48

A single response item

- Just over half of respondents (27) indicated that training and resources could not be improved.
- The 20 trainers who thought training and resources could be improved were asked to suggest improvements. Four respondents suggested that PowerPoint presentations needed improving and three felt the NRT should take less of a ‘big brother’ approach.

- Two of the trainers taking part in follow-up interviews suggested that the number of PowerPoint slides used in training sessions be reduced, with one of these trainers adding that the quality of the materials (in terms of design) could be improved.
- In order to reduce the amount of time trainers spent travelling to venues, one of the trainers interviewed by NFER suggested that the NRT put more thought into the allocation of trainers to training sessions.
- One trainer who was interviewed suggested that the NRT send regular e-bulletins to keep trainers informed of new developments.
- Two trainers who were interviewed requested that the NRT ensured that the CQI structure remained. One remarked:

Although it is possibly expensive and difficult to organise, the CQI-ing at events, in my experience, certainly improves them. You are there as the representative of the NRT to feed back on the quality of the training. The people I have talked to about the CQI have said how useful it was. If the people who are subjected to it say it is useful, that is not a bad thing.

4.6 Working with others

A key element of the evaluation was to explore Regional Trainers' relationship with others involved in remodelling. Trainers were asked how often they liaised with others within the remodelling community and how useful the support received from these groups had been.

4.6.1 Level of contact

The Regional Trainers taking part in the survey were asked to report on the regularity of their contact with: RCs; other Regional Trainers; LEA Remodelling Advisers; NCSL; NRT Regional Advisers; the NRT's Core Team; NCSL Consultant Leaders; and others. Table 4.4 shows their responses.

Table 4.5 Liaison between regional Trainers and others with the remodelling community

| | Often | Occasionally | Never | No Response |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------------|
| | N | N | N | N |
| Regional Centres | 38 | 9 | 1 | - |
| Other Regional Trainers | 17 | 26 | 5 | - |
| LEA Remodelling Advisers | 14 | 34 | - | - |
| NCSL | 13 | 27 | 7 | 1 |
| NRT Regional Advisers | 7 | 37 | 3 | 1 |
| NRT Core Team | 7 | 26 | 13 | 2 |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | 5 | 17 | 24 | 2 |
| Others | 1 | 1 | 2 | 44 |
| N= 48 | | | | |

A series of single response items

- The majority of Regional Trainers (38) *often* liaised with their RC. Only one trainer indicated never working with his/her RC. Of the five trainers taking part in follow-up interviews, three reported regular contact with their respective RC. The relationships were described as positive. One trainer said his RC was ‘proactive’ and kept him informed of ‘bits and pieces’.
- Over a third of respondents indicated that they often liaised with other Regional Trainers (17) and 26 specified *occasional* liaison. The five trainers involved in follow-up interviews reported ad-hoc meetings with their colleagues. The main source of contact was through the delivery of training and CQI. In the cases where trainers delivered joint training, they generally spent a short amount of time preparing together.
- Fourteen Regional Trainers reported that they *often* liaised with LEA Remodelling Advisers and 34 indicated *occasional* liaison. The planning and delivery of training had been the main or only source of contact between the five trainers interviewed by NFER and LEA Remodelling Advisers.
- Thirteen Regional Trainers indicated that they *often* liaised with NCSL, and 27 reported *occasional* liaison.
- Thirty-seven trainers specified *occasional* liaison with Regional Advisers.

- Twenty-six respondents reported *occasional* liaison with the NRT’s Core Team. This was the case for four of the follow-up interviewees. They reported intermittent contact, usually based around training and meetings. That said, there was a feeling that support was on hand if needed.
- Thirteen trainers indicated *never* liaising with the NRT’s Core Team. One of the follow-up interviewees said liaison with Core Team was the responsibility of someone else in his organisation.
- Survey respondents were given the opportunity to specify other people they worked with in relation to remodelling. Two respondents mentioned that they worked with LEA officers and one mentioned that s/he also worked with headteachers.
- Contact with other stakeholders, as reported by the five follow-up interviewees, included: Remodelling Consultants; WAMG signatories; and headteachers.

4.6.2 Usefulness of support

NRT Regional Trainers were asked to rate the usefulness of the support they had received from colleagues involved in remodelling. Table 4.5 shows the results.

Table 4.6 Usefulness of support received from organisations concerned with remodelling

| | Very useful | Useful | Fairly useful | Not very useful | Not useful | Not applicable | No response |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------|---------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| NRT Core Team | 21 | 13 | 6 | 2 | - | 6 | - |
| NRT Regional Advisers | 11 | 16 | 16 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 |
| LEA Remodelling Advisers | 9 | 15 | 17 | 2 | - | 5 | - |
| NCSL | 5 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 4 |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 26 | 6 |
| Regional Centres | 25 | 15 | 4 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Other Regional Trainers | 16 | 16 | 5 | 1 | - | 8 | 2 |
| Others | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 46 |
| N = 48 | | | | | | | |

A series of single response items

- NRT Regional Trainers found the support from RCs to be most useful. Twenty-five trainers indicated that the support from RCs had been *very useful*, and 15 rated it as *useful*.
- The NRT’s Core Team were considered to be useful, with 21 trainers indicating their support was *very useful* and 13 saying the support was *useful*.
- Support from other Regional Trainers was viewed to be *very useful* and *useful* by 16 Regional Trainers respectively.
- Similar numbers of Regional Trainers indicated that the support from NRT Regional Advisers was *fairly useful* (16), *useful* (16) and *very useful* (11).
- Support from NCSL Consultant Leaders was not utilised by the majority of Regional Trainers, with 26 selecting *not relevant*.

4.7 Delivery of training

The questionnaire posed a series of questions relating to the delivery of remodelling training. The trainers were asked to report on the capacity of the RCs to deliver training, the effectiveness of regionally-based training, possible alternatives to the delivery approach currently being used and any difficulties faced in delivering training to LEAs. The five trainers involved in follow-up interviews were asked to comment on the benefits of regionally-based training and how they saw their role developing in the future.

4.7.1 Capacity of RCs

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked to rate the capacity of RCs to deliver training to LEA staff. Table 4.6 shows their responses.

Table 4.7 Capacity of RCs to deliver training to LEA staff

| | Very good | Good | Fairly good | Not very good | Not good | Not applicable |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------|---------------|----------|----------------|
| | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Capacity of the Regional Centres | 30 | 12 | 4 | - | 1 | 1 |
| N = 48 | | | | | | |

A single response item

- Almost two-thirds of Regional Trainers indicated that the capacity of RCs was *very good* and a further 12 thought that the capacity was *good*.
- One respondent felt that the capacity of RCs was *not at all good*. This opinion was not shared by three respondents from the same region, who indicated the capacity of RCs was *very good*.

4.7.2 Effectiveness of regionally-based training

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked to rate the effectiveness of the regionally-based training to train LEAs to support schools in implementing remodelling. See Table 4.7 for the results.

Table 4.8 Effectiveness of regionally- based training in training LEAs to support schools in implementing the remodelling programme

| | Very effective | Quite effective | Not very effective | Don't know |
|--|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|
| | N | N | N | N |
| Effectiveness of regionally-based training | 30 | 15 | - | 3 |
| N= 48 | | | | |

A single response item

- Almost two-thirds (30) of Regional Trainers thought the regionally-based training was *very effective*. No trainer rated it as not very effective.

4.7.3 Benefits of regionally-based training

The five trainers involved in follow-up interviews were asked to report on the main benefits of delivering training from a regional base, as opposed to a national base, for the remodelling programme as a whole.

Four of the five trainers said the main advantage of delivering from a regional base was local knowledge. Those involved in remodelling regionally were knowledgeable of local situations and were able to tailor training to particular needs. One trainer remarked: ‘It would have been a disaster to do it nationally. You would be saying “everybody is starting at the same point”.’ Delivering

remodelling from a regional base also ensured a healthier work/life balance for trainers as less travel was involved.

While acknowledging that delivering remodelling from a regional base was useful for PPA training, one trainer said it was not as necessary for Skills and Tools training because local knowledge was not needed. Another trainer remarked: ‘The tools stuff was relatively uncontroversial. The PPA stuff, I think, has a number of difficulties.’

On the subject of PPA training, one trainer said, the best seminars had on hand people working within LEA finance and HR departments to explain their LEA’s position on issues such as HLTA and cover supervisor pay scales (as there is no national framework for this). This trainer said: ‘I CQI-ed a couple of instances where local people with local knowledge weren’t there and it was dreadful.’

4.7.4 Alternative approaches

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked to indicate whether or not they thought there was a better way for LEAs and schools to be supported to implement the remodelling process. The results are reported in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 Views on whether or not better ways to support LEAs/schools in implementing the remodelling process exist

| | N |
|-------------|----|
| No | 25 |
| Yes | 15 |
| No response | 8 |

N= 48

A single response item

- NRT Regional Trainers were positive about the support provided to LEAs/schools, with only 15 indicating that support could be improved.
- The 15 trainers, who indicated there was a better way to support LEAs/schools in the implementation of the remodelling process, were asked to comment on their response. Two trainers said there was a need for stronger central control over the remodelling process (as not all LEAs have the commitment and/or capacity to deliver a consistent positive/supportive message). Another two felt

that financial support for schools needed to be improved, and two others said trainers should use their skills to work with schools on a more individual basis.

- Over half of respondents (25) thought there was no better way to support LEAs and schools implement the remodelling process. When asked to comment on their reasons, the most frequent explanation was that the model was very effective (five respondents).
- Twenty-three Regional Trainers did not add additional information explaining why they felt support either could or could not be improved. Three respondents noted that LEA ownership of delivery was vital to success of the programme.

4.7.5 Difficulties faced

Regional Trainers completing the survey were asked to comment on any difficulties they may have faced in delivering training to LEAs. Twenty-eight trainers responded to the question. The most frequently mentioned response related to a lack of enthusiasm by LEAs (seven respondents). Four respondents commented that there was a lack of clarity about funding issues and four said that LEA representatives were not aware of their expectations to deliver the programme. Six trainers said there were no difficulties at all.

From the perspective of four of the five Regional Trainers involved in follow-up interviews, the message being put across by the remodelling programme had caused some problems when delivering training. Three of these trainers explained that some headteachers, particularly those from primary schools, were unhappy with the lack of funding available for remodelling. One said:

I think heads, particularly in primary schools, do find it very difficult to see where the money is going to be available from. I know the initial reaction is not always what will end up, but this makes it quite difficult when you are delivering because these are the anxieties that are uppermost in heads' minds.

Two trainers said that some headteachers were fundamentally opposed to using non-qualified staff to teach lessons. It was noted that, some schools were struggling to implement changes because, over the years, they had not developed the support staff role. Another trainer said she was sympathetic to schools' concerns. She said the basic principle of ten per cent PPA time was valid, but schools were constrained by their circumstances in how they might achieve this. This trainer commented:

The NRT's central team have a very upbeat and positive attitude, which they should have, but some of the real difficulties are for people at a local level to deal with. That makes it quite difficult when it comes to heads who are finding this very, very challenging, particularly in the small school/rural areas but probably in the inner cities as well.

Two trainers involved in follow-up interviews said the materials used with the training sessions had caused some problems. One of these trainers said some primary schools (particularly small primaries) thought the materials were too heavily geared towards secondary schools. The other trainer thought the materials (and the remodelling programme in general) were too prescriptive, remarking:

On the one side, it [remodelling] is saying 'it's very much up to schools to decide how they do this, particularly PPA'. Then it [remodelling] has incredibly tight prescriptions about what you can and cannot do, with regards to time for PPA.

One trainer said it was difficult to fit the training sessions into the NRT's fixed timescale, and another had faced problems when the Regional Adviser in his region had not properly briefed him about the schools taking part in training.

It was also noted that, at the beginning of their involvement in remodelling, Regional Trainers were asked to be available for a certain number of days, but they found this was more than was needed. Some LEAs had been slow to engage and some wanted to deliver the training without Regional Trainers. One trainer explained that, as an independent consultant, this was problematic because he had expected to work a certain number of days. He acknowledged that, in the cases where training sessions were cancelled, the NRT had paid trainers but he said 'it leaves a hole in what you are doing'.

A further challenge, highlighted by one trainer, was mixed-phase training. He felt training should have been targeted at particular groups of schools, organised by phase. Another trainer said, to avoid the agenda being taken over by one phase, one of the LEAs in his region had carried out single-phase training. However, he also noted that another LEA had included primary and secondary schools in training and had found it beneficial. He said: 'The quality of the conversation was mostly impressive.'

4.7.6 Addressing the challenges

The five trainers interviewed by NFER were asked to comment on how the challenges they faced were being addressed. A variety of responses were given:

- Flexibility from RCs in matching trainer availability with demand for training.
- Delivering PPA training in a series of short sessions (to give headteachers time to absorb the information and adapt).
- LEA-developed policies and frameworks (e.g. pay structure for support staff).
- Including HR and financial managers in PPA training (to give headteachers concrete information about legal issues).
- Involving headteachers as part of the training delivery team.
- Considering the audience (i.e. who they are and where they are coming from) to create the right learning environment.
- Following up headteachers' concerns with school visits.

4.7.7 Future role

When asked how they saw their role developing in the future, all five trainers involved in the follow-up interviews mentioned *Every Child Matters*.

For one trainer, some aspects of the remodelling programme had challenged her values. Therefore, she did not expect to work for the NRT in the future. She said: 'I find it very difficult to put across something that I know will be difficult for some of the schools.' This trainer said she would reserve judgment on the new agenda for *Every Child Matters*.

Three trainers said they were unsure about the role they would play in further remodelling work. One of these trainers said more communication was needed between the NRT's Core Team to RCs, in order to decide on how to move the agenda forward. Another trainer said, while he thought the NRT would be providing training for *Every Child Matters*, this had not been confirmed. He thought his role would continue to include training and CQI on behalf of the NRT. A third trainer commented that he would like his involvement with the NRT to continue into *Every Child Matters*, but said the NRT's directorate had been unclear about what experience was needed and the amount of work that would be available.

Two of the trainers saw remodelling as a journey that would sooner or later lead into the *Every Child Matters* agenda. One trainer said: ‘Remodelling is not something that is going to go away. It is going to be a constant process.’ These trainers were keen to continue their involvement with remodelling-type work. One said this might include NCSL Consultant Leader work or National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) tutoring. This trainer hoped there would be the capacity to maintain this way of working because it was ‘breaking down the isolationism of headteaching’.

4.8 Further comments

Regional Trainers completing the survey were given the opportunity to comment on any aspect of remodelling and/or the NRT. Just under half of respondents (22) did not comment. Most frequently, regional trainers made positive comments. Nine said that the programme set-up was very good and three thought the materials and resources were of a high standard.

The Regional Trainers involved in follow-up interviews were also given the chance to make additional comments about remodelling and/or their experience of working with the NRT. Some of their remarks reiterated comments made earlier in the interviews, which have been incorporated in the sections above. Other comments included:

I've enjoyed every minute I've worked with NRT. It's been really good fun as far as I'm concerned. It's been very positive in looking at the way in which some heads (and I say some, there is a lot of scientism) have taken the opportunity to rethink the way in which schools are structured.

There was a lot of very positive response from headteachers, because for the first time in living memory, there were high quality materials and effort put into training around an important national matter.

It is important we learn the lessons from remodelling. I am sure that, possibly through the Extended Schools of Every Child Matters agenda, there is an opportunity for remodelling to continue.

Notes

- 2 PPA trainers have been trained to deliver PPA Content and Delivery workshops to LEAs. Super Trainers have been trained to deliver Remodelling Skills and Tools training to LEAs and to provide support as required. Super and PPA Trainers have been trained to provide both types of support.

5 Findings from Regional Adviser interviews

5.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the findings from interviews carried out with nine Regional Advisers in January 2005. To facilitate comparisons, the interviews explored issues similar to those raised with LEA Remodelling Advisers and Regional Trainers, namely: roles and responsibilities; working with others; training and support; opportunities and challenges; impacts and achievements; and further developments.

5.2 Regional Adviser interviews

Telephone interviews were carried out with nine of the ten Regional Advisers currently working in England's nine government regions. The Regional Advisers were asked a series of questions relating to the effectiveness of the NRT's Core Team in supporting them in their role.

5.2.1 Interview design

The Regional Adviser interviews were semi-structured in design and focussed on six key areas:

- the remodelling process
- working with other stakeholders
- training and support
- impacts and achievements
- challenges
- further developments.

5.2.2 Interview administration

Regional Advisers were sent an email inviting them to be involved an interview. Emails were followed-up by a telephone call a few days later. Interviews were

conducted in January 2005. Each interview took between 20 and 30 minutes to complete.

5.3 The Regional Adviser role

The NRT's representatives in England's nine government regions are known as Regional Advisers. Currently, ten people carry out this role, eight of whom work individually, and two of whom job-share. Only one of the job-sharing advisers was interviewed by NFER. Of the nine advisers interviewed, seven started their role in April 2004 and two started slightly later, one in June and one in November 2004.

5.3.1 Main roles and responsibilities

The Regional Adviser role was established in order to provide additional remodelling support throughout the country, and also to be the main point of contact for LEA Remodelling Advisers. When asked about their main roles and responsibilities, all nine advisers reported that their prime function was to oversee the effective implementation of the National Agreement within their respective region.

The advisers hoped to achieve their main role by informing key stakeholders about remodelling and securing their backing. They were involved in offering support, guidance and advice to stakeholders, particularly LEAs. The advisers commented that, through their links with the NRT's Core Team, they were able to communicate a coherent and consistent message about remodelling.

The nine Regional Advisers felt it was their role to ensure that LEAs were confident in conveying the remodelling message to schools and capable of engaging schools in the change management process. This could be achieved by providing training, building strong relationships, effective communication, sharing information and celebrating achievements. One adviser said: 'One of the best ways to build capacity is to build confidence by saying "this is good" and giving credit where credit is due.'

The role of Regional Adviser also involved challenging LEAs, in relation to the quality of support they were providing to schools, in order for them to achieve better results. It was hoped that 'raising the bar' would help LEAs to move their thinking forward. One way of achieving this was to monitor the progress LEAs

were making in schools and to carry out CQI visits. This involved evaluating LEA remodelling events in terms of what had worked well and what had worked less well.

5.3.2 Delivery support

The Regional Advisers were asked to report on the main ways in which they had been involved in delivering remodelling. A number of responses were given. However, advisers stated that delivery was provided on a proportion-to-needs basis. The following methods of support were given:

- CQI
- coaching new LEA Remodelling Advisers
- gathering evidence of good remodelling practice
- establishing relationships with all WAMG signatories
- attending/delivering/supporting LEA conferences, training and workshops
- presenting to audiences such as headteachers, governors, support staff and school improvement teams
- daily/weekly email and telephone contact with LEA Remodelling Advisers to provide updates and advice
- brokering information (e.g. policies, strategies or newsletters being used in other regions)
- half-termly regional LEA Remodelling Adviser network meetings (to facilitate collaboration between LEAs and to look at remodelling plans, progress made, common issues, good practice and future support)
- monthly/termly review meetings with the LEA Remodelling Advisers to monitor progress (an in-depth stock-taking exercise, from which support is targeted).

5.4 Working with others

As part of their role, Regional Advisers work alongside other groups within the remodelling community and other interested parties, including: LEAs, RCs, other Regional Advisers and other stakeholders. When interviewed by the NFER, Regional Advisers were asked to report on how they worked with these groups and how effective their working relationships had been.

5.4.1 Working with LEAs

The Regional Advisers commented that, on balance, LEAs had made good progress with the remodelling agenda. In taking up their role, advisers were able to extend the NRT's reach. The advisers felt they were well positioned to support and challenge LEAs.

The support offered by Regional Advisers was seen to have given LEAs more confidence in delivering the remodelling message. One adviser commented: 'Where they are now in relation to where they were in April is significantly different in terms of positive progress.' Another adviser said the LEAs in her region had 'moved a lot further than they would probably realise'.

Good working relationships were reported with about two-thirds of LEAs. At the top-end of the scale were the 'high flyers'. These LEAs had, from the beginning, responded well to the remodelling agenda, had built strong intra-LEA teams, were organised and well structured. Relationships with these LEAs were considered to be extremely effective.

Near to the top of the scale were a group of LEAs which, while being very cooperative, needed extra support to get up and running. These LEAs worked closely with Regional Advisers, and were being moved forward to a position of greater strength. Although they were gaining in confidence, Regional Advisers were often present at remodelling events taking place within the LEAs. Relationships with these LEAs were viewed as positive.

Towards the bottom of the scale were LEAs described as 'high touch' which, for a variety of reasons, were not as far forward as they should have been. These LEAs required extra encouragement from Regional Advisers to get things moving. Some of these LEAs were facing problems due to their large size (usually over 250 schools), which had caused them to be slow to engage. In such cases, Regional Advisers had to be very proactive in order to keep the LEA focused.

For other 'high touch' LEAs, their challenge was capacity. Some were struggling because of staff changes/illness, and some did not have the right calibre of personnel to deliver the agenda effectively. One adviser said he was supporting such LEAs by developing coping strategies, and by sharing with them more closely the good practice of other LEAs. Two advisers reported that, in exceptional cir-

cumstances, they would intervene at an appropriate LEA level if certain people were seen to be obstructing the remodelling process.

At the lowest point on the scale were LEAs ‘causing concern’. These LEAs had not engaged their schools in the change management process or the wider remodelling agenda. Some were described as being ‘independently minded’ and ‘not keen to follow the NRT line’. One adviser said problems had arisen because LEA Remodelling Advisors were not directly accountable to Regional Advisers or the NRT, but to their LEA. He described the lines of accountability as ‘a weakness in the system’. Relationships with these LEAs were seen as fragile, but were starting to improve through targeted support and regular contact.

5.4.2 Working with RCs

When asked about how they worked with RCs, some Regional Advisers spoke about the quality of their relationship. For two advisers, a ‘very strong’ relationship had been established (in one case, this was based on previous experience of working with the centre) and for another two advisers a ‘good’ relationship had been set up. However, one of these advisers said relations had been problematic to start with, and the other commented that, while the relationship was good, it was ‘loose’ and ‘driven by need’.

Of the nine Regional Advisers, eight said they had regular meetings with their RC (usually once a month). One adviser described these meetings as being ‘very productive and constructive’, and another said they were ‘full and frank’. The items discussed included:

- LEA progress
- the centre’s progress (e.g. if outcomes have been met)
- the coordinating and targeting of CQI
- the deployment of Regional Trainers
- capacity issues (in relation to the delivery of training)
- the customisation of training for certain LEAs
- the quality of training provided by the centre
- next steps/future developments.

5.4.3 Working with other Regional Advisers

The interviewees gave very positive feedback about their relationships with Regional Adviser colleagues. In particular, comments were received about team-work. The advisers felt the team was ‘very effective’, ‘very supportive’ and ‘very close knit’. One adviser described the group as an ‘open network’ with ‘a very high level of cooperation and a very low level of competitiveness’.

The fact that advisers came from similar backgrounds (i.e. they had all previously worked as headteachers) facilitated good working relationships. That said, it also helped that each adviser had different strengths and skills which they could share with the group, for example an understanding of a particular school type or experience in working with school workforce unions.

The Regional Adviser network had been facilitated by monthly meetings, whereby advisers met at the NRT’s head office for two days. At these meetings, there was a focus on training, which included team development. The meetings enabled advisers to look at effective strategies being used in other regions, thereby sharing good practice.

Away from the monthly meetings, advisers worked as a virtual team. They were in regular contact with each other by telephone and email. Through these lines of communication, good practice was shared. One adviser said this system worked well because the advisers ‘were a good physical team once a month’. However, one adviser noted that emails were sent on a rather ad-hoc basis, but she added that the NRT’s ‘catalogue of best practice’ would help to organise the information.

5.4.4 Working with other stakeholders

Regional Advisers had begun building relationships with a number of different stakeholders. This had included attending meetings and conferences, carrying out presentations and workshops, holding stakeholder briefings and setting up communication structures. In one instance, an adviser described herself as having ‘a wide impact as far as relationship building goes’. However, another adviser explained that she had been slow to set-up relationships with stakeholders because she wanted to establish her role as a Regional Adviser first.

Table 5.1 gives details of the stakeholders working with Regional Advisers (items are not arranged according to the frequency in which they were reported).

Table 5.1 Stakeholders working with Regional Advisers

| School Community | LEA/Local Level | Government | Other Bodies | National Initiatives |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Governors | WAMG | Government Office | Workforce unions | Healthy schools |
| Heads | School Improvement Team | Children's Services Agency | Teacher Training | Excellence in Cities |
| Support staff | Inspectors | DfES CPD Regional Advisers | Higher Education Institutes | Education Action Zones |
| Parents | Primary Strategy Consultants | Implementation Review Unit | Diocesan | |

5.5 Training and support

To prepare them for their role, Regional Advisers had received inductions from the NRT and NCSL. They had also been supported through meetings and additional training. The advisers were asked to comment on how effective the training and support had been in helping them to deliver their role.

5.5.1 Quality of induction and training

The Regional Advisers agreed that the quality of their induction, provided by the NRT, had been excellent. It had been well structured and well delivered, and had given them a clear view of the remodelling agenda. The advisers had been introduced to the change management model and had learned about different remodelling tools and techniques. One adviser said: 'It was really good, the best I've ever known in terms of induction'.

Since their induction, advisers had received different training for different needs, for example presentation skills, relationship building and conflict management. They had also been trained to deliver PPA workshops.

One adviser said: 'There is always some aspect of CPD which helps to support us.' He continued by saying: 'In terms of the quality of CPD and focussed development it is just unparalleled. I've never come across anything of such high quality.'

In addition to their NRT induction, the advisers were also introduced to NCSL's systems and procedures (as the NRT was then hosted within the College). IT training was provided for advisers who felt deficient in using certain programmes. Three advisers said they appreciated the opportunity to develop their IT skills, however, one of these felt the training was not well targeted in relation to IT.

5.5.2 Role preparation

The advisers felt the NRT's induction was effective in preparing them for their role. A reason for this was because advisers had several weeks to digest the information and understand its content before they began working in the field. One adviser said: 'We didn't go out cold. Everything went through the mill. So when something goes out, it goes out as a quality programme.'

5.5.3 Quality of support

The Regional Advisers were very satisfied with the quality of support provided by the NRT's Core Team. They were seen as helpful, responsive and close at hand. Advisers also commented that the NRT was good at informing them about future developments and, when issues were raised, they were taken seriously and followed-up. One adviser described the NRT as an unusual organisation in that it was team-based and very non-hierarchical. Another adviser said: "It [the NRT's support] is so much better than anything I've experienced in my professional life.'

The monthly meetings between advisers and the NRT ensured regular dialogue between the two groups. Each adviser was able to bring the Core Team up-to-date with the successes and challenges within his/her respective region. Working closely with the NRT's Core Team had another benefit, as one adviser remarked: 'I've been able to use the expertise I've gained from the Core Team to work better with WAMGs, unions and professional associations'.

The support provided by the NRT to advisers was viewed to be visible, but not overwhelming. The ability to access virtual support had made a big difference to some advisers. It had given them a sense of security and belonging. One adviser said:

There hasn't been one time when I've felt out on my own. If one person hasn't been available, another person will step up to help. It is the sort of job where,

even with the best plans you could feel vulnerable, but I can say, hand on heart, I have never felt vulnerable. I have felt challenged but never vulnerable.

5.6 Opportunities and challenges

In carrying out their role, the Regional Advisers had encountered opportunities and challenges. When interviewed by NFER they were asked to report on both of these issues.

5.6.1 Main opportunities

For the Regional Advisers, their role had provided them with several opportunities. The main opportunity was being able to apply previous experiences and knowledge to a progressive agenda. The advisers were able to link their previous work directly to remodelling and contribute to its development at a national level. One adviser said: ‘You feel you are contributing to something that is changing the shape of education and changing how education will be delivered for generations to come.’

Facilitating relationships and networks, such as cross-LEA working, was another opportunity reported by advisers. In their role, advisers felt able to bring together people from different areas of work, not always education, to share information and discuss relevant issues. Supporting the remodelling community regionally, particularly LEA Remodelling Advisers, was seen to be a significant factor in ensuring the success of remodelling.

For some, the Regional Adviser role had been hard work and a huge learning curve. It was reported that there was ‘a lot to learn and a lot to unlearn’. Despite this, advisers were extremely positive about their job. One adviser remarked: ‘I have no hesitation saying this is the best job I’ve ever had.’ Another said: ‘Working in this area has been the most powerful and stimulating professional development that I’ve had in my career’. The advisers had enjoyed the opportunity to make a difference within their region and see schools move forward.

5.6.2 Main challenges

Regional Advisers reported a number of challenges in relation to their role. For some, working without any clerical support was a problem. One adviser

explained that, in her role as a headteacher, her diary was usually managed for her. Another adviser admitted being ‘absolutely useless’ at allowing enough office time. She said she often spent evenings and weekends catching up with emails and writing notes.

Two advisers reported managing the role of Regional Adviser and headteacher as a challenge. These advisers worked for the NRT for four days and as a headteacher for one day a week. This dual role presented challenges in terms of capacity and priorities. One of the advisers said it was difficult to divide the roles into a four-day/one-day split.

For one adviser, working in an unfamiliar part of the country had been rewarding, but difficult. The adviser said developing strong relationships with unknown LEAs, within a short space of time, was challenging. Three other advisers made reference to working within a regional context. They reported that the amount of travel carried out per day could be burdensome. It was also noted that scheduling regular meetings with LEAs was difficult, as there were so many per region. Slotting together meetings in neighbouring LEAs was one strategy used in order to reduce travel time.

It was reported by one adviser that, because Regional Advisors were appointed in the second year of remodelling, the impact of the Regional Advisor role was lessened (mainly because LEAs had already had project plans in place).

Engaging with key stakeholders, keeping the remodelling agenda moving and sharing good practice with a wide audience were further challenges. In particular, putting across hard messages, while preserving good relationships, was difficult. One adviser said: ‘Relationships are the key. If you don’t get them right, things tend to go pear-shaped.’ Another adviser remarked: ‘You have to get to the point where you’re not seen as a threat, or an inspector, but as someone who is there to listen and help out if needed.’

5.7 Impacts and achievements

When interviewed by the NFER, Regional Advisers were asked to comment on the main remodelling impacts and achievements within their respective regions. In the cases where an impact had occurred, advisers were also asked to report on the contributing factors.

5.7.1 Main impacts

In the short time in which they had been working as Regional Advisers, a number of impacts, related to remodelling, had been observed. However, it was noted that these impacts varied between schools and across LEAs. One adviser pointed out that, while school change might have happened without remodelling, this was unlikely.

Overall, it was too early for Regional Advisers to draw definite conclusions across the whole spectrum of schools within their region, as some schools had not yet fully engaged with the programme. Table 5.2 shows the impacts of remodelling so far, as reported by advisers (items are not arranged according to the frequency in which they were reported).

Table 5.2 Reported remodelling impacts

| Whole schools | Support Staff | Teachers | LEAs |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| More open culture | Better career and training opportunities | Reduced workload | New ways of thinking |
| New approaches to workload issues | Increased job satisfaction | More time for teaching | More cross-LEA collaboration and sharing |
| Curriculum development | Greater feeling of inclusion | Less pressure | |
| Greater appreciation of support staff | Improved morale | Reduced teacher absence | |

5.7.2 Contributing factors

As shown in Table 5.2, the impacts of remodelling, as reported by Regional Advisers, had been quite considerable. So, what had contributed to its success?

From the perspective of some Regional Advisers, the mandatory nature of the National Agreement had been the catalyst for change. One adviser said the Agreement had ‘made headteachers sit up and listen’. It was also noted that a statutory timeframe for delivery had helped to keep schools focused. That said, it was felt that, without a supportive programme in place, schools would have struggled to implement the new legislation.

Regional Advisers identified the NRT as sending out a ‘persuasive and powerful’ message to schools. Its change management model was seen to have provided schools with a structure to work from, but it was also viewed as flexible (i.e. able to respond to a school’s individual needs). Advisers also praised the quality of the NRT’s training materials and providers (and the money behind this). One adviser said: ‘Schools are probably getting good materials for the first time.’ It was also noted that the CQI of training events had ensured a consistent message.

The well-structured delivery of the remodelling programme was recognised as another factor contributing to the success of remodelling. Schools had been introduced to the agenda in a phased approach, which took them through a series of events. They were introduced to the change management process and equipped with the skills and tools needed to unlock some of the issues around remodelling. One adviser said: ‘They are not new skills and tools but it is unusual for schools to be equipped with them in such a systematic and coherent way’.

From the perspective of six advisers, the energy and commitment of LEA staff was crucial to the success of remodelling. In the words of one adviser: ‘The support within the LEAs for their schools has been very good. The impact would not be there if this was not in place.’ In particular, support provided by LEA remodelling advisers to schools was seen as essential. This was seen to work best when the remodelling adviser had credibility (i.e. had worked through the reforms as a headteacher), in order to give peer support

Four advisers explained how their own role had influenced the impact of remodelling. These advisers felt they had facilitated and strengthened links between stakeholders and made the remodelling agenda more widely known.

One adviser said: ‘I don’t think they [stakeholders] would be so up to date with the agenda if I hadn’t been here in the region.’ The advisers thought they had challenged LEAs quite considerably, but also encouraged them. In the words of an adviser: ‘They [LEAs] haven’t been used to working in this way and I’ve offered them a lot of support to enable them to do that.’

5.8 Further developments

In relation to further developments, when interviewed by the NFER, Regional Advisers were given the opportunity to suggest improvements to the ongoing

support provided to them by the NRT's Core Team. They were also asked to comment on the ways in which they thought their role as Regional Adviser would develop in the future.

5.8.1 Improvements

By and large, advisers were highly satisfied with the support they were given by the NRT's Core Team. One adviser said, because of the frequent dialogue between advisers and the Core Team, there was always opportunity to suggest improvements, and these were acted upon.

From the perspective of three advisers, there was room for improvement. One adviser said she would appreciate more clerical support. For another adviser, LEA accountability was an area of weakness. This adviser believed a much clearer line of accountability between LEAs and the NRT was needed. He felt that a formal contract between the two groups would help to address many of the challenges he was facing.

A third adviser commented that, because the remodelling team had grown, communication and feedback throughout the NRT could be improved. She said:

When I started at a brand new school, communication was superb because everybody was involved in everything and everyone knew what was going on. That is one of the core principles of the NRT. But now we've become bigger, communication needs to become better.

5.8.2 Regional Adviser role

In the third and final year of remodelling, advisers believed their role would continue to focus on facilitating the implementation of the National Agreement. However, they thought their role would expand as new agendas were introduced, namely *Every Child Matters* and the *Extended Schools* policy contained within it.

Advisers anticipated that their role would continue to involve supporting and challenging schools and LEAs, but this would centre on wider workforce reform, in order to prepare them for the delivery of the new agendas. It was felt that the linkage between the NRT, RCs and LEAs would provide opportunities to develop the new agendas in the future.

For Regional Advisers undertaking secondments to the NRT, a decision had to be taken about returning back to headteaching. One adviser explained that he was in a quandary about how to take forward his career. Although there was a possibility of him taking on a new headship, he regretted the prospect of handing over the relationships he had taken time to build. He said rebuilding the relationships would take time.

Another adviser commented that he had very much enjoyed working in the adviser role and was keen to build on the experience. However, he intended to return to his previous headship and thought he would be a much more effective headteacher, having acquired new skills and qualities.

6 Findings from interviews with Regional Centre Directors and Programme Managers

6.1 Introduction

During January and February 2005, RC Directors and Programme Managers were asked to report on how effective the NRT had been in supporting their role as remodelling training coordinators. This chapter presents the key findings from interviews carried out with all nine RC Directors and seven Programme Managers. The NFER was unable to contact two Programme Managers (despite sending several emails and making numerous telephone calls, it was not possible to arrange interviews with these people). Interviews with Directors and Programme Managers explored similar issues to interviews carried with LEA Remodelling Advisers, Regional Trainers and Regional Advisers, as reported in previous chapters.

6.2 Methods

6.2.1 Interview design

The same interview schedule was used for both the Directors and Programme Managers. Interview schedules explored similar areas to those explored in the interviews with LEA Remodelling Advisers, Regional Trainers and Regional Advisers. Interviews were semi-structured and focussed on six key areas of the evaluation:

- the remodelling process
- working with other stakeholders
- training and support
- impacts and achievements
- challenges
- further developments.

6.2.2 Interview administration

All RC Directors and Programme Managers were sent an email inviting them to be involved in the research. Emails were followed up by a telephone call a few days later. Despite relentless emails and telephone calls to two Programme Managers, we were not able to make contact to arrange the interviews. Interviews with the Directors and seven Programme Managers were conducted between January and February 2005. Each interview took between 20 and 30 minutes to complete.

6.3 Background

To extend the scale of its activities and provide high quality leadership development for schools and LEAs, NCSL established nine RCs (one in each of the Government regions in England). Each RC has a Director and Programme Manager who coordinate the delivery of NCSL training programmes. As the NRT was established as part of NCSL from April 2003 to April 2005, RCs were used as the hub from which to direct the regional delivery of remodelling training in the NRT's second year of operation.

6.3.1 The Director role

Each RC has a Director who is responsible for overseeing the work of the centre in delivering training programmes, and supporting LEAs and schools, on leadership development. Currently, eight RC Directors and one Director of Finance and Development have this role. Four of the Directors the NFER spoke to also had responsibility for their associated Leadership Centre.

At the time of the interviews in early 2005, most Directors had been in post for about 18 months. A few Directors had previously been involved in delivering NCSL training programmes and had been in post for between one to three years. One Director had been in post for less than a year.

When asked about their main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling, all nine Directors reported that their role was one of overseeing the delivery of the training programme in collaboration with the Programme Manager. Most Directors did not consider their role to be, as one director said 'hands on' but a role of 'maintaining an oversight of the programme'. This task was done prima-

rily through regular meetings with key stakeholders involved in the programme, for example Regional Advisers and the NRT's Core Team.

Directors explained that it was the Programme Managers, who in collaboration with the NRT created a regional training team to deliver the training programme in their region. Directors managed and supported their Programme Manager to achieve this effectively.

6.3.2 The Programme Manager role

Each RC had a Programme Manager who took the lead in delivering training programmes. Six of the seven Programme Managers interviewed described their job title as Programme Manager for remodelling or workforce reform. The other said their job title was Area Manager for the Leadership Centre. Most Programme Managers had been in post for about 12 months, since April 2004. One had been in post for a little longer, since January 2004.

When asked about their main roles and responsibilities, all agreed that they had responsibility for managing and coordinating the training for the remodelling programme. One Programme Manager described his role as 'the bridge between what happens on the ground by way of training and the requirements of NRT in London'. Almost all programme managers explained that they were involved in evaluating the trainer's delivery of the training, through the NRT's internal evaluation process, called Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). Most Programme Managers were involved in regular regional meetings with their Directors, Regional Adviser and the NRT's Core Team.

6.4 Involvement in the remodelling process

Directors and Programme Managers were asked to describe how RCs had been involved in the delivery of the remodelling training. Directors described the main role of RCs as supporting the work of the NRT by recruiting and training trainers to effectively deliver the programme of training across the region. Programme Manager elaborated and explained that they organised and provided training for LEA personnel on PPA workshops in order for LEAs to cascade the training down to schools. Directors and Programme Managers described RCs as an identifiable base within each region that LEAs and schools could access for additional support and guidance on remodelling, or other leadership issues.

Most Programme Managers were involved in CQI evaluations of trainers and LEA personnel on behalf of the NRT. Programme Managers evaluated trainers and LEAs to ensure the effective delivery of the programme. These evaluations were viewed positively by Directors, Programme Managers and trainers. Both valued the opportunity to receive feedback on the delivery of their training as it enabled them to address emerging issues. CQIs also provided an opportunity for Regional Advisers to report back to the Core Team successful strategies that could be developed nationally.

On the whole, Programme Managers explained that the evaluation findings were very positive about the training. One Director mentioned that he was involved in carrying out CQIs on trainers and LEAs, as the programme training was cascaded down.

A small number of Directors described how RCs supported each other in delivering the programme. For example, one director explained that his RC had a surplus of trainers so these were deployed to another region to deliver training that was experiencing a shortage of trainers.

Many programme managers felt that the model adopted by the NRT to deliver the remodelling programme was very effective indeed. They explained that RCs had the knowledge and awareness of local issues to support the roll-out of the programme. As one programme manager said, 'I think it's a good system. I feel it is very effective. First of all, NRT train us, we train the LEAs and it is a good cascade system without being diluted'.

Directors were also positive about the NRT model of delivery. They described the RC role as pivotal in the delivery of the programme. They commented on the value of the effective collaborative working between RCs, the NRT's Core Team and other stakeholders in rolling out the programme.

6.5 Training and support

Directors and Programme Managers were asked about the training and support they had received from the NRT, and how well it had supported them in their roles.

As most Directors had been involved in previous NCSL programmes, they drew on this knowledge and experience for rolling out remodelling training. As the

programme of training developed, Directors felt that the NRT became more understanding to their needs, particularly in relation to developing the training within the context of regional issues.

The NRT's Core Team trained Programme Managers and trainers on how to deliver remodelling training to LEAs. Programme Managers were extremely positive about the training received from the NRT's Core Team. Programme Managers described it as 'essential' and 'excellent'. One commented that not only was the NRT training very good but that the materials that were provided were 'an added bonus'.

Directors agreed with Programme Managers that the quality of the NRT's training delivered to trainers was very good. Some Directors undertook the Skills and Tools training themselves so they understood what was expected from their trainers and so they had a thorough understanding of the remodelling programme. Most Directors were very positive about this training. Most Directors commented on the high quality of the materials that were available. However, a small number felt that the training materials were not very good. They were concerned that trainers had to adapt some of the materials to suit their needs and that the NRT had been resistant to this.

Directors and Programme Managers agreed that the NRT had been very effective in supporting RCs to deliver the remodelling training. Both were pleased with the high level of information sharing that the NRT promoted. Regular meetings were held between the Directors, Programme Managers and the NRT's Core Team. The NRT presence at the NCSL Director meetings was also valued.

Many Programme Managers commented that the NRT website and the support offered via the telephone and email were invaluable. They appreciated having the resource of the Core Team to draw upon when they needed additional guidance and assistance. Programme Managers described the NRT as a highly responsive team who answered questions quickly and effectively. As one programme manager explained, 'Every time you talk, ring or email the Core Team, you get a response. They do something about it and they are on top of things. I think their efficiency is wonderful'.

Despite these overwhelmingly positive reactions from Directors and Programme Managers, some concerns were raised about the NRT's Core Team. These are reported in Section 6.8.2: which discusses challenges faced by RC Directors and Programme Managers.

6.6 Working with others

As part of their responsibility in rolling out the delivery of the remodelling agenda, Directors and Programme Managers worked with various stakeholders involved in the programme. These included Regional Advisers, LEA Remodelling Advisers and the NRT's Core Team. Directors and Programme Managers were asked to comment on how their role related to that of the key stakeholders and how effectively they felt they worked together.

6.6.1 Working with Regional Advisers

On the whole, Directors and Programme Managers valued the relationship they had with their Regional Adviser. They viewed the Regional Advisers as the link between RCs and the NRT's Core Team and felt they were mutually supportive of each other. Although Directors had limited contact with the Regional Adviser outside of the meetings, which were held about every six weeks, they explained that Programme Managers had more day-to-day contact with advisers. When there was the need for more contact, Directors explained that Regional Advisers were quick and responsive to their needs.

Programme Managers valued the high level of contact and support they received from their Regional Adviser both formally and informally. For example regular regional meetings were held but in addition, Programme Managers contacted advisers with ideas and concerns by email and telephone. Only one programme manager commented that she did not have regular contact with her Regional Adviser. She felt that this was due to the nature of the RC's working practices.

Directors felt that the regular meetings provided enough of an opportunity for both to become fully informed about the other's work in relation to developing the remodelling programme across the regions. They worked together to ensure no conflicting messages were presented to LEAs and schools. However, one Director felt that he did not have as much direct contact with the Regional Adviser outside of the regular meetings as he would like. The Director felt the relationship could be developed further. Another Director suggested it might have been useful for Regional Advisers to be based within RCs to aid facilitation and future development.

Another Director explained that there was a gap in the communication between the RC and the Regional Adviser in the initial stages of the programme's development. However, circumstances had changed in this region and a new adviser was appointed. The Director felt the relationship developed with the new Regional Adviser was much improved and she commented that things were 'dramatically different'.

6.6.2 Working with LEA Remodelling Advisers

The 16 Directors and Programme Managers were asked to comment on how their roles related to that of LEA Remodelling Advisers. On the whole, Directors and Programme Managers explained that they had limited contact with LEA Remodelling Advisers other than through delivery training. LEA Remodelling Advisers attended the regional meetings but there was limited contact between them and Directors beyond the meetings.

Directors understood that it was the role of the Regional Advisers to liaise directly with LEAs and offer additional support. That said, Directors and Programme Managers explained that they were in a position to offer additional training and support to LEAs, if requested. As one programme manager explained, 'We are seen to be support for them should they have difficulties with capacity and issues with resourcing and what they need to take forward'.

Some Programme Managers had arranged additional training events for LEAs upon request. However, this request usually came through the Regional Adviser rather than directly from the LEAs. Most Programme Managers understood it was the role of the Regional Adviser to liaise directly with LEAs, and that RC personnel were not encouraged to do so by the NRT.

One Director felt disgruntled about the level of contact between RCs and LEAs. He felt that the NRT had 'missed a trick' as RCs had a good foundation and established networks from which the programme could benefit, however these networks were not fully utilised by the NRT. Other Directors and Programme Managers expressed similar concerns about RC networks and systems not being fully utilised.

A few Directors explained that a by product of delivering the remodelling training was that relationships with some LEAs had been strengthened.

6.7 Regional Centres and the NRT

Directors and Programme Managers were asked for their views on how well they felt the NRT had utilised RCs in relation to rolling out the remodelling programme.

On the whole, Directors and Programme Managers felt RCs had been well utilised in terms of delivering the training. They felt that they had worked hard to deliver the training on time and as time went on, they felt they became extremely effective in their role. Directors commented that this model had been very effective at engaging and training LEAs as they were aware of local issues. They felt that they were in a good position in terms of sharing information and offering joined up thinking between leadership development and NRT.

Directors felt that regional teams of trainers could not have been deployed or recruited without RCs. Directors explained that they drew upon existing relationships and links. In addition to drawing on relationships, RCs were able to extend their connections, for example with LEAs.

Directors and Programme Managers were very positive about the regional trainers who delivered the training, which included ‘they’re excellent’ and ‘very good’. Directors and Programme Managers ensured that the most highly skilled trainers were involved in delivering remodelling training.

A small number of Programme Managers expressed concern that there had been some overlap between the training trainers received about remodelling and other national initiatives that RCs were involved in delivering. They felt more emphasis should be placed on content of programmes rather than on the skills of delivery. One Programme Manager explained that the NRT and other NCSL training programmes, for example the ‘National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH)’ and ‘Leading from the Middle’, had a ‘similar thread’.

Despite the positive comments Directors and Programme Managers made about the trainers and the NRT programme, they raised some concerns. These issues are reported in Section 6.8.2: Challenges.

The challenges aside, Directors and Programme Managers were positive about their working relationship with the NRT. One director was impressed with the professional nature of the NRT compared to other programmes that the RC had

been involved in delivering. The comments made by Programme Managers about the NRT included, ‘Brilliant, absolutely fantastic! Improve consistently’ and ‘We find working with the Core Team excellent’.

6.8 Achievements and challenges

Directors and Programme Managers were asked for their views on the main benefits and challenges associated with delivering remodelling training from RCs, as opposed to a national delivery programme. They were also asked what had facilitated the successes and what had been done to address the challenges.

6.8.1 Achievements

The 16 Directors and Programme Managers emphasised a number of benefits and impacts associated with delivering the remodelling training from RCs.

Directors and Programme Managers felt that their extensive knowledge of local issues helped with the delivery of the training. They felt that they were in a unique position as they were aware of the challenges that faced LEAs and schools. They were able to ensure the training was not distant to LEAs which enabled a more manageable delivery.

Directors and Programme Managers explained that a combination of hard work and dedication from the NRT’s Core Team and the RCs had ensured the programme delivery was a success. Programme managers were asked to comment on the factors that facilitated their achievements. Programme managers were particularly positive about the support and information available from the NRT. The resources and materials on offer were also viewed very positively. One programme manager explained that he valued ‘the quality of the materials... when they are well delivered, you can’t go wrong’.

For some trainers, delivering the remodelling programme had developed their skills. Directors and Programme Managers explained that continuous assessment helped to develop trainers and helped RCs move forward in the right direction.

Another impact for Directors and Programme Managers was the opportunity, provided by remodelling, to work closely with LEAs. One Programme Manager noted that the remodelling programme had ‘broken down the barriers with

LEAs'. Another commented that the relationships developed through the remodelling programme could be extended into other areas in the future. They believed LEAs now viewed RCs as a new resource from which to draw upon for support and guidance. Directors were also pleased that contacts and partnerships had developed out of the RC's involvement in the remodelling programme. A small number of Directors explained that the remodelling programme had given the RC an identifiable role within the region.

Directors and Programme Managers mentioned that one of their achievements was delivering the training within the timescale. They were pleased that the trainers had delivered the training on time and to a very high standard. Directors and Programme Managers said they had very positive evaluation feedback.

A small number of Directors and Programme Managers noted a benefit of the NRT training programme for schools. They felt that the NRT model and the tools provided had introduced new ideas to schools and would help leadership development and school improvement beyond remodelling.

6.8.2 Challenges

Directors and Programme Managers mentioned a number of challenges associated with the remodelling training from an RC perspective.

The main challenge faced by Directors and Programme Managers was related to timescales. All thought that timescales were unrealistic and the timing of the events, for example in the summer holidays, had caused frustration. Programme Managers felt there were major issues with programme delivery in terms of setting dates and arranging the number of trainers required. Most commented that they were requested to arrange training at a few weeks notice which proved problematic as high quality trainers had been chosen to deliver the NRT training, at the request of the NRT. Trainers were therefore in high demand from other clients and were often booked up with other commitments months in advance.

One Director felt that the NRT lacked an appreciation of the breadth of work RCs are involved in delivering and needed to understand that that they are not only involved in delivering the remodelling training. Had RCs had a longer lead in time in which to organise training events, one director felt that the training delivery would have been even better. Directors and Programme Managers understood that the programme was politically driven but felt that the trainers

and coordinators needed to be treated with a greater professionalism that took account of their other commitments.

A small number of Directors felt that the NRT needed to be sensitive to the regional needs and issues. When arranging training event venues, for instance, the NRT needed to consider the difficulties associated with arranging training at some venues. A small number of Directors felt RCs should be given more ownership of the programme's delivery so these problems would not arise. Directors felt that sometimes the NRT were inflexible in their approach. Another Director commented that the NRT 'sometimes don't like it if you say "the even better if".' She felt that the NRT misunderstood that when she suggested improvements she was trying to develop the programme's delivery but felt that the NRT perceived this as a lack of enthusiasm and commitment to the programme.

Directors and Programme Managers explained that uncertainty about the future was another challenge. They were unsure whether RCs would have a contract with the NRT after March 2005. This had implications for people employed by RCs.

In terms of what had been done to address the challenges, RC Directors on the whole had expressed their concerns to the NRT. RC Directors commented that the NRT tried to give as much notice as they could and they accepted that was the nature of the work. They did not think the NRT could do anything about it.

All Directors and Programme Managers said they had relayed the challenges they faced to the NRT so the NRT should be aware of the challenges reported here.

6.9 Future developments

Directors and Programme Managers were asked how they saw their role developing in the future and what they would like RCs to do in the future in relation to remodelling.

All Directors and Programme Managers felt RCs were in a very good position to continue to offer training and support on remodelling. They looked forward to developing closer links with LEAs and schools in the future.

Directors and Programme Managers were very pleased to have had the opportunity to deliver the remodelling training programme and hoped that they would

have a significant role in the future of remodelling training, in whatever direction it moved.

At the time of the interviews, there was a great deal of uncertainty amongst Directors and Programme Managers about the future role of the NRT in relation to the children's agenda, specifically the 'Every Child Matters' Green Paper and Extended Schools. Directors and Programme Managers believed that RCs had the capacity to deliver training in the Every Child Matters arena. They felt that their involvement in remodelling had provided them with a good platform from which to continue to be involved in NRT and Workforce Reform Developments in Year 3 and beyond. RCs felt that their established networks could complement the work of the NRT on the children's agenda, as one Director said:

Every Child Matters is key to LEAs, local government and the Regional centres are in a good position to set up relationships in these areas. We have the capacity to bring on board health and social services.

Programme Managers agreed that RCs had the systems, structures and networks already in place and looked forward to finding out the new remit of the NRT. As one programme manager explained:

When the Every Child Matters agenda comes into play, the relationship and expertise that has been developed in the past year could grow further...we would be in a very good position to take forward any new initiative that came through the remodelling team.

Directors hoped that if they were to be involved in the future delivery of training programmes that they would be brought into discussions from the start, so they could get systems and structures established for the most efficient delivery.

In terms of future development of delivering NRT programmes, Directors and Programme Managers felt confident that the trainers had developed their skill range as a result of being involved in the remodelling training programme. This meant they could be used more extensively within RCs.

Programme Managers also hoped RCs would have a greater role in supporting LEAs and schools in the future. One programme manager felt that governors needed more training on remodelling and that so far, they had not been as involved as perhaps they could have been.

6.10 Further comments

Programme managers were given the opportunity to make additional comments about the remodelling programme. Their comments included:

I think it's a brilliant programme. I've felt incredibly well supported at all stages. It works I think and they have got an extremely good model.

The tools and skills are really appreciated by schools. I really would like to feel that all schools knew about these skills and tools and use them to take forward change in a more effective way than they currently do.

7 Summary of key findings and issues for consideration

7.1 Introduction

This report by the NFER is presented to the NRT at the end of its second year of operation and at a time of change. In its first year (April 2003 to April 2004), the NRT delivered training and support to LEAs and schools from a national base. In its second year, the scale and reach of the NRT's activities were extended to support the nationwide roll-out of the National Agreement. In its third and final year, the NRT will move from NCSL to the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). Its remit will be extended to include Every Child Matters. This chapter provides the NRT with a summary the key findings from the NFER's second evaluation.

7.2 NFER evaluation studies

7.2.1 Year one

Towards the end of 2003, the NFER began a year-long research project, on behalf of the NRT, looking at the NRT in its first year of operation (see Wilson et al., 2005). The NRT responded positively to the findings of this research and were proactive in addressing the concerns and issues it highlighted.

7.2.2 Year two

The overall aim of the Year 2 evaluation was to examine the effectiveness and impact of the NRT in relation to the evaluation objectives. The sub-aims were:

- to examine the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT in its second year of operation.
- to explore the change to the remodelling programme's delivery
- to explore the effects of regionalisation on the delivery of the programme
- to examine the supplementary remit given to the NRT by the DfES to provide training to LEA staff to deliver workshops to schools and examine the effectiveness of the NRT in adapting to this remit

- to ascertain the number of schools involved in Year 2.

The Year 2 report includes data collected through a survey of LEA Remodelling Advisers and Regional Trainers (carried out in November 2004). It also draws on the data collected through interviews with Regional Advisers, Regional Centre Directors and Programme Managers, and a sample of LEA Remodelling Advisers and Regional Trainers (carried out in January and March 2005).

The LEA Remodelling Advisers, Regional Advisers, trainers and RC Directors and Programme Managers involved in the NFER evaluation gave very positive feedback on the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT. The changes made to the Year 1 programme delivery were welcomed and respondents were looking forward to working with the NRT in future.

7.3 The change process

According to the LEAs that participated in the evaluation, the number of schools involved in remodelling in Year 2 was almost double the number involved in remodelling in Year 1. Despite reluctance on the part of some schools to embrace remodelling, LEAs felt that schools were progressing well.

The evaluation showed that the majority of LEAs involved in the study used the NRT-recommended change process (‘mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/

deliver’) with tranche events, to develop remodelling with schools. LEA advisers adapted the change process to suit their local context and the needs of individual schools. The NRT’s flexibility in enabling this was appreciated.

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) internal evaluations ensured that changes to the process were quality assured.

7.4 Working with others

Stakeholders involved in the evaluation (LEA advisers, Regional Advisers, Regional Trainers, RC Directors and Programme Managers) were very positive about their relationships with each other. This was facilitated through regional networks and supported by the NRT.

7.4.1 Regional networks

Of particular benefit for LEA advisers, Regional Advisers and RCs were the regional meetings and networks. These meetings provided the opportunity for stakeholders to discuss progress, share ideas and raise concerns. In addition to the regional meetings, some LEAs established their own local network meetings. This provided a further opportunity to share good practice.

Stakeholders involved in the evaluation commented on the value of drawing on the different perspectives and experiences of people from a variety of backgrounds. LEA advisers explained that remodelling had led to closer working relationships with other local authority departments, for example, human resources and finance, which was very beneficial. Collaborative working within and across LEAs, with Regional Advisers and RCs was considered to be one of the key factors in the successful implementation of the National Agreement.

7.4.2 Supporting LEAs

Regional Advisers explained that they extended the reach of the NRT to support and challenge schools with the remodelling programme. They felt that they were well positioned to do this. Overall, Regional Advisers thought they had a good relationship with most LEAs. Where LEAs had not yet embraced remodelling, additional guidance and support was offered. Regional Advisers felt that relations were improving with these LEAs due to this increased contact and support.

7.5 Training and support

All stakeholders involved in either the national NRT training or regional RC training commented on its high quality. This was facilitated by the support of the NRT and the highly skilled Regional Trainers.

7.5.1 Training

The types of training and support considered to be most useful by respondents to both the LEA Remodelling Adviser and the NRT Regional Trainer survey were:

- LEA Remodelling Adviser training events
- skills and tools training

- PPA content and delivery training
- PPA resource pack and toolkit.

Although satisfaction with training was very high, a small number of respondents described the training courses as very intensive with a great deal of information to absorb over a relatively short period of time.

7.5.2 Capacity of the RCs

Stakeholders involved in the evaluation were asked to rate the capacity of RCs as a base for delivering training. All agreed that RCs provided an effective base for the regional delivery of the programme and the quality of the training delivered by the trainers was judged to be very high.

LEA advisers and Regional Advisers agreed that they had a good relationship with RCs. However, RCs were rarely drawn upon as a source of support other than in terms of training delivery. RCs hoped to be involved in supporting LEAs and schools in the future. They considered themselves to be a resource that LEAs could utilise for additional support.

7.5.3 Support from the NRT

LEA advisers, Regional Advisers, Regional Trainers and RC Directors and Programme Managers commented that the NRT's Core Team was very quick and helpful in dealing with queries. Most stakeholders agreed that the quality of the materials produced by the NRT was invaluable in supporting the roll-out of remodelling.

Stakeholders involved in the evaluation valued the web-based support the NRT provided. LEA advisers said they would like access to case study reports in the future as remodelling progressed into its third year. They would also like further information on how to deal with covering exam invigilation and providing dedicated leadership time, which will be key issues for schools in year three.

All stakeholders felt that the NRT was very supportive to their needs. Stakeholders felt able to express their concerns to the core team. They understood that the NRT was also under pressure to implement the Agreement but felt that the team responded to challenges wherever they could.

7.5.4 CQI

The continuous evaluation of training through the CQI process ensured stakeholders received regular feedback on their practice. Although CQIs may have caused some difficulty to organise, stakeholders involved greatly valued the opportunity to develop their practice through CQI.

7.6 Achievements

All stakeholders involved in the evaluation were positive about the effect of training being delivered regionally. Knowledge and understanding of local issues and challenges faced by schools was seen as fundamental to the success of the programme. The hard work and commitment of the NRT and other stakeholders was also considered to be an important factor in ensuring the effective roll-out of the programme.

LEA advisers and Regional Advisers commented on the impact remodelling was starting to have in schools. Although still in its infancy, advisers agreed that teachers and support staff were beginning to reap the benefits of remodelling in terms of reduced workload for teachers and more professional development opportunities for support staff.

RCs valued the opportunity to be involved in the programme. They felt it had enabled trainers to develop their skills. Directors and Programme Managers felt that their involvement in the programme had improved their relationships with LEAs.

7.7 Challenges

It is to be expected that any large educational reform will face implementation challenges. What is striking in the results of this evaluation is that, while respondents acknowledged the considerable task involved, they felt well supported in pursuing their remit. A small number of difficulties associated with delivering the remodelling programme are reported here.

While interviewees were sympathetic to the pressures put on the NRT, the timing of training events was a particular challenge for RCs, trainers and LEAs. The requirement to arrange or attend training sessions at very short notice and at inconvenient times of the year caused frustration.

In the survey, some trainers expressed concern about reluctance on the part of some LEAs to embrace the remodelling programme. LEA advisers and Regional Advisers raised similar concerns. They said it was a challenge delivering a national message from the local context as many schools found it difficult to see past PPA time and the cost implications associated with implementing the National Agreement.

Regional Advisers also said they faced some difficulties because they lacked administrative assistance to support their role.

7.8 Future developments

In the immediate future, LEA Advisers, Regional Advisers and RCs said they would continue to support schools to implement the National Agreement.

When asked about long-term developments, a great deal of uncertainty surrounded interviewees' responses. They expected the NRT would be involved in facilitating the delivery of the Every Child Matters agenda. Interviewees suggested the current NRT model would be extremely effective for delivering the Children's Agenda as systems and support networks had been established through the remodelling programme. They said that if the NRT were to be involved in delivering the Children's Agenda, they would likely to be involved.

Regional Advisers considered the impact of their role had been lessened, as they were not involved in the first year of the programme. Collaborative working between key players and the NRT in relation to the regional development of the programme in the early stages is more like to ensure optimum delivery of the programme.

7.9 Main conclusion

The cascade model of training, developed by the NRT, seems to have worked effectively in year two. The high level of support and sharing of information between the NRT, RCs, within and across LEAs was particularly efficient at supporting the implementation of the remodelling programme. The NRT model could be used to develop the capacity of children's services and other partnership working in the future. Key factors that ensured the success of the model included:

- regional delivery and local knowledge
- high-quality trainers and resources
- collaborative working and support networks (nationally and regionally)
- access to provider support (including web-based support).

7.10 Issues for consideration

While the NRT have been very effective in delivering the remodelling programme through regional bases, the evaluation has highlighted a few issues that the NRT might wish to consider for the future development of the programme.

- In relation to training, respondents found the four-day training programme intensive and some would have valued more time for reflection. The NRT might like to consider altering this model. A suggestion would be to offer one or two days of training delivery then allow people to go away for a few days to absorb the information and reconvene for a day or two to discuss issues and concerns, and if necessary, receive further training.
- The short notice of events caused frustration for LEAs, trainers and RCs. We therefore recommend that the NRT should give the maximum possible notice of training events in future.
- The RCs felt that they could offer further support to LEAs and Regional Advisers through their systems and structures. As the centres are affiliated with the National College for School Leadership, the College might like to encourage LEAs and Regional Advisers to draw on the expertise and networks established by RCs in the future.
- Lack of administrative support for Regional Advisers increased their workload. The NRT should consider what might be done to help. For example the capacity of RCs as a base for the Regional Adviser role would enable advisers to draw on RCs' resources.
- The NFER recommends that future developments of the NRT's work, especially as it moves into the Every Child Matters agenda, should involve all key players in the early stages of development.

8 Recommendations for future evaluation

8.1 Introduction

The remit of the NRT has changed between year one and two, and will continue to change in the future. The NFER evaluation findings in year one were very positive about the NRT's effectiveness and impact; this was supported by findings in the year two evaluation. The year two findings have shown that the NRT has been effective in adapting to its new remit. As the NRT's remit will alter again in year three, it is important that the NRT continues to be evaluated in adapting to its new brief. The NFER was asked by the evaluation sponsors to suggest recommendations for the future evaluation of the NRT. Our suggestions are outlined below.

8.2 Recommendations

We recommend building on the year one and year two evaluations conducted by the NFER and suggest a similar methodology and approach for future evaluations. The external evaluation must not duplicate internal evaluations carried out by the NRT through its CQI process.

It is fundamental that all key players involved in the roll-out of remodelling are involved in evaluating the NRT. In order to explore the comparability of the effectiveness and impact of the NRT to implement the National Agreement between years one and three, we recommend collecting data from schools (with the proviso that they are not overburdened with evaluation activity), LEA Remodelling Advisers, Regional Advisers and training providers.

As the NRT's remit moves into the Every Child Matters agenda, and the main policies contained within it (such as extended schools), it is crucial to seek the views of key players involved in developing this arena with the NRT. We therefore recommend that pilot extended schools, to be supported by the NRT, are also included in the evaluation process.

References

ATL, DfES, GMB, NAHT, NASUWT, NEOST, PAT, SHA, TGWU, UNISON, WAG (2003). *Raising Standards and Tackling Workload: a National Agreement. Time for Standards*. London: DfES.

HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY (2003). *Every Child Matters* (Cm. 5860). London: The Stationery Office.

NATIONAL REMODELLING TEAM (2004). *Schools and Change Process* [online]. Available: http://www.remodelling.org/who_schools.php [23 March, 2005].

WILSON, R., EASTON, C., SMITH, P. and SHARP, C. (2005). *National Remodelling Team: Evaluation and Impact Study (Year 1) Final Report*. [online]. Available: <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research/downloads/RMT.pdf> [23 March, 2005].

WORKFORCE AGREEMENT MONITORING GROUP (2005). *Raising Standards and Tackling Workload: Implementing the National Agreement* (WAMG Note 11) [online]. Available: <http://www.remodelling.org/downloads/296.pdf> [23 March, 2005].

Appendix 1 Interview schedules

A1.1 Interview schedule for LEA Remodelling Advisers

Background

1. Please confirm your job title.
2. How long have you been in post?
3. Please give a brief description of your main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling.

Remodelling process

4. In your questionnaire, you indicated that you use the 'mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver' process utilising tranche events OR the 'mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver' process, utilising alternatives to tranche events OR and alternative process you developed. Please can you tell me a little more about your decision to adopt this approach?

Working with others

5. Please tell me how you work with:
 - a. colleagues in your LEA, in your remodelling role?
 - b. your NRT Regional Adviser?
 - c. other LEA Remodelling Advisers?
 - d. your associated RC and Regional Trainers?
 - e. other stakeholders?

How effective have these working relationships been? In what ways have these roles continued to support each other deliver remodelling?

Has anything in particular helped facilitate these relationships?

Training and support

6. Overall, how effective have you found the training you have received to fulfil your role as LEA Remodelling Adviser?
7. How effective do you think your NRT Regional Adviser and your associated RC and Regional Trainers have been in supporting you to deliver the remodelling programme?
8. What improvements do you think could be made to the training and support offered: a) nationally b) within your region?

Impact and achievements

9. What have been the main benefits of delivering remodelling within your LEA/region?
10. What do you think has contributed to making it work in your LEA/region?

Challenges

11. What have been the main challenges associated with delivering remodelling in your LEA/region? Please explain why.
12. What has been done to address these challenges?

Further developments

13. How do you see your role developing next year?

AOB

14. Is there anything else you would like to add?

A1.2 Interview schedule for Regional Trainers

Background

1. Please confirm your job title.
2. How long have you been in post?

3. Please give a brief description of your main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling.

Working with others

4. Please tell me about your experience working with:
 - a. colleagues from your RC
 - b. other Regional Trainers
 - c. LEA Remodelling Advisers and their teams
 - d. NRT Regional Advisers and Core Team
 - e. other stakeholders?

How effective have these working relationships been? In what ways have these roles continued to support each other to deliver remodelling training?

Has anything in particular helped facilitate these relationships?

Training and support

5. Overall, how effective have you found the training you have received to fulfil your role as Regional Trainer?
6. How effective do you think the RC and NRT have been in supporting you to deliver remodelling training?
7. What improvements do you think could be made to the training and support offered to you?

Impact and achievements

8. What do you see as being the main benefits of delivering training from a regional base for the remodelling programme as a whole?
9. What do you think has contributed to making it work?

Challenges

10. What have been the main challenges associated with delivering remodelling training?

11. What has been done to address these challenges?

Further developments

12. How do you see your role developing in the future?

AOB

13. Is there anything else you would like to add?

A1.3 Interview schedule for NRT Regional Advisers

Background

1. Please confirm your job title.
2. How long have you been in post?
3. Please give a brief description of your main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling?

Remodelling process

4. How have you been involved in supporting the delivery of remodelling so far?
5. How effective has the training from NCSL/NRT been in delivering your role?

Working with others

6. Tell me how you work with LEAs? How has your support enabled them to fulfil their role? How effective have they been?
7. Tell me how you work with RCs? How has your support enabled them to fulfil their role? How effective have they been?
8. How have the NRT RAs worked as a team?
9. Tell me how you work with other stakeholders? How has your support enabled them to fulfil their role? How effective have they been?

Impact and achievements

10. What have been the main benefits associated with delivering remodelling within your region?
11. What do you think has contributed to making this work within your region?

Opportunities and challenges

12. What have been the main opportunities and challenges associated with your role?
13. What has been done to address these challenges?

Further developments

14. How satisfied are you with the on-going support of the NRT's Core Team? Is there anything that could be improved?
15. How do you see your role developing in the future?

AOB

16. Is there anything else you would like to add?

A1.4 Interview schedule for Regional Centre Directors and Programme Managers

Background

1. Please confirm your job title.
2. How long have you been in post?
3. Please give a brief description of your main roles and responsibilities in relation to remodelling?

Remodelling process

4. How has the RC been involved in delivering of remodelling training so far?
5. What training or support have you received from NCSL/NRT for delivering remodelling/PPA training? How well has the training supported you in your role?

Working with others

6. How does your role relate to that of the LEA Remodelling Advisers? How do you work together?
7. How does your role relate to that of the NRT regional advisers? How do you work together?
8. Do you feel that the RCs are being well utilised in relation to remodelling/the NRT?

Issues and challenges

9. What have been the main challenges associated with delivering remodelling from the RC? (Do you feel the RCs have the capacity to deliver remodelling (PPA) training?)
10. What has been done to address these challenges?

Impact and achievements

11. What have been the main benefits associated with delivering remodelling from the RC?
12. What do you think has contributed to making this work?

Further developments

13. How satisfied are you with the support of the NRT's Core Team? Is there anything that could be improved?
14. How do you see your role developing in the future?
15. What else would you like to see the RC do in the future in relation to remodelling/the NRT?

AOB

16. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix 2 Questionnaires



Year 2 Evaluation of the National Remodelling Team Questionnaire for LEA Remodelling Advisers

This questionnaire is part of the National Remodelling Team (NRT) Year 2 Evaluation Study which aims to establish the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT. We would be very grateful if you could complete this questionnaire which should take no longer than 15 minutes of your time. Your contribution is important to the future development of the work of the NRT.

This questionnaire focuses on your views and experiences of:

- the process of change with schools
- the number of schools involved
- working with others
- training and support
- future support.

All of your responses will be completely confidential and no individual, school or LEA will be named in any report.

If you have any queries relating to the completion of this questionnaire please contact Jennie Jupp on 01753 637 356 or by email at jjupp@nfer.ac.uk

The Change Process

1. Which of the following change processes are you following through with schools:

(please tick one box)

The "mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver" process, utilising tranche events

The "mobilise/discover/deepen/develop/deliver" process, utilising alternatives to tranche events

An alternative process you have developed, please describe:

2a. To what extent do you use different processes with different schools?

(please tick one box)

To a great extent

To some extent

Not at all

2b. If you use different processes with different schools, how are these adapted?

3. To what extent do you draw on the skills and tools provided by the following to develop the change process within schools?

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Always | Nearly always | Sometimes | Hardly ever | Never |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| NRT Core Team | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Regional Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| LEA Remodelling Consultants (trained by NRT in remodelling Skills and Tools) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliated Centre (AC) Regional Trainers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Headteachers already implementing remodelling | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Number of schools involved

4a. Approximately how many schools in your LEA are engaged/do you expect to be engaged in remodelling in: *(please insert number)*

Year 1 (from September 2003)

Year 2 (from September 2004)

4b. If the number of schools involved in Year 2 is greater than that involved in Year 1, what has been the main way(s) in which you have increased the number of schools involved?

4c. How useful have you found each of the following in relation to increasing the number of schools involved in the remodelling process in Year 2?

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Very useful 1 | Useful 2 | Fairly useful 3 | Not very useful 4 | Not useful 5 | NA 6 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Training offered by NRT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT run Chief Education Officer (CEO) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Conference | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Briefing sessions for LEA staff | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Briefing sessions for wider Local Government staff | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Briefing sessions for Diocesan Representatives | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Working with others

5. Are you using LEA Remodelling Consultants (trained by NRT in remodelling skills and tools) within your LEA? Yes

If yes, in what ways?

No

If no, why not?

6. How would you rate your relationship with each of the following:

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Very good | Good | Fairly good | Not very good | Not good | NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| NRT Core Team | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Regional Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| LEA Remodelling Consultants (trained by NRT in remodelling Skills and Tools) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliated Centre (AC) Regional Trainers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Others (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Training and Support

7. How useful have you found the following training/resources:

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Very useful | Useful | Fairly useful | Not very useful | Not useful | NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Skills and Tools training event | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| LEA Remodelling Adviser training event | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| PPA Content and Delivery training | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cover Resource Pack and toolkit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| PPA Resource Pack and toolkit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Governors Brochure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Brochure – Shaping our Future | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Raising Standards through Remodelling DVD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT website | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8. The training for LEA Remodelling Advisers in Year 2 (from September 2004) is being delivered by AC Regional Trainers, and not direct from the NRT, as it was in Year 1(from September 2003).

To what extent do you feel the quality of training is being sustained in Year 2 compared to that delivered in Year 1?

(please tick one box)

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Better than Year 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| About the same | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Worse than Year 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. What has been the overall effect on you, of the NRT training moving from a national to a regional base?

10. How would you rate the capacity of the Affiliated Centres to deliver training?

(please tick one box)

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Not very good | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 14.** We would like to report the range of job titles of LEA Remodelling Advisers.
Please specify your job title:

We would like to follow up the responses, in a short telephone interview, given by some LEA Remodelling Advisers to collect additional information relating to this evaluation and would be grateful if you could complete the following section.

- 15.** I am willing for NFER to contact me again in connection with this research.

Yes

No

Name

Contact Number

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please return it to the NFER in the
prepaid envelope provided
by **19th November 2004.**

© National Foundation for Educational Research

- 14.** We would like to report the range of job titles of LEA Remodelling Advisers.
Please specify your job title:

We would like to follow up the responses, in a short telephone interview, given by some LEA Remodelling Advisers to collect additional information relating to this evaluation and would be grateful if you could complete the following section.

- 15.** I am willing for NFER to contact me again in connection with this research.

Yes

No

Name

Contact Number

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING
THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please return it to the NFER in the
prepaid envelope provided
by 19th November 2004.

© National Foundation for Educational Research



Year 2 Evaluation of the National Remodelling Team Questionnaire for NRT Regional Trainers

This questionnaire is part of the National Remodelling Team (NRT) Year 2 Evaluation Study which aims to establish the effectiveness and impact of the work of the NRT. We would be very grateful if you could complete this questionnaire which should take no longer than 15 minutes of your time. Your contribution is important to the future development of the work of the NRT.

This questionnaire focuses on your views and experiences of

- the training and support you have received
- delivering training and support to LEAs.

All of your responses will be completely confidential and no individual, school or LEA will be named in any report.

If you have any queries relating to the completion of this questionnaire please contact Neelam Basi on 01753 637 324 or by email at n.basi@nfer.ac.uk

RMP

©National Foundation for Educational Research, The Merc,
Upton Park, Uxbridge, Bucks. SL4 2DQ

RTQ

Training and Support

- 1.** How useful have you found each of the following training/resource materials provided by the NRT in supporting your role as Regional Trainer:

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Very useful 1 | Useful 2 | Fairly useful 3 | Not very useful 4 | Not useful 5 | N/A 6 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| NRT Remodelling Skills and Tools Training | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT PPA Content and Delivery Training | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| PPA Resource Pack and Toolkit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cover Resource Pack and Toolkit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Brochures created by NRT (eg. NRT Shaping our Future, Governors brochures) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Website | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 2.** Do you feel NRT training/resources for Regional Trainers could be improved?

Yes

No

If yes, please comment the nature of any improvements.

- 3.** How often do you liaise with:

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Often | Occasionally | Never |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| NRT Core Team | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Regional Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| LEA Remodelling Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliated Centres | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other Regional Trainers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Others (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4. How useful have you found the support you have received from:

(please tick one box on each row)

| | Very useful | Fairly useful | Not very useful | Not useful | NR |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| NRT Core Team | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NRT Regional Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| LEA Remodelling Advisers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| NCSL Consultant Leaders | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliated Centres | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other Regional Trainers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Training Delivery

5. How would you rate the capacity of the Affiliated Centres to deliver training to LEA staff?

(please tick one box)

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Very Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
| Good | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
| Fairly good | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| Not very good | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
| Not at all good | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| Not applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 |

6. How effective do you feel the regionally based training is in training LEAs to **support schools in implementing the remodelling programme** (please tick one box)

Very effective Quite effective Not very effective

Don't know

7. Please specify below if you have encountered any difficulties in delivering the content of your training to LEAs.

8. How many days have you been contracted to provide training/support/CQI observation to LEAs? (please insert number)

9. Do you think there is a better way to support LEAs/schools to implement the remodelling process?

Yes No

Please comment on the reasons of your answer.

Additional Information

10. Please use the space below for any other comments you have about remodelling or the work of the NRT.

11. Are you trained to deliver: *(please tick one box)*

PPA Content and Delivery workshops to LEAs (PPA Trainer)

Skills and Tools events to LEAs (Super Trainer)

PPA and Skills/Tools training to LEAs (Super & PPA Trainer)?

12. We would like to report the range of job titles of NRT Remodelling Trainers. Please specify your job title: _____

We would like to follow up the responses, in a short telephone interview, given by some NRT Remodelling Trainers to collect additional information relating to this evaluation and would be grateful if you could complete the following section.

13. I am willing for NFER to contact me again in connection with this research.

Yes No

Name _____

Contact Number _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return it to the NFER in the prepaid envelope provided by 19th November 2004.

4

To download a copy of either of these questionnaires, click on the links below.

 [LEA Remodelling Advisers questionnaire](#)

 [NRT Regional Trainers questionnaire](#)



If you would like to receive a printed copy of this report, please contact the Publications Unit on 01753 637002 or book.sales@nfer.ac.uk

ISBN 1 905314 06 X
NFER ref: RMP

National Foundation for Educational Research
The Mere, Upton Park, Slough
Berkshire SL1 2DQ
www.nfer.ac.uk