

**Research Report
No 376**

The Sex and Relationship Education (SRE) Teaching Pilot: An Investigation of Key Stakeholder Perceptions

***Ian Warwick, Kim Rivers, Peter Aggleton, Lisa Ruxton,
Laura Turney and Paul Tyrer***

***Thomas Coram Research Unit,
Institute of Education, University of London***

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© Queen's Printer 2002. Published with the permission of DfES on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

ISBN 1 84185 819 6
October 2002

Acknowledgements

Our thanks are due to all those who found time to take part in the telephone and face-to-face interviews undertaken as part of the evaluation, and to members of the evaluation steering group. Thanks also to Penny Mellor at TCRU and John Eagles at the DfES for providing administrative support to the evaluation.

The Evaluation ~~Evaluation~~ Project Steering Group

List members in alphabetical order by institution. DfES, DH and HDA in that order – to get from Laura or Lucy

DfES~~Departement~~Department for Education and Skills

Sue Pentland
Lucy Fogarty
Laura Sukhnandan

DH
Department of Health

Karen Turner
Joe Monks

HDAHealth Development Agency

Roz Caught
Marilyn Toft

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction and background.....	4
Aims of the evaluation.....	4
Methods.....	5
Findings.....	5
Conclusions and key learning	6
1 – Introduction and background	8
1.1 – About the pilot	8
1.2 – Background to the development of the pilot	9
1.3 – About the evaluation	11
1.4 – Aims and objectives of the evaluation	11
2 – Methods	13
3 – Findings	18
3.1 – Recruitment to the pilot	18
3.2 – Improving professional practice	19
3.2.1 – Benefits to teachers.....	19
3.2.2 – Benefits to pupils	21
3.2.3 – Benefits to line managers.....	22
3.2.4 – Benefits to the whole school.....	22
3.3 – Factors helping and hindering the development of professional practice	24
3.3.1 – Time and timings	24
3.3.2 – SRE leads and local support networks	25
3.3.3 – Written materials and documentation.....	27
3.3.4 – SRE and PSHE	30
3.3.5 – The website	31
3.3.6 – Financial resources	32
3.3.7 – Accrediting the individual and/or the whole school	33
3.3.8 – Accreditation and the NHSS.....	35
3.3.9 – Building and maintaining a supportive infrastructure	36
3.4 – Preparing for the ‘national roll-out’	41
3.4.1 – Utilising the experiences of pilot participants	42
4 – Conclusions and key learning.....	44
4.1 – Meeting purposively	44
4.2 – Clear written materials	44
4.3 – Transparency in assessment, moderation and recognition of work ..	44
4.4 – Responsive management and resourcing	45
4.5 – Phasing in the roll-out and learning from it	46

[Appendix One – SRE Accreditation Criteria](#)

[Appendix Two – Examples of Interview Schedules](#)

[Appendix Three – Examples of Evidence for PDR Submission](#)

(The appendices to this report are not available online. Anyone wishing to see the material should contact laura.sukhnandan@dfes.gsi.gov.uk)

Executive Summary

Introduction and background

A major government initiative for the accreditation of teachers of sex and relationship education (SRE) entitled 'Professional Development and the Accreditation of the Teaching of Sex and Relationship Education' was launched on October 12th 2001. It involved a pilot accreditation of just over 30 (special, primary and secondary) teachers from across the eight National Healthy School Standard (NHSS) regions.

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned the Thomas Coram Research Institute to conduct an evaluation of the pilot through a study of key stakeholders' views about its operation. These stakeholders included SRE teachers, their line managers, SRE lead officers, national assessors and national officers.

In 1999 the Social Exclusion Unit's report on Teenage Pregnancy recommended that the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) develop proposals to accredit teachers of sex and relationship education. Following the quinquennial review of TTA, responsibility for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) passed to the DfES.

To take this work forward, DfES developed criteria for accreditation consistent with the Department's Teachers Standards Framework.¹ In July 2001, DfES and Department of Health (DH) Ministers approved this approach and agreed that the National Healthy School Standard (NHSS) - jointly funded by the DH and DfES – should underpin the process.

The pilot project 'Professional Development and the Accreditation of the Teaching of Sex and Relationship Education' was launched on October 12, 2001. The pilot aimed to exemplify the DfES strategy for the continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers with a view to improve the quality of sex and relationship education (SRE) within the context of personal, social and health education (PSHE) in schools.

Aims of the evaluation

The overall aims of the evaluation were to:

- Offer a stakeholder analysis of perceptions of the pilot accreditation process;
- Identify instances of good practice with respect to teacher accreditation;
- Identify facilitators of and barriers to good work;
- Identify aspects of the pilot process that require modification and amendment prior to the 'rolling out' of any national accreditation scheme.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

¹ Appendix One contains details of the criteria

Methods

A series of face-to-face and telephone interviews were undertaken with key stakeholders involved in the pilot accreditation process in order to access perceptions of the scheme from contrasting perspectives. Stakeholders included teachers participating in the pilot, their line managers, local SRE lead officers, national assessors and relevant project officers within the DfES and partner organisations such as the DH and Health Development Agency (HDA) (known as 'national officers'). Teachers, line managers, SRE leads and national officers were interviewed on more than one occasion to provide a picture of experiences relating to the on-going development of the pilot.

The views of respondents were analysed to focus on issues of particular relevance to five key aspects of the accreditation process, namely:

- Recruitment to the pilot;
- Achievements (and perceived benefits) arising as a result of participation in the scheme;
- Factors that helped and hindered achievements, including:
 - producing the PDR;
 - use of pilot monies;
 - issues related to local and national support;
- Roles and needs of key players;
- Issues related to the national roll-out.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Findings

- Participation in the pilot enabled around 30 teachers to develop and submit a portfolio of evidence related to documenting and developing SRE in primary, secondary and special schools. Participants perceived the pilot to be, on the whole, successful.
- Many teachers became aware of the SRE pilot through their involvement in local healthy schools work, through direct contact with SRE lead officers or through the direct involvement of their head teacher and other management staff. Reasons for wanting to be involved in the pilot varied – ranging from the desire to acquire personal recognition with a view to promotion, acquiring new skills, learning the 'state of the art', improving classroom practice, and whole school improvement.
- Benefits of participating in the scheme were perceived to accrue both to individual teachers as well as to a school's SRE programme. Participants indicated that direct benefits to pupils would be as much in the medium to longer term as in any immediate sense. Nonetheless, National Assessors appointed to the pilot scheme identified examples of good to excellent classroom practice.
- Many participants found the written guidance materials lacking in clarity both in terms of content and layout. Teachers in primary and special schools felt they were less relevant to their professional needs than teachers in secondary schools.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- Teachers felt the criteria for assessment could be more transparent and the process of moderation more constructive. National Assessors recognised this initial weakness and, with SRE Lead Officers and the National Coordinator, further developed their support to teachers' for the production of the Professional Development Record.
- Participants felt that the existing focus of the accreditation process on SRE was too narrow, and that a system that recognised good practice in PSHE would be more relevant to teachers – especially those working in primary and special schools.
- The provision of additional financial resources enabled teachers to participate in the scheme, but there were concerns that resources were not paid to schools quickly enough.
- Respondents frequently stated that participation in the scheme was more demanding of their time than anticipated.
- Most local SRE lead officers were instrumental in bringing together and facilitating local learning and support networks.
- Respondents generally felt that a balance should be struck between recognising the efforts of individuals and the contribution made by schools.
- The NHSS was seen as a significant complementary programme of activities to the pilot accreditation process.
- Whilst most pilot teachers were keen to be involved in supporting the roll-out of any national accreditation scheme, they would wish first to see modifications to the existing scheme.

Conclusions and key learning

- With the pilot generally being perceived as successful, the scheme should be rolled out nationally – providing that revisions are made as suggested by, among other things, the findings from the research study.
- To build on the contextual features and processes of the pilot that have so far contributed to its achievements, the institutional location and management of a national scheme should continue to promote the involvement of key players from a range of national partners including the DfES, DH and NHSS.
- The written support materials were perceived to be potentially confusing both in terms of content and layout. Revision of these materials is currently underway in preparation for the national roll-out of the scheme.
- Successful participation in the scheme depended on the individual efforts of teachers as well as on the work of SRE lead officers who coordinated local/regional groups that enabled teachers to reflect on their practice. Local, regional and national support meetings should continue.
- The pilot appears to have enabled the establishment of criteria for assessment and moderation. Assessors should continue to be involved in further developments of assessment, moderation and recognition of work.
- No single form of accreditation would appear to suit all participants. A range of forms of the recognition of work should be developed.
- Responsive coordination should remain a feature of the scheme. Financial resources should be administered swiftly so that work in schools is not hindered by promised funds being unavailable.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- To assist with the national rollout of the scheme, the strengths and overall successes of the pilot (and the revisions made to it) could be widely promoted. However, attention will also need to turn to how the DfES might, through evaluation, best learn about whether and in what ways the national scheme is successful.

1 – Introduction and background

1.1 – About the pilot

A major government initiative for the accreditation of teachers of sex and relationship education (SRE) entitled 'Professional Development and the Accreditation of the Teaching of Sex and Relationship Education' was launched on October 12th 2001.

The pilot aimed to exemplify the DfES strategy for the continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers with a view to improve the quality of sex and relationship education (SRE) within the context of personal, social and health education (PSHE) in schools.

The pilot involved just over thirty (special, primary and secondary) teachers from the eight National Healthy School Standard (NHSS) regions.

Recruitment into the pilot ~~but~~ was based on networks and partnerships already established through the development of ~~by the National~~ Healthy Schools ~~ss~~ Standard ~~cheme~~ (NHSS).

Participating teachers were asked to self-assess their achievements for the provision of SRE and to produce a Professional Development Record (PDR) consistent with DfES CPD strategy criteria. Teachers were invited to do this via a series of steps that would assist them to:

- Reflect on their SRE teaching to date;
- Learn about the pilot accreditation scheme;
- Review their SRE-related work in relation to the pilot scheme standards;
- Access training needs and support (in relation to the scheme) with their SRE lead;
- Engage with the school's process to support professional development;
- Access support when needed;
- Gather evidence related to the pilot scheme standards;
- Develop an action plan for further development;
- Submit PDR to a national assessor (two points of submission are highlighted, the first for preliminary evidence for the PDR, the second for the completed PDR);
- Achieve accreditation (if pilot standards are achieved).

To help those involved in the scheme to clarify what, and how, work should be undertaken, two folders were produced (described by respondents as the 'red and blue' folders): the first, provided an overview of the scheme; the second, described the nature and production of the PDR.

Eight local professionals drawn from local healthy schools partnerships (hereafter 'SRE leads') were given responsibility for supporting the development of SRE teachers. Each assisted with the identification of professional development needs and opportunities, access to training, and the

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

development of the PDR. SRE leads were provided with guidance about their involvement, being asked, among other things, to offer appropriate support to teachers and their line managers, communicate with key stakeholders, provide specialist local information, keep a record of tasks, activities and expenditure, as well as assist with the evaluation of the pilot.

In preparation for the final submission of the PDR, national assessors reviewed preliminary evidence (for the PDR) and provided feedback for consideration by teachers before final PDRs were submitted.
Participating teachers were involved via a series of steps that guided them to:

- Reflect on their SRE teaching to date
- Learn about the pilot accreditation scheme
- Review their SRE related work in relation to the pilot scheme standards
- Access training needs and support (in relation to the scheme) with their SRE lead
- Engage with the school's process to support professional development
- Access support when needed
- Gather evidence related to the pilot scheme standards
- Develop an action plan for further development
- Submit PDR to a national assessor (two points of submission are highlighted, the first for a draft PDR, the second for the completed PDR).
- Achieve accreditation (if pilot standards are achieved)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

~~SRE leads~~leads ~~were provided with guidance about their involvement, being asked, among other things, to offer appropriate support to teachers and their line managers, communicate with key stakeholders, provide specialist local information, keep a record of tasks, activities and expenditure, as well as assist with the evaluation of the pilot.~~

The pilot was managed by a steering group that included officials from the DfES Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) team and others with responsibility for CPD, the Teenage Pregnancy Unit (TPU), the Sex Education Forum (SEF), Ofsted, the National Healthy School Standard (NHSS) team and other specialist advisers. A Coordinator for the pilot was employed to oversee the pilot and manage the programme on a day-to-day basis.²

In the light of experience from the SRE teaching pilot, a national roll-out of the scheme is due to take place during 2002/3.

1.2 – Background to the development of the pilot

The initiative grew out of the Social Exclusion Unit's (SEU) report in 1999 on Teenage Pregnancy which ~~(Stationery Office, or correct reference and date, with full reference as a footnote)~~ recommended that the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) develop proposals to accredit teachers of sex and relationship

² Throughout the rest of this report we use the term 'National Coordinator' to describe this role

education (SRE~~EA~~).³ Following the quinquennial review of TTA, responsibility for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) passed to the ~~DfES~~Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

To take this work forward, DfES ~~has~~ developed criteria (~~see Appendix XX~~) for accreditation consistent with the Department's Teachers Standards Framework.⁴ ~~In July 2001 (what date? To check with Laura or Lucy F, DfES and Department of Health (DH) Ministers approved this approach and agreed that the National Healthy Schools Standard (NHSS) - jointly funded by the Department of Health (DH) and DfES – should underpin the process.~~

~~The pilot Accreditation sinvolved just a little over thirty teachers from the eight NHSS regions sites. As part of the scheme, teachers were asked to self-assess their achievements for the provision of SRE and to produce a Professional Development Record (PDR) consistent with DfES CPD strategy criteria.~~

~~To assist those involved in the scheme to clarify what, and how, work should be undertaken, two folders were produced (described by respondents as the 'red and blue' folders); the first, one provided an overview of the scheme; the second, other described the nature and production of the PDR.~~

~~Eight local officers, from NHSS regions, who had with responsibility for developing SRE work lead (hereafter 'SRE leads/leads') s assisted in the identification of professional development needs and opportunities, access to training, and the development of the PDR. In preparation for the final submission of the PDR, National Assessors reviewed assessed draft portfolios and provided draft feedback for consideration by teachers before final portfolios were submitted. In the light of experience from this pilot work, a national roll-out of the an a s Accreditation s Scheme is due to take place during 2002/3.~~

The ~~fed into the~~ development of the pilot scheme was also influenced by two key initiatives:

- *Learning and Teaching – A Strategy for Professional Development*. ~~This laid~~ lays out some of the parameters within which preparation and support for teachers of SRE ~~could an~~ be provided. These include the creation of more time and opportunity for professional development, a clearer focus on activities linked to the solving of specific teaching and learning problems, support for coaching and feedback, and action in areas of strategic training need. Beyond this, there is a concern to identify and spread good practice in professional development, building upon established networks and partnerships.

³ See http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/published.htm#pub_reports for a copy of the report

⁴ Appendix One contains details of the criteria

Field Code Changed

- The *Teachers Standards Framework*, together with associated Guidance on producing a Professional Development Record, ~~have~~has been developed as part of the national Continuing Professional Development (CPD) strategy to help teachers recognise their achievements, and plan for future development. The Teachers Standards Framework identifies ten key dimensions of teaching and leadership. It enables teachers to identify development objectives for themselves, as well as areas where they may be able to develop, manage and support the work of colleagues and support staff. The framework was used to develop standards for SRE against which participants in the pilot would assess their work.

1.3 – About the evaluation

During November 2001, ~~the~~ Thomas Coram Research Unit, ~~at the~~ Institute of Education, University of London was commissioned by DfES to undertake an evaluation of the pilot through an investigation of key stakeholders' views about its operation.

The ~~evaluation~~ evaluation design sought to provide ~~an~~a holistic and balanced view of the pilot from the perspectives of its key players (teachers, their line managers, SRE ~~Leads~~Leads, ~~n~~National ~~o~~Officers and ~~a~~Assessors). To be useful to those developing the pilot, and given the formative nature of the scheme, ~~respondents~~participants provided qualitative responses to a series of open-ended questions organised around a series of key themes (see below). To assist ~~with~~ findings to be utilised, a series of opportunities for reflection and discussion were provided including: (i) regular feedback to members of the Steering Group, (ii) a written interim report specifying emerging themes from initial interviews, (iii) a presentation of themes identified from mid-point telephone interviews, (iv) a draft final report containing themes from the evaluation overall, and (v) a final written report (with executive summary and research brief).

1.4 – ~~A~~Aims and objectives of the evaluation

The overall aims of the evaluation ~~aw~~ere to:

- Offer an analysis of stakeholder ~~analysis of~~ perceptions of the pilot accreditation process;
- Identify instances of good practice with respect to teacher accreditation within this pilot process;
- Identify facilitators of, and barriers to, good work;
- Identify aspects of the pilot process that require modification and amendment prior to the 'rolling out' of any national accreditation scheme.

More specifically, the evaluation aimed to:

- Assess the perspectives and perceptions of those involved in the project with respect to the ease of utilising DfES criteria for accreditation including their reference to the different dimensions of teaching and learning;
- Explore the extent to which teachers were able to assess their achievements and skills with respect to particular dimensions of teaching and learning;
- Examine the extent to which teachers were able to identify areas in which their current experience is limited and/or perhaps lacking;
- Identify the degree to which teachers were successful in identifying relevant CPD opportunities that may allow them to develop the necessary skills, dispositions and competences;
- Identify ways in which line managers and others were able to support teachers in developing a suitable PDR that displays achievements and skills, together with areas of specific strength;
- Identify ways in which line managers, local SRE leads and others were able to facilitate teacher development through 'professional learning teams', local networks, coaching, mentoring and other forms of support including those involving input from LEAs and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs);
- Point to potential and experienced blocks and barriers within the accreditation process, including those linked to self assessment, PDR development, and the inability (perceived or otherwise) to access to relevant guidance and support;
- Identify facilitators and levers for success within the accreditation process, including the part played by head teachers and other senior staff, the actions and contributions of SRE leads, and the contribution of local NHSS local partnerships.

Beyond this, the evaluation sought to:

- Identify how participating partnerships were able to use the sum of money (£5000) allocated to support their work, and the forms of use that were perceived as working to best effect;
- Point to elements of the pilot process, including exemplified standards and the clarity of materials and advice provided, that require amendment prior to any national roll out;
- Assess the perceived impact (from a variety of stakeholder perspectives) on teachers' approach to teaching SRE, including its perceived effectiveness.

An interim report containing findings from the first set of interviews was produced for the Evaluation Steering Group. Where appropriate, emerging themes were used to inform the development of the pilot.

2 – Methods

A series of face-to-face and telephone interviews were undertaken with key stakeholders involved in the pilot accreditation process. These included teachers – from secondary, primary and special schools – participating in the pilot, their line managers, local SRE leads, national assessors and relevant project officers within the DfES and partner organisations such as the DH and Health Development Agency (HDA) (known as ‘national officers’). Teachers, line managers, SRE leads and national officers were interviewed on more than one occasion to provide a picture of experiences relating to the pilot.

Separate interview schedules were developed in consultation with the DfES for each round of interviews and each set of respondents. Questions in the schedule were based on the themes outlined in the evaluation aims (above).⁵ Copies of schedules are attached (Appendix AXX) – Laura [would you like ALL the schedules for all phases and all types of respondents as an Appendix or just for your records?] Fine (can you include an example of a schedule from each participant group – and state that schedules are available from DfES/Authors)

In selecting teachers and their line managers, we sought to speak with all those who were available during the interview periods. All SRE Leads and assessors were interviewed. Key National Officers (lead officers in national organisations) were selected in consultation with the DfES.

More specifically, interviews were conducted as follows:

Teachers

- Initial interviews
 - During January-February 2002, face-to-face interviews were conducted with 22 teachers participating in the pilot accreditation scheme.
- Mid-term interviews
 - During April-May 2002, telephone interviews were conducted with 15 teachers.
- Final interviews
 - During June 2002, telephone interviews were conducted with all available teachers (25).
 - Non-participation in interviews was due to personal reasons or the school undergoing an OFSTED inspection.

Line managers

- Interviews with 65 line managers of teachers participating in the scheme were conducted during June 2002. Non-participation in

⁵ See Appendix Two for examples of schedules used. Copies of schedules are available from the authors or the DfES

interviews was due to the respondent not wishing to be interviewed (as they stated they had limited involvement with the scheme), a lack of time, or the school undergoing an OFSTED inspection)

Local SRE ~~leads~~leads

- Initial interviews
 - During January-February
- Final interviews
 - June 2002
- Information was collected from all 8 SRE ~~leads~~leads.

National ~~a~~Assessors

- Telephone interviews were conducted with ~~all~~ ~~3~~three national ~~A~~assessors. In addition a telephone interview was conducted with representative of a Higher Education Institution (HEI) who was assisting the Coordinator of the pilot to develop the accreditation process with a view to involving other HEIs.

National ~~o~~Officers

- Initial interviews
 - During January-February, and in consultation with the DfES, nine ~~lead~~ officers were interviewed from the DfES, DH, the NHSS Team and the Pilot Accreditation Steering Group. Interviews were largely conducted face-to-face, with three interviews being conducted by telephone.
- Final interviews
 - In consultation with DfES, six ~~lead~~ officers drawn from the Steering Group ~~were~~ were selected for interview. Four interviews were conducted face-to-face with two interviews being conducted over the phone.

Table 1 – Summary of interviews

Pilot Site	Teachers			Line managers	SRE leads		National Officers		National Assessors (+ HEI rep.)
	Initial	Mid-term	Final	Final	Initial	Final	Initial	Final	Final
Berkshire	2	1	3	2	Yes	Yes			
Devon, Plymouth and Torbay	3	2	3	12	Yes	Yes			
Essex and Southend	2	1	2	2	Yes	Yes			
Hammersmith and Fulham	2	2	3	1	Yes	Yes			
Lincolnshire	4	2	4	3	Yes	Yes			
Middlesborough	3	2	3	3	Yes	Yes			
North West	3	3	4	1	Yes	Yes			
Solihull	3	2	3	2	Yes	Yes			
Total Special	5	1	5						
Total Infant/ Primary/ Junior/Middle ⁶	10	6	10						
Total Secondary	7	7	10						
TOTALS	22	15	25	156	8	8	9	6	3 (+1)

Can we need to thicken the line above 'Total special' in some way since what is below the line is different qualitatively from what is above it.

Both face to face and telephone interviews were conducted to a standardised format. Whenever possible, telephone interviews were tape-recorded. Data were analysed by way of successive approximation to draw out similarities and differences among respondents' accounts.

⁶ In order to protect anonymity of respondents, quotes from teachers in infant, primary, junior and middle school phase are not differentiated. Doing so would have meant some respondents would have been comparatively easy to identify.

|

3 – Findings

The views of respondents were analysed to focus on issues of particular relevance to five key aspects of the accreditation process, namely:

- Recruitment to the pilot;
- Achievements (and perceived benefits) arising as a result of participation in the scheme;
- Factors that helped and hindered achievements, including:
 - producing the PDR;
 - use of pilot monies;
 - issues related to local and national support;
- Roles and needs of key players;
- Issues related to the national roll-out⁷.

3.1 – Recruitment to the pilot

Many teachers became aware of the SRE pilot through their involvement in local healthy schools work, through direct contact with SRE leads or through the direct involvement of their head teacher and other management staff. In one case, a school nurse had let the teacher concerned know that the pilot was taking place. Although the majority had been invited to participate, those sampled reported that they did actively want to be involved in the SRE pilot. Participants were drawn from a range of schools including: special, primary and secondary; religiously affiliated; single sex and co-educational, as well as those in urban, sub-urban and rural areas.

Reasons for wanting to be involved in the pilot varied – ranging from the desire to acquire personal recognition with a view to promotion, acquiring new skills, learning the ‘state of the art’, improving classroom practice and whole school improvement. None of the teachers interviewed reported feeling coerced into participating.

None of the teachers involved had met with resistance at school for their involvement – although almost all acknowledged that the agreement of managers at school was crucial and a determining factor in their decision to

⁷ Few differences were found between the different types of schools (infant/primary/junior/middle, secondary and special). Where respondents made comments about type of school, these are reported.

participate. A small minority of teachers said that while heads teachers were initially keen for them to be involved, they subsequently regretted it when they realized how much work was required.

Many teachers acknowledged that the financial support available had made their involvement possible – especially in relation to payment for teaching cover.

Levels of awareness of the pilot in schools varied widely. Some interviewees said that there was not much awareness of their involvement in the pilot among colleagues at school beyond the management team, and that most colleagues simply thought they were ‘doing a course’. However, others commented that there was some considerable interest and that they had developed mechanisms for sharing their experiences.

‘At school we have a close staff that are supportive and I have been sharing any courses and information with staff through meetings’.
(Teacher – Primary)

‘I have taken a volunteer from each year team with an interest in SRE to train alongside me ... I have held meetings to inform them what I’ve been doing and actively involved them in the process.’ (Teacher – Secondary)

3.2 – Improving professional practice

3.2.1 – Benefits to teachers

Almost all respondents indicated that participating in the pilot had, at least in some way, improved their professional practice. Teachers generally felt the scheme had helped them to focus their work, gain new ideas about SRE, enhance their classroom practice, develop and consolidate links with external partners, and review school policy.

“It made me think of a wider range of teaching methodology and teaching in different ways. The children have mentioned some of the strategies we used which they like such as puppets, circle-time and their evaluation forms have been evidence that they have learnt from the programme so far. In addition it has improved my own subject knowledge” (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle)

‘It’s made me look at issues I’d not really thought about. It’s made me focus on the actual teaching and what I’m trying to get across. It’s improved my policy writing as I’ve had to write policy documents and some of the others have actually followed them for reference, which is quite nice. It’s made me realise that there’s not enough in my original sex and relationships policy and I’m going to be reviewing that as part of the action plan.’ (Teacher – Secondary)

'It's made me more focused ... and it's given me other ideas to work on and work round. It's given me ideas about doing things I've not worked on before, it's made me think of other strands that I can bring into the work that I'm doing and to extend that work'. (Teacher – Special).

Improvements appeared least noticeable among those teachers who were most experienced in SRE, or who found themselves in a school where SRE was already well developed. While some teachers reported that the documentation of their own work had been helpful, others stated that it took them away from developing ideas to improve their practice.

My practice hasn't changed, but the process of documenting evidence, preparing folders and discussion with line manager and other teachers has enabled me to be more reflective on my practice, and share with others, in meetings, it's been a learning curve. (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle)

As an experienced teacher, it hasn't enhanced it [professional practice] at all. Most of the time was spent gathering evidence from things already done. To enhance professional development I would like to be developing new ideas and initiatives for use in the classroom. Instead time was spent compiling forms, quantifying what I do and it is time consuming. I spent so much time on it I can't see anyone wanting to do it voluntarily. (Teacher - Secondary)

Teachers' line managers also reported some improvements to professional practice. They often highlighted the ways that the whole school had benefited through a review of policy, by consolidating external links, and on occasions by raising the profile of SRE within the school through discussions and presentations with teaching colleagues.

It has helped her audit where the school is at and highlighted some of our shortcomings. It has helped [name] reflect on practice. She is a very strong teacher anyway and this has contributed to her process of reflection (Line manager - Special)

Something she's always been interested in, the PSHE side of things and this particular aspect is something which she sees as being of tremendous benefit, the schemes on which she's been working have really benefited us and benefited her as well because it's an area that tends to be slightly sensitive, particularly in Catholic schools and she has learnt a lot about what's available and about the ways it can be put over to the parents. (Line Manager - Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle)

~~*I would think that she's come across and shared with others some cutting edge good practice, the time to think about her own philosophy and teaching, it's quite an emotive area in schools really, and time to develop the materials and resources and to network with others, so it's moved her pedagogy onwards (Line Manager – Secondary)*~~

SRE leadsleads also commented on the benefits to teachers involved in the pilot scheme. By meeting with teachers throughout the pilot year (and in some cases through the observation of lessons), SRE leadsleads had noticed a gradual, but ongoing, improvement inte professional practice. They too suggested that those teachers who had benefited least were those with greatest experience of PSHE and SRE.

Yes I think they have [developed their practice]. It's sharpened them up and given them a clear focus. Certainly, things are better in terms of strategic planning [...] and feedback from things that have changed and their plans for next year sound like they've moved on from where they were at the start of the pilot (SRE Lead)

In primary especially, they've developed lots and lots of good practice in the classroom. [...] The development of schemes of work has gone on apace, and that's really effected change. It's really brought teachers together. (SRE Lead)

I think it's improved practice in the sense of lesson planning and thinking more widely around the area of Sex and Relationships Education; so thinking about the Law and confidentiality for example. But in terms of [improving their] actual teaching, I'd say no. These are very experienced teachers. (SRE Lead)

3.2.2 – BBenefits to pupils

As part of improving professional practice, respondents were asked whether and what benefits might have accrued to pupils. On the whole, teachers, their line managers and SRE leadsleads did not want to overstate increases in pupils' academic attainment.

A few teachers stated that some pupils may well have benefited, perhaps due to an increased awareness of issues related to confidentiality, or by becoming better listeners (through responding to ground rules) or through higher quality discussions.

It's made me more aware of being accountable, evaluation and ensuring the children have grasped concepts I've taught them, I work in small groups and on one-to-one with pupils so it made that time to find out what children have grasped" (Teacher - Special)

On the whole, line managers agreed with teachers that pupils would have benefited in some way as a result of improved classroom practice. But they also noted that benefits were as likely to be in the longer as much as in the shorter term, due to the integration of good practice into activities with pupils.

I would think that she's come across and shared with others some cutting edge good practice, the time to think about her own philosophy and teaching, it's quite an emotive area in schools really, and time to

develop the materials and resources and to network with others, so it's moved her pedagogy onwards.' (Line Manager - Secondary).

Most SRE ~~leads~~leads were sceptical that pupils' achievement would have been raised within the timeframe of the pilot. They stated that, in any case, the pilot had been set up more to improve, in the first instance, teachers' practice. It was likely, they indicated, to be rather too early to see benefits to pupils.

'No. This pilot is a process of having to find evidence of what you're already doing. It's not fundamentally about increasing achievement.' (SRE Lead).

3.2.3 – Benefits to line managers

There were mixed reports among line managers of the ways ~~in which~~that they themselves had benefited. Some noted that, if teachers were motivated, and if SRE policies and practices were improved, then this made their life easier as a manager.

A few line managers took a fairly active interest in the pilot scheme. For one or two, this interest was related to improving their management skills by supporting a more junior member of staff through a scheme.

'Initially, I put [name of teacher] forward as the main person, because I was looking at becoming an Advanced Skills Teacher so I needed evidence to prove that I could guide and mentor another member of staff, so we did it that way round ...' (Line Manager – Secondary)

For one or two others, ~~an increase in interest~~it was more to do with recognising the need for major improvements to SRE in the school and working closely alongside the teacher.

'Working alongside her and seeing the resources that she's got, I've been very impressed with the work that she has done and with the steering group particularly for year 6, we've recently adopted a new scheme for sex education and working alongside what ~~she~~she has been able to put in from her knowledge has meant that I can see the wider implications and for me personally I've learnt a tremendous amount this year.' (Line Manager – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

3.2.4 – Benefits to the whole school

Almost all of the line managers interviewed stated that teachers' participation in the pilot had in some way benefited the school. Many noted that SRE was better organised, and that elements of good practice in SRE were being disseminated through the school. Much of this related to teachers' initial

assessments or audits of current policy and practice as well as identifying opportunities for the future.

'It's been good because it's made us realise that certain things are out of date, such as the SRE policy and the confidentiality policy, so we've gone right back to those and we're re-visiting those as well.' (Line Manager - Secondary)

~~*'We needed to start from the beginning and so it's developed my practice in that I've produced a policy, I've met the governors, I've met with staff and students and I've written schemes of work that have been implemented in the year groups with consultation with the heads of year.'* (Teacher - Secondary).~~

Line managers who recognised that SRE was in particular need of development in their school, were often most likely to note the benefits of participation in the scheme. However, this did not hold true for all respondents. One line manager, in particular, felt that a review of school policy and practice could have been achieved more swiftly by simply asking the school to review its SRE-related work.

'Her practice has improved and been extended, (X) has had opportunity to observe other's teaching and looked at the whole curriculum. It's been good for her professional development having the responsibility. She has had slots in staff meetings which has given her a chance to discuss the issues with other teachers.' (Line manager – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

3.3 – FFKey factors **that helped** and **hindered** the development of professional practice

[lan -- Amend contents page title too](#)

3.3.1 – TTime and timings

Every respondent (including teachers and their line managers, SRE Leads, Leads, aAssessors, and national officers) raised concerns about the amount of time taken to participate in the scheme, and the phasing of the work. During the first round of interviews, respondents often talked of the 'rushed' nature of the set up. As the scheme progressed, respondents turned their attention further to the national roll-out, hoping that it would be delayed or phased in some way.

Almost every teacher stated that more time had been spent participating in the pilot than originally expected. Some teachers, however, pointed out that it was difficult for them to separate work associated with making ongoing improvements to the SRE programme from that related to the working on the pilot scheme.

'It's been a lot more than expected, about two to three hours per week and then the trips to London. What we needed was more lead-in time, and the scheme run over the whole year.' (Teacher – Special).

Teachers generally found it difficult for teachers to quantify the amount of time they had spent on the pilot each week. Some weeks, they noted, were busier than others. The most any one teacher estimated was around four hours per week, with two hours being the more usual figure quoted.

'[The time taken] varies, sometimes I've not done anything and sometimes I've done quite a lot. I really couldn't say how many hours a week, I'd have to really think about that because sometimes I really have done a lot, but, I'd say, probably about two hours a week.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'It's hard to say really, but on average, about 2 hours a week.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

~~The time taken to e~~Collecting evidence and preparing the professional development record (PDR) was a more lengthy process than many teachers, line managers and SRE Leads had anticipated. In part, this related to uncertainties about what sort of PDR should be submitted to National Assessors. Much time among teachers, SRE Leads and the National

~~c~~Coordinator of the pilot was spent clarifying what evidence and materials should make up the PDR.⁸ ~~Respondents' suggestions about improving this aspect of the scheme are noted later (add in page/section number).~~

'I spend about 2 hours per day when compiling the evidence and weekends and when I'm not physically doing it it's on my mind-it's far more than I expected. I've annotated my lessons but I'm still having to do more since the feedback [on the PDR].' (Teacher – Secondary).

~~Just~~ as important, however, was the phasing or sequencing of the pilot scheme. ~~As noted in the Interim Report, m~~Most respondents noted that the lead-in to the scheme felt rushed. Participants did not have enough time to prepare themselves for the work ahead. In addition, the timing of receiving feedback on the PDR, responding to comments from ~~a~~Assessors and the final submission date did not fit in well with teachers busy work lives. ~~These issues are considered in more detail below.~~

'It would have been better if scheme ran for a full year, to carry it through to the end of the term, because we're about to teach various aspects of the area, particularly for the Year 2s so much more towards the end of the term, after SATS.' (Teacher - Infant School).

3.3.2 – SSRE Leads/leads and local support networks

It was widely ~~considered~~~~thought~~ by most teachers, from the initial round of interviews to the final, that the support provided by the local SRE ~~l~~Lead was a central feature of their successful participation ~~in the pilot scheme~~. Working with the local ~~SRE l~~Lead, enabled teachers to clarify the pilot scheme's written materials, build and utilise local networks, gain access to SRE-related resources (including written materials and links with external agencies such as Teenage Pregnancy Coordinators and Brook), respond to feedback from ~~a~~Assessors and put together their final PDR.

'[In terms of what has helped me] first and foremost is the SRE ~~l~~Lead – she's been outstanding throughout the process.' (Teacher - Special).

'The SRE lead's been very good giving me resources, keeping me up dated, helping me to produce the portfolio, very useful.' (Teacher - Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'I would say that we probably couldn't have done it without her' [the SRE ~~l~~Lead]. She has been very supportive and very good and where I've struggled with some of the aspects of it and where I've needed to get it clear in my head – 'what are they actually asking me to do?' – she's been really good.' (Teacher - Secondary).

⁸ Respondents' suggestions about improving this aspect of the scheme are noted in Section 3.3.3

The role of local SRE Leads was seen as being as much to do with facilitation of group learning as it was with providing support to individuals. In these ways As such, SRE Leads were able to build on the motivation and professional interests of teachers. By setting up meetings within which issues related to SRE could be discussed, local Leads provided a forum to support that enabled reflective practice to develop.

'Talking to other colleagues within the pilot has given me that confidence to put different things forward. It's given me the confidence to put things into practice.' (Teacher - Special).

'I wouldn't say that working with the SRE Lead has been essential, but it's been helpful. But we've had to rely on our own initiative a lot of the time ... though she has provided a lot of information, she's very good that way.' (Teacher - Secondary).

Teachers were not uncritical of their local Lead's role. A few indicated that their ongoing participation in the scheme was as much to do with their own individual effort as it was with support from an external partner. This was most noticeable in two areas where the SRE Lead was least active in bringing together teachers.

'The SRE Lead has not been helpful, we were not really brought together as a group.' (Teacher – Secondary).

SRE Leads themselves generally valued the way the pilot scheme had enabled (through funding and encouragement from the national officers) the development of local groups and networks. A few of them talked of the difficulties of bringing together teachers, perhaps due to supply cover being unavailable.

'Because we had funding, we had the chance to come together and discuss issues – that was really positive. The fact that they were going through the process together, it helped them problem solve, they thought through the particular dimensions together.' (SRE lead).

'They've had regular meetings with me and very very limited meetings with each other. The teachers in secondary schools weren't allowed out... We've tried evenings and weekends! The couple [of meetings] we did have they found very positive, especially in terms of finding out what's going on in other phases.' (SRE lead).

Local networks and group meetings were valued as they enabled teachers not only to draw on the experiences of the SRE Lead, but also to learn from each other about, among other things, work in other schools, work across phases, and the requirements of the PDR. Just as important though was the emotional support teachers gained, not least the development of confidence about the work they had to submit for assessment.

3.3.3 – ~~W~~ritten materials and documentation

Throughout the evaluation, the red and blue guidance folders were variously ~~described~~ ~~talked about~~ as lacking in clarity, difficult to understand, confusing and lacking in exemplars. However, as the scheme progressed, and as teachers met with one another, with ~~SRE Leads~~ SRE leads and with the ~~n~~National ~~c~~Coordinator, the framework and requirements outlined by the written materials generally became clearer. ~~Never~~ ~~one~~ ~~theless~~, it was felt by many teachers that what they were required to do was repetitive, too paper-bound and often not tailored as well as it might be to the support of learning in primary and special schools.

'[What was not helpful] were the actual forms we had to fill in for the evidencing the initial cover forms and the questions, we had to say what we do and evidence it, ... they weren't particularly helpful I didn't think they were broken down and worded particularly well, it took quite a long time to plough through those and understand what exactly was being asked for.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'A lot of things are hard to gather evidence for, children may not record some things and so quite a lot of the time you're doing things to get evidence and the people who are there observing, the line manager, and maybe they could verify that it's been done rather than having to evidence it or write it all down. I don't think many teachers have time for this, particularly if they have a full time class they won't have time for the evidence because there's so much emphasis on collecting evidence for other things now, such as performance management or continuing professional development portfolios, there seems to be this new phase in education where people just have lots of portfolios for lots of evidence for different things.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'[What was good about the files was] the way each point was laid out, when coming to fill it in it did help you focus as to whether you have covered each criteria and as to whether you were in the right place and that was good for thinking things through.' (Teacher - Secondary school).

~~Although~~ ~~T~~teachers were asked specifically about their perceptions of the written materials. ~~D~~, ~~they often returned to their~~ difficulties with the language and layout of the files where identified as issues in need of some improvement. ~~n~~ ~~asked in a more open-ended way about the weaknesses of the pilot scheme.~~ ~~Despite this~~ ~~Nonetheless~~, they also wished to record their appreciation of visits made to them by the ~~n~~National ~~c~~Coordinator. This provided them with opportunities to clarify what action was needed to take forward their participation in the scheme.

'She was brilliant. She really helped me sort out what was needed from those files and for the PDR.' (Teacher - Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle)

National Officers also recognised that written materials were in need of revision. This process was said to be underway in preparation for the national roll-out. With hindsight, it was suggested that exemplifying the Teachers Standards Framework might not perhaps have been the best way to develop the written materials. Two National Officers suggested that perhaps ideas from other accreditation schemes (such as NVQs) could have been considered - with a greater emphasis placed on teachers describing, recording and reflecting on one or two aspects of their actual practice.

Assessors also noted that teachers had difficulties in interpreting the dimensions and submitting good quality evidence. There were two rounds of submission for PDRs. During the first of these, evidence for the PDR a draft record was sent to Assessors who then provided interim feedback to teachers and SRE Leads/SRE leads. During the second, a the final PDR containing revised and further evidence revised PDR was sent for assessment.

In providing interim feedback, assessors indicated that Draft PDRs were said by Assessors often to consisted often of too great a quantity of un-cross-referenced photocopied materials that were generally not cross-referenced and lacked sufficient evidence from pupils, or did not detail the specific contribution of teachers to SRE. A frequent omission was a commentary on how, for example, school policies or lesson plans had informed a teacher's practice, and/or how a teacher's practice informed the development of policy or written programmes of work.

Some teachers were not sure what to submit for the PDR. There was too much in terms of including programmes of work and policies without a commentary on these and how they had been adapted for their own use. (Assessor)

More evidence was needed of what teachers were actually doing. More evidence of pupil evaluation and annotated lesson material showing reflection on practice. The need for this could be spelled out more. (Assessor)

Never/Nonetheless, aAssessors were able to identify did state that there were some very good examples of evidence (such as photos, witness statements and critical descriptions of practice).⁹ They recognised that there were particular challenges for teachers in primary and special schools to in submitting evidence, especially as the scheme was focussed on SRE rather than PSHE. Assessors stressed that their intention in providing feedback was to be as constructive as possible.

⁹ A range of examples of evidence submitted for the PDRs (and judged to be of good quality by Assessors) is included as Appendix ThreeB.

'There has been some good evidence from pupils such as photos and examples of what happened' (Assessor)

'I tried to provide written comments that were as sensitive as possible, but it was not always perceived in that way!' (Assessor).

Some teachers were enthusiastic about the feedback they had received from assessors.

'Ours was really positive feedback and it outlined two points that we hadn't completed but weren't big deals, but I was very pleased with the feedback because it was very very positive. We have worked hard on trying to make sure it was right.' (Teacher - Secondary School).

However, others were

Teachers, though, were sometimes displeased feeling that, on occasions, feedback was critical of the type of feedback they received. On occasions, it was perceived to be overly critical, inconsistent and/or lacking in detail. SRE Leads SRE leads and the nNational cCoordinator met with teachers to assist them to respond to feedback in preparation for the final submission of the PDR.

'We weren't very happy about the feedback. All the assessors did was look at the lesson plans – they didn't take into account how the teachers had taken a whole school approach to putting together their evidence. [...] We should really have met with the assessors – they should've given us more guidance.' (SRE lead).

Assessors stated that their earlier participation in the development of the pilot scheme would have helped clarify the sorts of evidence that might best be required of teachers. This would not only have assisted teachers, but also enabled aAssessors to have developed a greater shared understanding of the criteria for assessment, something which had to be built as the pilot scheme progressed. Furthermore, aAssessors stated that, ideally, they would have appreciated a greater role in moderation, perhaps meeting with SRE Leads SRE leads and Teachers to discuss feedback. In actuality, however, aAssessors were aware that the resources available to the scheme would not provide them with opportunities to do this. In fact, more time than anticipated was taken up with reading and providing feedback, due partly to the size and variability of PDRs.

'There was too little time to standardise our thoughts. As aAssessors we had different backgrounds, and we have to make sure that we understand the pressures on teachers. PSHE is only one tiny part of teachers' work, and SRE even less so.' (Assessor).

Assessors commented that, in general, PDRs submitted in the final round were of better quality than earlier drafts and so were easier to assess. They

knew there to be 'stunning' SRE and PSHE teachers and were concerned that a system of accreditation should enable good and best practice to be ~~identified drawn out~~, and written up.

'The files I am seeing now are much easier to assess. There has been an improvement from the first round of submission.' (Assessor).

3.3.4 – SSRE and PSHE

~~(this para is unclear and contradictory, please rewrite)~~ Almost every respondent indicated they would welcome the focus of the accreditation scheme to be PSHE rather than SRE. ~~However, one respondent stated that it was stated that a~~ the focus on the latter ~~might would better~~ responded to the ~~aim outlined by the~~ TPU's ~~goal of reducing, to reduce~~ rates of unwanted pregnancy among young people. ~~However, it would have other benefits as well.~~

'It's a good idea to accredit PSHE rather than SRE. Good PSHE can help keep pupils in school. We do PSHE throughout the year rather than in just a few weeks in the summer term.' (Teacher – Secondary).

'I also think it should be widened to PSHE rather than just SRE because you don't actually teach SRE in isolation, it's part of a whole framework.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'Most of what we do in this area has to be part of PSHE.' (Teacher – Special).

'It's important to make sure that the details of SRE are still taught and can be pinned down. For example, at Key Stage 4 it is important to address contraceptives and STIs' (National officer.)

Reasons for accrediting PSHE rather than SRE were fourfold. First, some respondents stated that the skills and values associated with PSHE were similar to those of SRE. However, and as one ~~n~~National ~~o~~Officer emphasised, the particular topics associated with SRE are also important for pupils to learn. Second, for some teachers, especially those in primary and special schools, PSHE was said to be more relevant to their pupils than SRE. The latter, it was suggested, may be taught very infrequently in these types of schools compared to the former. Third, given that SRE might be taught for a few sessions only, PSHE would provide more opportunities for teachers to identify evidence of their practice. Fourth, with Citizenship being statutory ~~subject~~, a PSHE accreditation scheme might be ~~first~~ a step towards ~~providing giving~~ it ~~witha~~ similar status in schools.

'If ~~PSHE SRE~~ rather than ~~SRE PSHE~~ (are these the right way round?) was accredited, this would provide teachers with more opportunity to provide evidence of their practice.' (Assessor).

'We should have gone with PSHE earlier. It was apparent early on that special and primary school teachers respond better to PSHE rather than SRE. It is more related to what they do and addresses the importance of relationships and self esteem.' (National officer).

'It will be PSHE rather than PSHE and Citizenship. The latter is statutory, and this might be a stepping-stone to make PSHE statutory.' (National officer).

3.3.5 – The website

Teachers generally did not have too much to say about their use of the internet and/or a particular website. During early interviews, some respondents indicated that online support was highly beneficial, but **believed that it** should not be provided at the expense of face-to-face meetings.

After reflection on their use of the internet, one person indicated in the final round of interviews that more specific information about confidentiality and the law would help them with Dimension B (in the written materials). Others tended to suggest that while a related website is probably useful, they preferred to develop their ideas by talking and meeting with other people. A teacher's response appeared to relate as much to her or his own personal preference about using the internet, **as to more general evaluations of it was about** the role of ICT in the accreditation scheme.

*'More information may simply have contributed to the paper trail, you chase paper and don't really take in what you're reading. The information provided by the SRE **Leadlead** was sufficient and much more useful.'* (Teacher – Secondary).

*'The website was possibly useful, but not really for me **as** I'm not that computer literate.'* (Teacher – Special).

~~*'Websites can be useful for teaching, e.g 'wired for health', but the pupils didn't like it because the initial amount of words can be off-putting as many of the boys are dissatisfied with the education system and a number are dyslexic so for me there is not enough pictorial information that will engage the pupils immediately. They were switched off by it, because it was not interactive enough. I personally don't get enough time to browse all the websites.'* (Teacher – Special).~~

Two respondents questioned whether the development of the website had been strategically tied in as best it might, to the development of the accreditation scheme. Achieving complementarity between the two, it was suggested, had more to do with workers utilising their professional links made **beyond** with the pilot scheme, than with explicit strategies **from key players** to foster joint working.

'It was not joined up enough with the development of the scheme. This has happened through the worker's [on the website] time and commitment, rather than her being directed to do so.' (National Officer).

3.3.6 – Financial resources

Teachers, their line managers and ~~SRE Leads~~ SRE leads talked of the importance of financial resources to attract school staff, and maintain their involvement. Resources were used to pay for supply cover, for written SRE and PSHE materials, for attendance at CPD events and for travel to national meetings in London. A few respondents were concerned that money did not make its way quickly enough into schools, in one instance compromising the purchasing of supply cover.

'There were sufficient resources, but the money came into the school very late, just two weeks ago and this did cause problems in that I couldn't spend the time out of school without the available funds to cover my absences. I couldn't book time off until the money came in.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'We had expenses to go to London and courses that have been put on through the HSS, but very little has been spent on supply as I've found it hard to get away because I'm covering other duties.' (Teacher – Special).

But even with adequate funding, some respondents reported difficulties in using the the moneys available to gain release ~~them~~ from their ~~their~~ usual school duties. In some instances, duties associated with the teacher's seniority prevented attendance at external meetings. On others, supply cover was not available when needed. ~~And f~~ For those in special schools, there were unique challenges in bringing in supply teachers who were unfamiliar to pupils. It was suggested by one respondent that the latter problem might be resolved by knowing in advance exactly when cover would be needed. This would require teachers to carefully plan their participation in the scheme and would certainly involve teachers and line managers knowing before the beginning of the school year what level of supply cover was likely to be needed at what point.

'The money would have been fantastic, but it's been very difficult to get [the teachers] out of schools. First because of their [senior] roles and second because it's very difficult to find supply cover.' (SRE lead).

'One of the problems is that teachers don't come out on courses unless there's supply cover. But now schools want 'a person', do you know what I mean? They want a named person that they know is going to come in. What would be brilliant would be if there was an element of money identified for cover and schools were informed at the beginning of the year so they could plan ahead.' (SRE lead).

3.3.7 – Accrediting the individual and/or the whole school

Findings from the first round of interviews ~~revealed~~ showed contrasting perceptions as to whether schools or individuals should be accredited. Towards the end of the pilot scheme, such differences in opinion were still apparent.

Some teachers felt strongly that the individual who chiefly undertook the work should be accredited. After all, it was argued, outcomes came about because of their individual efforts. Not accrediting individuals would provide less of an incentive to their participation.

'Well, I've done most of the work, so the accreditation should go to the individual. I've written the policies, I've held the meetings, I've done the evaluations, taught the lessons and collected the evidence together.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'I think that individual teachers should be given accreditation because with professional development and performance related pay coming on line, I think it's important that people are able to use this in that sort of way. With something like SRE, you wouldn't get accreditation any other way, it's not like you get an SRE degree and not many people do PSHE as a subject in college, so it's useful for individuals to get that. But I do know there's a school where the whole school's been doing it – so that's a useful thing there but I think it would be hard in a secondary school to do that because it's more of an individual thing... it rests on individuals and on an individual to deliver it.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'I think the balance should be between accrediting the school and the teacher, as ideally a holistic 'whole school' approach is preferable as this encourages more staff to take responsibility for SRE and to take on board the ideas being communicated via a specific teacher. A problem is that the onus can fall on one individual whereas it should be the whole schools responsibility and it can be off-putting for one teacher alone. Most important is that the profile is raised in this area, if accredited the teacher or school should be awarded more status, A credit to an M.A is good if a teacher knows the direction they are moving in but the incentive must be matched by the amount of responsibility it carries.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

However, there appeared to be a tendency for more senior teachers to be less concerned about their own accreditation. One teacher, who was due to retire in a few years time, stated that her participation in the scheme was chiefly to benefit the school – to leave it with a solid programme of PSHE and SRE.

Respondents also raised the issue of teacher mobility, that is, if the school lost a teacher who had been accredited, what would happen to the on-going development of SRE within a school?

'You've got to accredit the individual teacher, because the individual teacher is putting the work in and doing the planning – what happens when that teacher moves to another school? Does the accreditation go with that teacher?' (Teacher - Special).

A few ~~Line Managers~~[line managers](#) suggested that the school should receive some form of recognition that a staff member had participated in a scheme, partly because the work of one member of staff could not be divorced from that of others.

'In [name of teacher]'s case she should be accredited, she's very good at what she does, having said that part of why she's so good is because of the curriculum and that's a departmental thing so we should all get the credit for that. I also know I have teachers teaching my curriculum who do a really bad job of it and therefore shouldn't have the status of having accreditation. ... if for instance if a situation kicks off in SRE which I have to deal with a parental complaint, I wouldn't be happy with a parent coming to me and saying 'what are you playing at, you're an accredited school for SRE and my child has come home with a teacher who has said this to them today, it's a weakness of the teacher.' (Line manager - Secondary).

'Why don't we accredit the school and it's scheme of work related to SRE and it's materials and resources and the in-service training that goes on within the school rather than it being a person? That would be more valuable and more beneficial to the school, they know what the bench marks are, and doesn't rely on a member of staff staying or not, providing that there is a co-ordinator of SRE who may have some formal training, as long as that person remains in the school without them necessarily being accredited themselves it becomes the management of the school that ensures that accreditation remains in place, not dissimilar to the model for Records of Achievement, you have that accredited by the LEA once a year to show that your process is robust and appropriate to delivering that particular part of the curriculum.' (Line manager - Secondary).

While there was no overall consensus about whether an individual or the school should receive accreditation, some respondents went on to question what sort of teachers might best be involved in, and benefit from, the scheme. Should it, for example, draw in a biology teacher doing a little PSHE? Should [all teachers, from senior to pre-threshold, senior as well as threshold teachers](#) participate? While respondents had no definitive answers to these questions, they were aware that different sorts of outcomes would result from the participation of different sorts of teachers.

Teachers views about what form the accreditation should take were mixed and left somewhat open to question. Perhaps a member of staff could ~~receive~~[get](#) an extra increment on her or his salary – but what about members

of staff at the top of a pay scale? Perhaps credits towards a Masters degree could be awarded – but how might the work of staff who are not taking such a degree be acknowledged? As one Line Manager commented, more thought needs to be given to ways of recognising and 'celebrating' staff achievements.

'If you're going to value the accreditation, the best way is by the pocket really ... if people are pre-threshold, it should automatically take them through the threshold.' (Teacher - Special).

'I'd actually like to use it towards becoming an advanced skillschool teacher in this area. It seems to match in with some of the work that advanced skillschool teachers have to do as the next step is actually going out into the community and helping people getting their SRE teaching more structured.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'Credits towards a qualification, if you're going to link it to a university, is rubbish – they've been doing that for years. I've probably got points in every university in the country and I'm never going to use them.' (Teacher - Special).

3.3.8 – Accreditation and the NHSS

Comments about whole school and individual accreditation often resonated with ideas as to whether accreditation should be linked in some way to a school's involvement in the NHSS.

A number of respondents recognised the value of linking the two schemes as there was a degree of complementarity between the two. – Some teachers felt that evidence collected for the NHSS could be used towards their PDR. Local SRE Leads SRE leads, in particular, suggested that the participation in the NHSS encourages ways of working that support good SRE provision. NHSS partnerships might also provide teachers with opportunities to learn with colleagues in health or other sectors. Furthermore, recruiting a teacher from a school not yet participating in the NHSS might sensitise her or his colleagues towards the idea of the healthy schools approach. It was suggested that in an ideal world the two schemes would be linked. (Were all these suggestions from leads, if so, need to make this clear as it may read as though these are comments from the authors.

'Yes, it would be good to make accreditation part of the NHSS. All the different strands of PSHE, SRE, citizenship, etc, should be put in one bag.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'Well it has been useful we've been doing development work on drugs and healthy eating and all the other aspects so it's all come together quite fortuitously.' (Line manager - Secondary).

However, in recognising that they are not working in an ideal world, most respondents did not believe that SRE accreditation should be made

dependent on NHSS participation. One teacher felt that it could be a number of years before certain schools ~~became~~were involved in the NHSS and queried whether this would debar a teacher from seeking SRE accreditation. A ~~n~~National ~~o~~fficer noted that the accreditation scheme has more to do with teachers' professional development than whole school improvement and added that opportunities should exist for *all* teachers to take part in the scheme regardless of overall school performance.

'In an ideal world, the answer would be yes, but I think that's unrealistic ... It would be advantageous, but I don't think it should be a requirement.' (Teacher - Special).

'It's tricky. The accreditation is for individuals, so it can't be dependent on what schools are doing. Especially if you've got a 'wizzo' teacher who is really keen. But in an ideal world, everything would come through Healthy Schools.' (SRE lead).

'The accreditation scheme is about teachers chiefly and not about the whole school improving. It's about opportunity for all so teachers who are in a bad school can take part even if the school is not doing very much.' (National officer).

3.3.9 – ~~BB~~uilding and maintaining a supportive infrastructure

3.3.9.1 – ~~T~~he role, background and needs of ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads ~~(Check font size)~~

As noted ~~earlier~~, teachers generally praised the ways in which ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads had provided them with opportunities to work through the written materials, to reflect on practice, to make links with new partners, to identify evidence, to produce the PDR and to respond to ~~a~~Assessors' feedback. ~~Local SRE Leads~~SRE leads themselves were aware that, without their input, many teachers would have been unable to complete the pilot.

When asked to consider whether ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads should have a ~~background in~~ health or education ~~background~~, respondents views were somewhat mixed. Some teachers stated that, with a background in education, an SRE ~~Lead~~lead would be familiar with the 'nitty gritty' of work in schools. Others indicated that, with a background in health, an SRE ~~Lead~~lead could provide them with useful sexual health-related information and contacts. While most teachers seemed to favour ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads with an education background, it seems that others would miss the particular expertise that a health specialist could bring to the scheme.

'For the SRE ~~Lead~~lead to have an education background, I think that's important, he had an understanding of the classroom.' (Teacher - Secondary).

| *'The SRE [Leadlead](#) has a health background and that's been useful to gain a different perspective and find out what's happening in health area.'* (Teacher – Infant).

| [SRE LeadsSRE leads](#) were often aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their own backgrounds, emphasising their role was often one of facilitating learning and partnerships while brokering tensions between health and education.

'Anything that happens in schools has to be based in the LEA. It's status, realistically – there's still a divide. It needs someone who can give an overview of good practice, of how people can support one another and what's available in the LEA.' (SRE lead).

'If the lead was not from an education management background, they'd need to be taken through the process about what activities teachers need to undertake in their schools. Some leads didn't have that understanding of managing change.' (SRE lead).

'From a local perspective, I can see the advantage with the link being in health. I'm not saying health should lead, but I do feel strongly that there's got to be a health and education partnership. But even this can cause something of a battle. [One colleague in education] is feeling threatened because they see health as having a role in things 'health doesn't really understand!' (SRE lead).

| All [SRE LeadsSRE leads](#) highlighted the responsive and reassuring individual support provided by the [nNational cCoordinator](#). However, a few also indicated that they would appreciate further opportunities to share practice and, for those with a background in health, to find out more about approaches to teaching and learning. It was recognised that [SRE LeadsSRE leads](#) themselves also had a need for professional development opportunities, and one respondent suggested that [Leadleads](#) themselves should go for accreditation.

| *'It would have been better with more training for the [Leadlead](#)s upfront actually. Really, we went into the pilot in the dark. Also, knowing exactly for myself what the expected standard was: it was difficult to decide whether what I was doing was high enough quality. I would really have appreciated more training about how to lead in the pilot: [...] a blueprint for offering support.'* (SRE lead).

'[Us leads] should go for accreditation ourselves in some way. But I don't know how this could be engineered.' (SRE lead).

| National meetings, some [Leadleads](#) indicated, were also an opportunity for certain teachers (such as those in primary and special schools) to discuss and reflect together on their particular SRE-related needs. Where best to hold

meetings and how local, regional and national meetings might complement each other was raised, but left open to question.

'I've been feeling a bond with other SRE leads, but not enough. We need a process that can bring leads together more to share good practice. We've not networked enough, but to be honest, there's been no time, not enough time to form relationships.' (SRE lead).

'[I'd like] more time with us all together: the whole group, the teachers, more days in London with everyone together. The teachers really did enjoy and benefit from working with the teachers from other areas.' (SRE lead).

3.3.9.2 – Involving ~~national a~~National Assessors

~~National A~~Assessors were aware that their understanding of their role had developed as the pilot scheme progressed. Each ~~a~~Assessor stated that a more planned approach ~~to improving to their their~~ participation might benefit the scheme. For example, ~~a~~Assessors noted that their ~~earlier~~ involvement in the planning and development of the pilot could have contributed to the writing of the materials, the key features of the PDR and how best it could be assessed and moderated. In addition, early involvement would have helped ~~a~~Assessors consolidate a shared understanding of assessment criteria and feedback.

'It would have been better to have had us involved right from the beginning. Especially to bring in the experience of what could have been required from primary schools.' (Assessor).

'I would have liked to have been involved more in the formative development of the scheme. I feel I came in on something that had already started. In terms of feeling ownership, it would have been useful to have been involved at an earlier stage.' (Assessor).

However, each assessor realised the resource implications of greater involvement. As it was, the marking and moderation of files took much more time than originally anticipated and the level of resources available for the roll-out was queried. It was felt, though, that as it became clearer to teachers what constituted a good PDR ~~submission~~, the quality of ~~evidence submitted (in the PDR) portfolios~~ would rise and be quicker to assess.

'For ~~a~~Assessors, time for reflection and evaluating our role is very important. It is good to have a meeting after marking the folders. More time for moderation would have been good, perhaps to feedback to ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads. We could also meet with teachers, but I would not want to put ~~SRE Leads~~SRE leads out of their role.' (Assessor).

3.3.9.3 – The role of nNational oOfficers

There was general agreement among nNational oOfficers that key players at the nNational level had both committed themselves to the aim of the pilot scheme, and worked hard to ensure its success. Even though stakeholders had come to the scheme with different departmental or organisational priorities, and even with staff changes (which, it was said, tended to make progression of a programme more difficult), the good will and determination of key players highlighted their commitment to this area of work.

'There was determination among key players for this to work as they felt it was such an important area. There were changes to personnel during the life of the programme, and that makes things more difficult.' (National officer).

'People have worked well together, there is goodwill from the Steering Group members to make things work.' (National officer).

There was a degree of disappointment, however, that the nNational Steering Group ~~(for what? I think we need a footnote here saying what this group was, and what its role was supposed to be, for those who do not know. Again, I suggest Marilyn will be able to help)~~ had not worked as best it might. There were some suggestions that the expertise of the people on the Steering Group had been underused, with members being informed of progress of the scheme, rather than acting as decision-makers about its future aims and objectives.

'I expected to work more closely with key stakeholders in the nNational Steering Group.' (National officer).

'We could have worked more fully with the Steering Group. It seemed to be more a group to feedback to, rather than use their expertise.' (National officer).

3.3.9.3 – The organisational context of the accreditation scheme

There was some discussion about where an accreditation scheme might best be located organisationally. One nNational oOfficer felt it important to consider whether the scheme should be a part of the NHSS and went on to question whether the NHSS itself might best be located within the part of the ~~department of the~~ DfES section that takes the leads on inclusion. Another felt strongly that the scheme should not be tied to the NHSS. This respondent, along with one other, stated that the scheme should be tied in some way to the CPD framework, ~~and certainly be moved out of the DfES policy department (this doesn't really make sense, it shows a lack of understanding of how DfES works – do they mean out of DfES all together? Everything has to be located in a policy team).~~

'I wonder whether the DfES wants to hand it over in some way. They seem to want to, but I'm not sure to whom.' (National officer).

'Who owns the accreditation scheme? Perhaps it could be part of the NHSS which itself could be part of the DfES that leads on inclusion.' (National officer).

'There should be a shift of the scheme from the sex and relationship DfES education policy ~~department~~ and into teachers' CPD.' (National officer).

However, one other nNational officer questioned the degree to which the scheme was linked to CPD. Important to address was how the scheme might best engage those teachers (noted above) uninterested in gaining qualifications, or who are chiefly motivated by a desire to improve pupils' learning rather than to have their work formally recognised.

'If it is only linked to CPD, how do you bring in teachers who are less interested in qualifications?' (National officer).

3.4 – PPpreparing for the ‘national roll-out’

Respondents were aware that the pilot scheme would be ‘rolled-out’ as a national programme during 2002/3 and some expressed concerns as to how best it should happen.

‘My opinion would be, ‘The roll out – don’t rush it. Get it right.’ I would roll out the infrastructure first and then get the teachers in the schools. I think they might do it the wrong way round. I think that’ll be pressure from ministers, rather than coming from the HDA or DfES.’ (SRE lead).

‘I’m concerned that the rollout is keeping to a political agenda at the expense of getting things right. It needs to be fully tested or it will fail.’ (SRE lead).

With regard to timing, nNational oOfficers spoke of [the importance of a ‘phased’ introductionscheme](#). While further activities to help build an infrastructure for the scheme would take place between September and December 2002, teacher recruitment would start in January 2003, with further intakes likely in April and September of that year.

‘Reducing teenage pregnancy has to be part of a multi-faceted approach. Good SRE is essential and we cannot afford to delay the roll out.’ (National officer).

‘Is there enough time for the national roll-out? Yes. As the next phase is starting in January and from September to December time there is time for feedback and revisions. We will have cohorts of teachers in January, April and September working with the local lead. Clearer expectations are needed about who does what and when.’ (National officer).

Discussions about linking accreditation with postgraduate qualifications had taken place between the nNational cCoordinator and a representative of an HEI. Some teachers, already registered for a higher degree, had built on their SRE portfolio, to produce material that could be assessed at Masters level.

Revisions to the written [support](#) materials (the red and blue folders) were already being made. Particular emphasis was placed on streamlining the evidence collection process, providing exemplars, encouraging reflection on practice, highlighting the need to annotate written materials (such as lesson plans and school policies) as well as using language and ideas as familiar to special and primary teachers as those in secondary schools.

No comments were received about the level of funding that would be available for the roll out.

‘I have no idea how the resourcing will be maintained. But it is needed for supply and for local support.’ (National officer)’

During initial interviews, many teachers indicated that the accreditation should have a high profile and credibility. Some stated that many schools and teachers did not take SRE very seriously, and teachers often went on to say that accreditation could improve the status of SRE teaching if the profile of the accreditation is high enough.

Building on these ideas, two National Officers stated that, to ensure the participation of teachers, the accreditation scheme would have to be well marketed and publicised. This should highlight how a teachers' participation would build on existing school priorities (such as inclusion, pupil behaviour, NHSS).

'I'm still unclear about what the national roll-out exactly involves. What we need is good marketing to bring in schools.' (National officer).

'We need publicity and PR, and head teachers especially need to know about it.' (National officer).

Despite some apprehension among respondents about the timing of the roll out, National Officers were keen to see a revised scheme up and running. One officer noted that a national roll out would present its own challenges, and could well be 'painful.' Another proposed that a continuous 'phasing in' of the scheme should be considered, with lessons being continually learned about progress.

'The roll out will be painful as it presents its own issues to respond to.' (National officer).

'The important thing is to keep phasing the scheme in and to keep learning lessons from this.' (National officer).

3.4.1 – Utilising the experiences of pilot participants

Almost all teachers stated that they would be interested in having to have a continued involvement with a national accreditation scheme. Indeed, some teachers had already made plans to support others in their local area. However, few respondents indicated that they would recommend the scheme to others in its present form without revisions being made to its timing, to the written support materials and to the guidelines on producing a PDR.

'Yes, [I would recommend the scheme to others] as at the end of the day, it has honed my teaching.' (Teacher - Secondary).

'I would be prepared to support other teachers. I would love to be involved.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

'I would be willing to recommend this scheme and to share my experiences as it is a great idea on paper but I would have to see the amendments myself first.' (Teacher – Secondary).

'Yes, if it was revised, yes. If it's not revised, no.' (Teacher – Infant/Primary/Junior/Middle).

Of those who did want a continued involvement (and who expressed an opinion about the nature of their involvement) most wanted to provide support to new participants in their area. Some were, however, wary about the level of paperwork providing such support might involve.

'Yes, if there wasn't such a lot of work ... I think people will be put off by that ... the workload should be lessened.' (Teacher - Special).

4 – Conclusions Summary and key learning

In general terms, the SRE pilot accreditation was viewed as successful by most respondents. Many teachers noted that participation in the pilot had had a positive impact on them as teachers, even given the difficulties they encountered with aspects of the scheme's documentation (both the written guidance as well as producing the PDR). Line managers too generally commented favourably on the impact of the scheme on teachers and their schools. Both groups as well as [SRE Leads/SRE leads](#) indicated that it would be hard to measure immediate benefits to pupils, these being more likely to arise in the medium to longer term. Nonetheless, [National Assessors/assessors of the PDRs](#) noted that evidence of good quality practice had been documented.

4.1 – Meeting purposively

Most respondents indicated that successful participation in the scheme was due to a combination of individual hard work as well as meeting with others to reflect on practice. The purposive bringing together of key players (such as teachers, [SRE Leads/SRE leads](#) and the [National Coordinator](#)) to review practice appeared to be a key element of the pilot's success. Teachers appreciated an SRE [Lead/lead](#) who facilitated and managed such contact.

On the whole, teachers suggested that [SRE Leads/SRE leads](#) should have a background in education, or at least an understanding of school processes. However, other teachers spoke of how much they had gained from their SRE [Lead/lead](#) who had health sector experience of working with young people.

4.2 – Clear written materials

Most unfavourable comments were reserved for the pilot's written materials. Partly in response to feedback from pilot teachers and from interim evaluation [interim findings](#), the [National Coordinator](#) is revising the pilot guidance folders. Examples of best practice (as contained in assessed PDRs) are being included as written support materials. Whether greater access to the [Internet](#) would enhance some respondents' participation in the scheme remains open to question. However, it should be seen as but one element of a process whereby learning is supported among participants.

4.3 – Transparency in assessment, moderation and recognition of work

Assessors indicated that they would have appreciated greater involvement during the development of the pilot to identify assessment and moderation procedures. The criteria for assessment did not seem to [be clear](#). [Some teachers indicated that feedback from assessors was very helpful, particularly where good work was identified and praised and advice provided on what sorts of evidence was needed for future submission. Other and some teachers \(and, some to a degree SRE Leads/SRE leads\) noted that felt that](#)

feedback from assessors was not always as useful or consistent as they felt it should be. Nonetheless, towards the end of the pilot there appeared to be a greater shared understanding of procedures for both assessment and moderation as well as the ways in which teachers might best respond to feedback. Assessors indicated that they would appreciate continued involvement over decisions about the nature of the PDR, its assessment and its moderation.

Almost every respondent indicated that the scheme should recognise work related to PSHE, and not only SRE. However, with national priorities attached to targets such as reductions in teenage conceptions and [sexually transmitted infections \(STIs\)](#), ~~(in full)~~, the valuable school-based work in SRE should perhaps remain as a particular focus of the scheme. Whatever topics and issues are the focus, when building evidence for the PDR, ~~a~~Assessors indicated that teachers should reflect particularly on their actual practice. This can be achieved by, among other things, annotating lesson plans and school policies to demonstrate how they influenced (and were influenced by) a teacher's practice, providing observations and/or witness statements to verify practice, providing examples of pupils' work.

Teachers spoke of different ways ~~in which that~~ their achievements could be recognised. For some, academic awards would be suitable. ~~F~~, for others, monetary rewards were as (or more) important. Some respondents spoke that improvements to an SRE programme or greater pupil achievement were incentive enough to participate. It may, therefore, be useful to have a number of ways of recognising teachers' successful participation in the scheme

— Respondents talked about the need to balance ~~the~~ accreditation of individuals with ~~the~~ accreditation of the whole school. If ~~the final scheme is~~ chiefly an accreditation of individuals, it would be useful to consider how participants' learning from involvement in the scheme could inform the work of colleagues ~~elsewhere~~ in the school.

4.4 – RResponsive management and resourcing

At the time of the final round of interviews, discussions were underway about the institutional location of the scheme. Utilising the partnerships, expertise and goodwill embodied through the NHSS appeared to be fairly fundamental to the scheme's success – especially so with regard to the initial recruitment of teachers. Furthermore, good national coordination is likely to remain an essential feature of a valued scheme and is likely to incorporate visits to local and regional sites, close liaison with ~~SRE Leads~~[SRE leads](#), and responsiveness to the needs of local/regional groups of participants.

Teachers and their line managers valued the dedicated resources available to support their participation in the scheme. Some degree of freedom in spending money (such as on supply cover, written materials and training events) was appreciated. However, and as noted by line managers in particular, getting money into schools was said to take too long. This is,

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

perhaps, an important area to address prior to the marketing of the national roll-out to senior managers in schools.

4.5 – Phasing in the roll-out and learning from it

Most teachers indicated that they would be willing to assist in the national roll out, provided they knew that revisions they suggested to the scheme had been made, and provided the workload was not burdensome.

—Line managers and teachers spoke negatively of the rushed introduction of the pilot. A longer lead in time would help managers and teachers plan their involvement in the scheme over the school year. This might help teachers manage their time and could be helpful to those who need to plan supply cover in advance. The proposed phasing-in of the new scheme should help participants plan their involvement.

Some National Officers commented particularly on the need for good marketing of the national roll-out. As part of this, it might make sense to inform old and new audiences alike about successes so far, as well as what and how changes to the pilot have been made.

As the roll-out progresses, thought should be given to how the DfES, DH, NHSS and members of the Steering Group can best learn about whether the scheme is successful and what contributes to this. The evaluation of the pilot, the type of information collected and the timely feedback of emerging findings assisted those attached to the scheme to identify strengths and verify areas for development. The national roll-out presents new challenges, and new information ~~will be~~ required ~~in order to~~ respond ~~to~~ successfully to these.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Appendix One – SRE Accreditation Criteria

Appendix Two – Examples of Interview Schedules

Appendix Three – Examples of Evidence for PDR Submission

(The appendices to this report are not available online. Anyone wishing to see the material should contact laura.sukhnandan@dfes.gsi.gov.uk)