

Evaluation of the Graduate Leader Fund Final report

Sandra Mathers, Helen Ranns, Arjette
Karemaker, Alison Moody, Kathy Sylva,
Jenny Graham, and Iram Siraj-Blatchford

This research report was commissioned before the new UK Government took office on 11 May 2010. As a result the content may not reflect current Government policy and may make reference to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) which has now been replaced by the Department for Education (DFE).

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

Acknowledgements

Social surveys are the work of a team, and the authors would like to gratefully acknowledge the contribution of many colleagues. We would like to thank Deborah Sanders, Patrick Towgood, and Leila Allsopp at the DfE for their support during the course of the project. We are also grateful to Mary Baginsky, Thom Crabbe, Christopher Price and Rebecca Bull at the Children's Workforce Development Council, and to the members of our Steering Group, for their assistance and advice.

Within Oxford University our appreciation goes to Zeenat Ghumra, Natalia Kucirkova, Jenny Good, Victoria Vincent, Sophie Walsh, Harriet Alexander, Lucinda Turnpenny, Lauren Cross and Emma Watson who worked on the fieldwork, data cleaning and writing up of the evaluation. In addition, we would like to thank Faye Linskey for her help in coordinating the baseline fieldwork, Keith Levy, Steve Henshaw and Sandra Henshaw for software support and James Hall and Julia Hall for their statistical advice. Last but not least, we thank all the fieldworkers who carried out the observations and collected the data.

At the National Centre for Social Research we would like to thank Naomi Stoll and Alice Mowlam for conducting fieldwork and analysis for the qualitative impacts case studies, Natasha Reilly for her assistance with the telephone survey and Emily Diment for data management. We would also like to thank Nafiis Boodhumeah and Bhavna Patel for programming the telephone interview, Chris Massett, Sonia Shirvington, and the telephone interviewers for carrying out the work. Thanks also go to Sam Clemens and Clarissa White for their input throughout the evaluation.

Beyond the Oxford University and NatCen team we gratefully acknowledge our collaborator Susan Purdon from Bryson Purdon Social Research for her statistical advice and guidance.

We also thank all the settings, their managers, staff and parents – without their participation there would be no study and no report.

Content

Executive summary	5
1 Introduction	12
1.1 Graduate Leader Fund policy background	12
1.2 The National Evaluation of the Graduate Leader Fund	14
1.3 Structure of this report.....	14
1.4 The Impact Study.....	16
1.5 Qualitative case studies.....	21
2 Literature Review: the relationship between professional development and the quality of early childhood provision... 23	
2.1 Policy context	23
2.2 The relationship between qualifications and quality	28
2.3 The relationship between a higher qualified workforce and provision	31
3 Characteristics of impact study settings and the EYPs	32
3.1 Characteristics of the impact study sample	32
3.2 Characteristics of EYPs and their settings at follow-up.....	34
3.3 Representativeness of the sample: what are we measuring?	39
4 Impact of gaining an EYP on change in quality over time....	41
4.1 Impact on overall quality for children aged 30 months-5 years (ECERS-R).....	42
4.2 Impact on overall curricular quality for children aged 3-5 years (ECERS-E)	44
4.3 Impact on overall quality for children from birth-30 months (ITERS-R)	46
4.4 Summary of findings	47
5 Predictors of quality at follow-up	48
5.1 Predictors of quality at follow-up for children aged 30 months to 5 years (ECERS-R)	49
5.2 Predictors of curricular quality at follow-up for children aged 3 to 5 years (ECERS-E).....	55
5.3 Predictors of quality at follow-up for children from birth to 30 months (ITERS-R)	58
5.4 Summary of findings on predictors of quality (birth to five).....	61
6 Improvements made and how they happened	67
6.1 What prompted improvement.....	68
6.2 The scale of improvements	69
6.3 Improvements made to settings' practice.....	69
7 Factors affecting the delivery of improvement within settings	76
7.1 Planning.....	77
7.2 EYP role	79
7.3 Other staff.....	83
7.4 External support	85
7.5 Parental willingness	85
7.6 Features of the setting	86

8	Parents' assessments of change.....	87
8.1	Change in quality.....	87
8.2	Choosing a nursery.....	88
8.3	Views on qualifications.....	89
8.4	Views on experience.....	90
8.5	View of provision.....	91
8.6	Involvement in child development.....	92
8.7	Involvement in the setting.....	92
9	Final conclusions and discussion.....	93
9.1	The impact of Early Years Professional Status (EYPS).....	93
9.2	Key factors for facilitating the future impact of EYPS.....	97
9.3	Quality for specific groups.....	103
9.4	Sample and context.....	104
9.5	Issues for consideration.....	105
Appendix A	Quality assessment measures.....	108
Appendix B	EYP Standards.....	113
References	115

Tables

Table 1.1	Sample profile (settings taking part in the qualitative case studies).....	22
Table 3.1	Characteristics of the settings at follow-up that were related to quality.....	33
Table 3.2	Sector of EYP settings (n=32).....	35
Table 3.3	Setting employs a graduate with a relevant (level 6) degree (n=32).....	35
Table 3.4	EYP pathway completed (n=34, missing=1).....	35
Table 3.5	Length of time EYPS had been held at follow-up (n=35).....	36
Table 3.6	Proportion of "home-grown" EYPS (n=35).....	36
Table 3.7	Proportion of EYPS who held a relevant degree prior to deciding to complete EYPS.....	36
Table 3.8	Proportion of EYPS who achieved their degree while at their current setting.....	36
Table 3.9	Reported role of EYPS within their setting (n=35).....	37
Table 4.1	Impact on overall quality for children aged 30 months to 5 yrs (ECERS-R).....	43
Table 4.2	Impact on curricular quality for children aged 3 to 5 yrs (ECERS-E).....	44
Table 4.3	EYP deployment.....	46
Table 5.1	Predictors of pre-school quality at follow-up as measured by the ECERS-R.....	50
Table 5.2	Predictors of curricular quality at follow-up for the pre-school age range, as measured by the ECERS-E.....	56
Table 5.3	Predictors of quality at follow-up for the birth to 30 month age range as measured by the ITERS-R.....	59
Table 8.1	Parental assessment of change in quality of provision in last 18 months.....	88
Table 8.2	Choosing a setting.....	89
Table 8.3	Parental perceptions of highest qualification of staff members.....	90
Table 8.4	Parental satisfaction with the overall quality of a setting.....	91
Table 8.5	Parental satisfaction with elements of provision.....	91

Figures

Figure 1.1	Elements of the evaluation design and reporting details.....	15
Figure 1.2	Leadership change scenarios to be tested in the impact study.....	16
Figure 3.1	The mean percentage of time spent on different roles before and after gaining EYPS (n=35).....	38
Figure 7.1	Role of EYP.....	79

Glossary

CIS	Caregiver Interaction Scale
CPD	Continuing professional development
CWDC	Children's Workforce Development Council
DfE	Department for Education
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
EAL	English as an Additional Language
ECAT	Every Child a Talker
ECSD	Early Childhood Studies Degree
ECE	Early Childhood Education
ECERS-E	Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Extension
ECERS-R	Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised Edition
ECOI	Early Child Observation Index
EIG	Early Intervention Grant
EPPE	Effective Provision of Pre-school Education project
EYFS	Early Years Foundation Stage
EYP	Early Years Professional
EYPS	Early Years Professional Status
EYSEFD	Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree
GLF	Graduate Leader Fund
HGGI	Home Grown Graduate Incentive
IDACI	Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
IQF	Integrated Qualification Framework
ITERS-R	Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised Edition
LA	Local authority
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
PVI	Private, Voluntary and Independent (settings)
QCF	Qualifications and Credit Framework
QP	Quality Premium
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
RI	Recruitment Incentive
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SPS	Senior Practitioner Status
SST	Sustained Shared Thinking (techniques)
TF	Transformation Fund

Executive summary

Introduction and background

Since 2006 the Government has provided funding through the Transformation Fund (TF) to help professionalise the early years workforce and to deliver the Ten Year Strategy for Childcare. The aims of the TF were based on evidence highlighting the relationship between qualifications and the quality of early years provision, as well as differences in quality between the maintained and the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector (Siraj-Blatchford et al., 2006; Sylva et al., 2003; Taggart et al., 2003). A total of £250 million was made available for local authorities (LAs) to develop a graduate-led workforce within the PVI sector.

In August 2007 the TF was replaced by the Graduate Leader Fund (GLF) which provided a further £305 million in funding between April 2008 and March 2011. The GLF supports all full day care PVI sector providers in employing a graduate or **Early Years Professional (EYP)** by 2015, to lead practice across the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). The role of these graduate leaders is to support and mentor others, as well as to model skills and good practice to secure high quality provision. From April 2011 LAs have been funding support for EYPs in PVI settings through the Early Intervention Grant.

The National Evaluation of the Graduate Leader Fund (2007-2011) was commissioned by the former Department for Education and Skills (DfES)¹ and carried out by a consortium of researchers from the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), the University of Oxford and the Institute of Education (University of London). The main aim was to **assess the implementation of the Graduate Leader Fund and its impact on the quality of early years provision in the PVI sector**. This report presents the findings from the final three components of the evaluation: the literature review, the impact study and the qualitative case studies.

Evaluation design

At the heart of the GLF evaluation is the impact study, designed to **identify the impact of Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) on quality**, both at a single time-point and the impact of gaining a graduate leader on change in quality over time.

Findings are based on data gathered from a sample of 238 settings visited at two time-points, with two years between visits. Quality was assessed using three rating scales: Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised Edition (ECERS-R), designed to assess provision for children from 30 months to 5 years; the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Extension (ECERS-E), designed to assess curricular provision for children aged 3 to 5 years; and the Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised Edition

¹ Most recently Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and since May 2010 the Department for Education (DfE).

(ITERS-R), which assesses provision for children from birth to 30 months.

Qualitative case studies in 12 settings were undertaken to complement the impact assessment by describing the nature of improvements made and identifying the levers, barriers and facilitators to quality improvement. Managers, EYPs and setting staff took part. A survey was also conducted with parents in these 12 settings to elicit their views on the quality of provision and changes over time.

Sample and characteristics of EYPs

Of the 238 impact study settings, 32 gained an EYP during the course of the evaluation. Three settings employed two EYPs, giving a total of 35 EYPs in the sample. All EYPs had held their status for six months or more at the time of the follow-up. Around one third had held their status for 12 months or more, with the longest any EYP had held their status being 24 months. This evaluation therefore assesses the impact of EYPs within the first 6 to 24 months of attaining their status.

The majority of EYPs had achieved their status via the validation pathway or the short professional extended development pathway. Almost all (94 per cent) of EYPs held a managerial position, either describing themselves as senior managers or line managers. On average, EYPs spent 35 per cent of their time working 'hands-on' with the children (down from 48 per cent before gaining EYPS). EYPs reported taking on greater responsibility for the support and mentoring of other staff after gaining their status.

Key findings

The impact of gaining EYPS

- Settings which gained a graduate leader with EYPS made significant improvements in quality for pre-school children (aged 30 months to 5 years) as compared with settings which did not. Gains were seen in overall quality and in a number of individual dimensions of practice, including: positive staff-child interactions; support for communication, language and literacy; reasoning/thinking skills and scientific understanding; provision of a developmentally appropriate schedule; and providing for individual needs and diversity.
- EYPS provided 'added value' over and above gaining a graduate in terms of overall quality and (to a lesser extent) provision to support literacy/language, and planning for individual needs/diversity.
- Improvements related most strongly to direct work with children, such as support for learning, communication and individual needs, reflecting the role of EYPs as 'leaders of practice'. Fewer measurable improvements were seen in the more 'structural aspects' of provision, including the quality of the physical environment, care routines and provision for parents and staff members.

- EYPs were more influential on the quality of practice in their own rooms than on quality across the whole setting. The more time EYPs spent in rooms with children, the greater the impact they had on the quality of provision in that room.
- EYPs are tasked with 'leading practice across the full age range from birth to the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage'. However, in contrast to the positive findings in relation to quality for pre-school children, there was little evidence that EYPs improved the quality of provision for younger children (birth to 30 months). The low number of EYPs working in these rooms means that we cannot draw firm conclusions on the potential impact of EYPS on provision for infants and toddlers. Further research is needed to establish the most effective ways of raising quality for under 3s through workforce development.

Other predictors of quality

- The overall qualification level of staff working with the older children (30 months to 5 years) was a predictor of quality in more 'educational' dimensions of provision. Better qualified staff teams offered higher quality support for children's developing communication, language and literacy skills and their reasoning, thinking and mathematical skills, as well as higher overall curricular quality. As with the EYP findings, qualifications and quality were less related for the infant/toddler age range.
- Other factors, such as staff experience and adult-child ratios, were identified as being important for the more nurturing and 'care-based' aspects of provision (e.g. staff-child interactions and personal care routines) across the birth to five age range.
- Settings which catered for a greater proportion of children with SEN offered more developmentally appropriate schedules for children from birth to five, and higher quality interactions for the younger age range.
- The evaluation identified a link between disadvantage and the quality of provision offered to children. Settings catering for higher proportions of minority groups and children speaking English as an additional language (EAL), and settings in more income deprived areas, were rated as lower quality.
- A number of other setting characteristics were identified as predictors of quality, including the sector or 'aegis' of settings (e.g. private, not-for-profit), the number of recent changes experienced (e.g. in staffing, management or organisation), setting size and group size.

Improving practice in settings

- The case studies found that improvements made within settings were largely in response to the implementation of the EYFS, which was considered to be an important catalyst for change. Many of the reported improvements centred on child-led learning and meeting the needs of the individual child. Improvements

were driven by EYPs, other staff, sources of advice external to the setting, changes in management and other programmes and schemes supporting the EYFS.

- EYPs, managers and staff reported improvements in: planning and observation procedures; the use of key worker systems; a greater emphasis on child-initiated activities; the use of free flow to support children's choice; parent-practitioner relationships and parental involvement with the setting; staff support and evaluation; the physical environment of the setting; and health and safety practices/procedures.
- The scale of improvements ranged from those undertaking large-scale change to settings making small improvements. Those undertaking large-scale change did so in order to improve provision. Where smaller changes were made, this was more likely to be part of a continuous process of development in a setting already felt to deliver high quality provision.

Factors affecting improvements

A range of factors affected settings' abilities to successfully implement improvements to practice. These were:

- The degree of strategic planning undertaken ahead of improvements, and the extent to which planned changes were related.
- The role of the EYP as defined by three interrelated factors: leadership and skills; the EYP's position within the setting; and the extent to which the role and remit of the EYP was defined and agreed.
- Other staff's engagement and understanding of proposed improvements, including their understanding of how improvements would be delivered in practice and of why these changes would improve quality.
- Parental willingness for the proposed improvements to take place, alongside parental engagement in their child's development.
- External advice and support from early years advisors, who were seen as experts in the delivery of high quality provision, and from EYP networks.
- Setting features such as the outdoor space available and setting size. Planning and implementing improvement was considered to be more straightforward in smaller settings.

Parents' views of improvements, qualifications and their involvement in their child's learning

- Parents' assessments of change in quality did not reflect the changes in quality measured in the impact assessment. Only 27 per cent of parents with children in

'improved' settings recognised that the quality of provision had improved; 29 per cent of parents with children in settings that remained stable thought their provision had improved.

- Staff qualifications were not cited amongst the primary reasons for selecting a setting, with only 26 per cent of parents citing this as one of their top three factors.
- Parents exhibited a limited awareness of the presence of an EYP, and of qualifications more generally within their child's setting; only 25 per cent of parents in EYP settings knew that their setting had an EYP in place. Forty per cent of parents did not know what the highest qualification held by staff in their setting was and parents saw staff experience as more important than qualifications.
- Parents reported high levels of involvement in their child's learning and development, with 83 per cent reporting that they were actively encouraged to input into their child's learning and development records.

Conclusions

This evaluation provides positive evidence that the use of specialised early years graduate training pathways can lead to improvements in quality within the PVI sector. The impact assessment findings show that EYPs were effective in leading change for pre-school children (30 months to 5 years); settings which gained an EYP made significant improvements in quality over those that did not.

The evidence also suggests that EYPs were successful in leading implementation of the EYFS, with the positive benefits relating very strongly to direct 'hands-on' work with children. The dimensions of practice in which positive impacts were identified could also be described as 'process quality', defined as 'actual experiences that occur in [early years settings] including children's interaction with caregivers and peers and their participation in different activities' (Vandell & Wolfe, 2000). Process quality is important because of the widely held view that it is these interactions which impact most on children's outcomes (LoCasale-Crouch et al., 2007; Pianta, 1999).

The impact study identified fewer measurable changes in the quality of the physical environment, personal care routines and provision for parents and staff. This is surprising since the EYP Standards place emphasis on these areas, and the EYPs themselves reported making changes in these aspects of provision. Working with parents and leading and supporting other staff are viewed as important aspects of an EYP's role (CWDC, 2010). The absence of measurable change may have arisen because the ECERS and ITERS quality scales focus on the more 'structural' aspects of provision in these areas (i.e. aspects within the remit of managers rather than EYPs), or because the impacts EYPs had in these areas were restricted to a specific room rather than being setting-wide. This is supported by the finding that 'EYP hours in the room observed' was a stronger predictor of quality in that room than 'EYP hours in the setting'. It is also possible that the EYPs, many of whom who had gained their status relatively recently, were yet to have a measurable impact in these areas.

The role of EYPs is to lead practice across the full age range from birth (CWDC, 2010). Our evidence suggests that positive impacts were seen only for older children, with little evidence that EYPs improved the quality of provision for younger children (birth to 30 months). The low number of EYPs deployed in the infant/toddler rooms observed (less than half, as compared with 91 per cent working in the pre-school rooms observed) mean that it is difficult to draw firm conclusions on the impact of EYPS on provision for this age range. If, as with pre-school findings, EYPs have a stronger influence on practice in their own rooms, their absence in the infant/toddler rooms may have limited their potential to improve quality for the under threes.

The evaluation findings indicate that both EYP training and EYP roles are key factors for facilitating the future positive impact of EYPS. Key issues include: knowledge and skills gained via EYP pathways and later CPD opportunities; leadership skills; a clearly defined role and remit; and having both managerial authority and time spent 'hands-on' with children. The quality of a setting depends on many variables, the quality and qualifications of their leaders being only one of them. A number of factors 'beyond the EYP' were identified as contributors to quality, and as potential facilitators for the future impact of EYPS. These include: the qualifications and experience of the wider staff team; positive relationships with parents and other professionals; careful planning of changes; and supportive structural characteristics such as ratios and high quality physical environments.

Issues for consideration

The recent review of the Early Years Foundation Stage suggests that 'without continued investment in the early years workforce, the Government will continue to struggle to raise attainment, and in particular to narrow the gap between disadvantaged children and their peers' (Tickell, 2011). On the basis of this evaluation, we raise the following issues for consideration:

- Continued support and financial assistance for the development of a high level graduate-led workforce, on the basis that effective leaders are central to implementing government policy in improving the quality of early years provision. Alongside this, the further development of a long term workforce and qualifications strategy for all levels of staff, to ensure high quality early years provision for future generations.
- Based on evidence that EYPs are not being deployed to work with the youngest children, settings should be encouraged to consider whether their graduate leaders are leading practice across the birth to five age range. Coupled with this, research is required to establish the most effective ways of raising quality for our youngest children through workforce development.
- Ensuring that training for EYPs contains effective and high quality support to help them achieve their full potential in leading quality across the EYFS and across settings, and to overcome barriers to improvement. This should include training in effective leadership skills, change management and reflective self-evaluation, as well as effective strategies for working in partnership with parents.

- Ensuring that opportunities are provided for EYPs and other staff to develop 'purposeful' hands-on experience, alongside their development of specialised knowledge.
- Ongoing continuing professional development (CPD) for EYPs once they have achieved their status, to enable them to embed and further develop their skills as change agents and leaders of learning.
- Ensuring that EYPs and other staff are supported by the structural characteristics of settings which provide the bedrock for high quality, such as supportive adult-child ratios and physical environments.
- A defined role and remit for EYPs, as well as clear guidance for settings on how to develop these and communicate them to staff. An effective remit should provide EYPs with the authority needed to act as a catalyst for change, while also reflecting the importance of time spent working hands-on with children.
- Continued movement towards the recognition of EYPS as a specific leadership profession.

The evaluation also makes a number of recommendations for future research, which are outlined in Chapter 9 of the full report.

1 Introduction

1.1 Graduate Leader Fund policy background

The Government has provided funding since 2006 to help transform and professionalise the early years workforce and to deliver the Ten Year Strategy for Childcare. A key element of this approach has been the development of a graduate-led workforce, based on the findings of research such as the EPPE project (Sylva et al., 2003), which highlighted the relationship between qualifications and the quality of early years provision, as well as differences in quality between the maintained and the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sectors.

The 2006 Childcare Act abolished the distinction between care and education for young children and set the scene for the introduction of a new Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) curriculum for the birth to five age range (DCSF, 2008c), as well as the introduction of a new professional status for the early years workforce; the **Early Years Professional Status (EYPS)**.

Funding to support workforce reform in the PVI sector was provided by the Transformation Fund (TF), also established in 2006 and providing £250 million in funding to early years settings via their local authorities (LAs). In April 2008 the TF was superseded by the Graduate Leader Fund (GLF), which provided a further £305 million in ring-fenced funding to support all full day care PVI sector providers in employing a graduate or Early Years Professional (EYP) by 2015. The ring-fenced GLF funding ended in March 2011; from April 2011 LAs are required to support the development of EYPs in PVI settings through the Early Intervention Grant.

1.1.1 Early Years Professional Status

The role of Early Years Professionals is to lead practice across the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), supporting and mentoring others as well as modelling skills and good practice to secure high quality provision. Responsibility for the new EYP role falls under the remit of the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC), who describe EYPS as a 'gold standard for working in early years'. The remit of EYPs is to '*act as change agents to lead the Early Years curriculum from birth to five, improve and shape practice*', and their role is seen as '*key to raising the quality of early years provision*' (CWDC, 2008).

A number of different EYPS training pathways have been developed to meet the needs of practitioners with a diverse range of previous qualifications and experience. Four training routes were in place when the National Evaluation was commissioned (CWDC, 2006a)²:

² A fifth pathway was introduced in September 2009 (the Undergraduate Pathway) and is therefore outside the scope of this evaluation.

- the **Validation Pathway** (part-time, four months and aimed at those holding a relevant degree with practice experience)
- the **Short Extended Professional Development Pathway** (part-time, six months and aimed at those with a relevant degree but in need of additional training to develop their knowledge and skill base)
- the **Long Extended Professional Development Pathway** (part-time, 15 months and aimed at those who already have a foundation degree in early years or a relevant area and need to obtain an ordinary degree before completing EYPS)
- the **Full Training Pathway** (full-time, 12 months and aimed at those with a non-relevant degree to undertake intensive training over a year)

EYPS is awarded to graduates who successfully demonstrate that they meet a set of 39 professional standards when working with children from birth to five. The Early Years Professional National Standards (CWDC, 2008) define what EYPs should ‘know, understand and be able to do’ and are organised into six areas: *knowledge and understanding; effective practice; relationships with children; communicating and working in partnership with families and carers; teamwork and collaboration and professional development* (CWDC, 2008). A summary of the EYP Standards is shown in Appendix B.

Further discussion on the policy context for EYPS, and on workforce reform more broadly, is provided in the literature review (Chapter 2).

1.1.2 Implementation of the GLF

In contrast to the TF, which prescribed funding strands and levels at which incentives should be set, the GLF was designed to allow local authorities (LAs) greater flexibility to develop, target and publicise their own incentive systems. As a consequence, each LA was free to design an approach which would reflect the needs of their local PVI childcare sector and address the aim of employing at least one EYP in every PVI setting by 2015. The approach developed was intended to feed directly into local strategies for workforce development³. In the most disadvantaged areas, LAs could fund two graduate professional leaders per setting in order to improve early years experience for children in these areas. An additional allowance was incorporated for this purpose within LA allocations.

Each LA was expected to set its own targets for local workforce development for the duration of the GLF (i.e. until 2011) or beyond. Outcomes would then be measured against the baseline of the number of graduates leading practice in PVI full day care settings in each area.

³ The implementation of the GLF is explored in a separate evaluation report (Ranns et al 2011).

1.2 The National Evaluation of the Graduate Leader Fund

In June 2007, the (former) Department for Education and Skills (DfES)⁴ commissioned a consortium of researchers from the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), University of Oxford and the Institute of Education (University of London) to undertake an evaluation of the TF. The aims and design of the evaluation were revised in August 2007 to reflect the policy transition from the TF to the GLF.

The main aim of the national evaluation was to **assess the implementation of the Graduate Leader Fund and its impact on the quality of early years provision in the PVI sector**. This report presents the findings from the final three elements of the evaluation programme (carried out between 2008 and 2010):

- The (updated) literature review
- The impact study
- The qualitative case studies

All components of the evaluation are summarised in Figure 1.1, along with details of where each element is reported.

1.3 Structure of this report

- Chapter 1 (this chapter) introduces the policy context as well as the design and methodology of the evaluation.
- Chapter 2 sets the literature and policy context for the evaluation.
- Chapter 3 presents a profile of the impact study settings and the EYPs at follow-up.
- Chapter 4 assesses the impact of gaining an EYP on change in quality over time.
- Chapter 5 identifies the predictors of quality at the follow-up time-point.
- Chapter 6 describes the improvements which took place within settings.
- Chapter 7 considers the factors which affected the delivery of improvement within settings.
- Chapter 8 provides the parents' assessment of changes in settings.
- Finally, Chapter 9 reflects on the value and role of the GLF and presents policy issues for consideration.

Chapter summaries are provided at the beginning of Chapters 2 to 8.

⁴ Most recently Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and since May 2010 the Department for Education (DfE).

Figure 1.1 Elements of the evaluation design and reporting details



