

# WEST PARTNERSHIP CONDITIONS FOR CHANGE INTERIM HIGHLIGHTS REPORT

Interim Report

10 December 2019

Irene Bell, Stuart Hall  
and Kevin Lowden

The Robert Owen Centre for Educational Change (ROC) at the University of Glasgow, works in collaboration with schools, local authorities, Education Scotland and partner services to support schools to tackle the poverty-related attainment gap in young people's education.

At the core of the ROC approach is the *Network for Social & Educational Equity* (NSEE) which supports schools to meaningfully use appropriate evidence and data within collaborative working approaches to critically examine context and current arrangements, make changes based on evidence, monitor the impact of these changes and reflect lessons learned in practice.

The NSEE approach is informing the Collaborative Learning workstream of the West Partnership RIC. The survey reported in this document is part of an annual cycle of data gathering to understand the context of, and conditions in schools across the RIC and establish their capacity for change and collaborative working. Subsequent, surveys will explore any shifts in these conditions and progress made regarding collaborative capacity.

## Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary .....	5
Implications for the West Partnership .....	7
1. Overview of Survey Reponses .....	10
1.1 Introduction .....	10
1.2 Methodology.....	10
1.3 Overview of Local Authority Participation .....	11
1.4 Overview of Respondents .....	12
1.5 Overview of Respondent Roles.....	14
2. Summary of Key Highlights .....	16
2.1 Enquiry and Reflection – Aggregated Data.....	16
2.2 Enquiry and Reflection - Narrative .....	18
2.3 Planning – Aggregated Data.....	19
2.4 Planning - Narrative .....	22
2.5 Involvement – Aggregated Data .....	24
2.6 Involvement - Narrative.....	26
2.7 CLPL – Aggregated Data.....	27
2.8 CLPL - Narrative .....	29
2.9 Leadership – Aggregated Data .....	31
2.10 Leadership - Narrative .....	32
3 Narrative Summary of Key Highlights.....	34
3.1 Enquiry and Reflection.....	34
3.2 Planning.....	34
3.3 Involvement .....	35
3.4 CLPL.....	36
3.5 Leadership .....	37

4	Cross-cutting Conditions for Change: Implications for the West Partnership ....	38
4.1	Context for Change.....	38
4.2	Capacity for Change .....	39
4.3	(What) Counts for Change - Improvement and Attainment? .....	40
4.4	Cooperation for Change .....	42
4.5	CLPL for Change .....	43
4.6	Collective Leadership for Change.....	44
4.7	Conclusion for Change .....	45
	Appendix 1 - Key Highlights on Enquiry and Reflection .....	47
	Appendix 2 - Key Highlights on Planning .....	50
	Appendix 3 - Key Highlights on Involvement .....	54
	Appendix 4 - Key Highlights on Career Long Professional Learning .....	57
	Appendix 5 - Key Highlights on Leadership.....	60
	Appendix 6 - Narrative Summary of Open Question .....	63

## Executive Summary

---

The aim of the Interim Highlights Report based on the Conditions for Change survey results is to develop a baseline of establishment capacity for collaboration and positive change within the West Partnership Regional Improvement Collaborative (RIC). The survey will be repeated periodically to determine if the support available across the RIC is enhancing the conditions for effective collaboration. It is one part of an independent external evaluation of West Partnership activity.

The survey was designed around five main themes: Enquiry and Reflection; Planning; Involvement; Career Long Professional Learning (CLPL); and Leadership and was sent to two broad groups of practitioners, Senior Leadership Teams (SLT) and Staff in Early Years Centres/Nurseries, Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and schools with Additional Support Needs. The survey elicited a total of 1,730 responses, (615 from SLT and 1,115 from Staff). The results must be treated with caution, as this figure is not representative of the total practitioner population in the eight local authorities in the West Partnership and comparing the responses of both groups has no statistical significance. However, it provides a snapshot of practitioner views, activities and practices and gives an indication of variations of such between the two groups. Therefore, it could give the Partnership some useful insight into the ways in which it could lead change and promote collaborative working.

**Enquiry and Reflection** - there is evidence of good practice in talking about and reviewing classroom practice. However, sharing practice with colleagues from other establishments and working collaboratively using enquiry is much less frequent, particularly for Staff practitioners. Professional learning enables both groups of practitioners to reflect and improve their practice to some extent, but not to any great extent, which might be a cause for concern. Both groups identified that they have some of the skills and confidence to undertake professional learning through enquiry, but the majority don't have most or all of those skills or any great confidence to do it.

**Planning** - both groups of practitioners have knowledge of and involvement in planning and prioritisation in their establishments. However, there is a great deal of disparity, between the groups, in terms of degrees of knowledge and levels of involvement. This is perhaps unsurprising given respective roles and responsibilities,

although some of the disparity might not be wholly attributable e.g. there is a 26% difference between the groups who frequently have opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for their establishment, [56%, SLT and 30%, Staff]. Similarly, collaborative working is taking place to take forward improvement, but it does not seem to be deemed effective to any great extent. Practitioners are involved in establishment strategies for raising attainment, but less than half of the Staff group believe themselves to be very involved.

**Involvement** - children and young people are asked for their views before establishments make major changes, but it does not seem to be happening all that frequently. Parents views are taken into consideration when changes are being made to the curriculum, but it is more likely to happen sometimes rather than frequently. There is a large gap (45%) between SLT and Staff respondents who thought that their views were frequently taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made. There is also a gap between the groups in relation to the effectiveness of their establishment's arrangements for engaging parents in their child's learning. Children and young people would seem to have some involvement in talking about and planning their learning although this was identified more strongly by SLT.

**CLPL** - is very valued by the participants, but the extent to which depends upon the position of respondent. It would also seem to be more focussed on classroom/playroom practice rather than building leadership capacity. SLT had more positive responses in terms of time and support for CLPL, however, both were broadly similar in relation to their needs being met to some extent, but not to any great extent. SLT have more opportunities to share learning with colleagues from other establishments, although it doesn't happen frequently.

**Leadership** - SLT are frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles, but this is much less likely for Staff. Support from senior management for those taking on such roles is only deemed very effective by 55% of SLT. A substantial amount of SLT strongly agree their establishments are well led and well managed, 20% less Staff believe so. There are opportunities for children and young people to take on leadership roles. There are also opportunities for leadership in sharing learning externally, more so for SLT and it's not happening frequently.

## Implications for the West Partnership

**Context** - the response rates must be treated with caution; it's not possible to extrapolate from them, they can only be used as potential indicators of views or practices.

**Demographic** - the participants were mainly female, working full-time, with the majority working in their establishments for over five years. The SLT were more likely to be between 41 – 55 and Staff more likely to be between 26 – 50, with the majority under 45 years of age. This could have ramifications in terms of the number of potential retirees [SLT] over the next few years. The Partnership could play a vital role in terms of workforce development, empowerment and succession.

**Collaboration** - collaborative working and collaborative working using enquiry is taking place and this provides both a challenge and an opportunity for the Partnership. The challenge might be how to upskill practitioners in enquiry-based approaches or how to cascade the learning from those with such skills. In addition, a further challenge might be how to enable increased involvement of Staff in developing strategies and in decision making processes. There are opportunities to look at ways to share learning internally and externally, involving more practitioners than SLT and in organisational and systems development within and between establishments.

**(What) Counts for Change - Improvement and Attainment?** Practitioners are very familiar with their establishment's improvement priorities, however Staff are not as frequently involved in agreeing those priorities. Similarly, proportionately much less Staff than SLT are involved in strategies to raise attainment. Collaborative working is shown to be effective to some extent in taking forward improvement, but not to any great extent. External support for improvement is taking place and external partnerships are happening, but not necessarily frequently. There could be a role for the Partnership to get the message across that attainment is everyone's business and to identify the type of collaborative working which is most effective in improvement and attainment.

**Cooperation for Change** - establishments are working with parents to shape the curriculum and future direction of their establishments, in addition to engaging them in their child`s learning. However, it doesn`t seem to be happening frequently or to be very effective. Children and young people are being asked for their views, before major changes are made, but not always frequently. In addition, there are often frequent opportunities for them to take on leadership roles. There seems to be a lack of awareness amongst the Staff group as to whether children and young people are involved in planning their learning. The Partnership would seem well-placed to identify and share best practice, particularly in parental/family engagement and involvement in planning learning.

**CLPL for Change** – while CLPL is clearly valued by practitioners, the disparity between the groups in the extent to which it is, could be concerning, if coupled with the responses on the extent to which professional learning enables reflection and improvement in practice. There is a difference between the two groups in terms of their understanding of the focus of CLPL and the time allocated to it. Although, there is less of a difference between them when it comes to their needs being met. Less than half felt they were only met to some extent, therefore, it is of some concern that so many feel their needs are not met. There is a recognition of the support for professional leaning which is taking place. This might provide opportunities for the Partnership on developing and embedding CLPL practices and guidance for different types of practitioners.

**Collective Leadership for Change** – practitioners are being given opportunities to take on leadership roles, but those are mainly for SLT. Similarly, there are opportunities for leadership outwith establishments, but again mainly for SLT and not very frequently. Those same group of practitioners strongly agree that their establishments are well led and well managed, however, this is much less true for Staff. The Partnership could play an advocacy or influencing role in a `leadership of change` approach, which could include harnessing existing knowledge and experience to inform different leadership levels and learning/organisational systems.

**Conclusion for Change** - there are many positives to draw on in terms of review of practice, active collaboration in planning and enquiry and in conjunction with internal and external colleagues. There is a foundation for change through the existence of

enquiry skills, planning activity, involvement of SLT in setting priorities for improvement and attainment and support for professional learning. However, in many cases these do not apply to the majority, are not widespread, nor are happening frequently. Caution is required in interpreting the findings, as per the aforementioned caveats and the data needs to be augmented with evidence from other aspects of internal and external evaluation. However, they do provide a useful baseline to monitor shifts in the key question areas. In addition, they offer helpful insights into areas in which the Partnership might want to explore, strategically, with other partners and operationally through the workstreams.

# 1. Overview of Survey Responses

---

## 1.1 Introduction

This Interim Highlights Report based on Conditions for Change survey results is one part of an independent external evaluation of the West Partnership Regional Improvement Collaborative (RIC) activity. Regional Improvement Collaboratives represent an important development in Scottish Education in taking forward National Improvement Priorities. The West Partnership, comprised of eight local authorities: East Dunbartonshire, East Renfrewshire, Glasgow City, Inverclyde, North Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, South Lanarkshire and West Dunbartonshire, is responsible for more than one third of Scotland's children and includes approximately the same proportion of pre-school, primary and secondary practitioners. It is therefore in a strong position to influence the national agenda in achieving Excellence and Equity for all learners. The main aim of the survey is to develop a baseline of establishment capacity for collaboration and positive change, and by repeating the survey periodically to determine if the support available across the West Partnership is enhancing the conditions for effective collaboration.

## 1.2 Methodology

The survey results will provide a baseline to monitor any shifts in collaborative capacity and activity across the RIC and complement other evidence gathered to assess the effectiveness of collaboration and related enquiry. It is anticipated this will be undertaken on an annual basis.

The survey was designed around five main themes: Enquiry and Reflection, Planning, Involvement, Career Long Professional Learning (CLPL) and Leadership, which comprised of 45 Likert-scaled questions. There were nine demographic questions and one open question. The survey was intended for distribution to Senior Leadership Teams (SLT) and Staff in Early Years Centres/Nurseries, Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and Schools with Additional Support Needs. The survey design builds on an earlier version developed by Ainscow *et al.* (2013)<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ainscow, M. *et al.* (2013). *Creating the Conditions for School Improvement: A Handbook of Staff Development Activities*. London: Routledge.

The questions were broadly the same for both groups and only slightly modified to reflect individual roles.

The survey was administered by the eight individual local authorities on behalf of the West Partnership RIC. The first deadline for return was 13 September 2019. This was subsequently extended twice, to 31 October 2019, to allow for an increased response rate.

The survey questions were created using SurveyMonkey and results exported to the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The closed questions response data was analysed using SPSS and the open question responses run through SPSS and text frequencies generated using NVivo software. The tabular percentages may not sum to one hundred percent due to rounding.

The limitations of the approach are that the response rate and subsequent responses cannot be considered representative of the total practitioner population in all the local authorities but could be considered as a snapshot of the West Partnership RIC. Given the generally high levels of reported collaborative capacity, it might also be that the responses are from those enthusiastic practitioners and SLT members who believe they already have a strong collaborative stance and capacity. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted with these caveats in mind.

Additionally, the collaborative approaches to practitioner enquiry which have been identified cannot currently be directly attributed and a couple of respondents from both SLT and Staff groups mentioned they thought the survey was too long and had difficulty answering some of the questions in relation to their roles and context.

### 1.3 Overview of Local Authority Participation

The survey received 615 total SLT responses and 1,115 staff responses over the two months the survey ran. All eight local authorities within the West Partnership RIC were invited to participate. Below, Table 1.1 identifies the frequency and percentage of SLT participation by local authority (n.b. not all individuals who participated in the survey answered demographic information, thus the total number of responses may vary from the total surveys received), while Table 1.2 identifies the frequency and percentage of the Staff participation by local authority.

**Table 1.1 SLT Participation by Local Authority**

Local Authority	N	%
South Lanarkshire Council	118	23
Glasgow City Council	109	21
Renfrewshire Council	83	16
North Lanarkshire Council	70	14
East Renfrewshire	38	8
East Dunbartonshire	37	7
West Dunbartonshire Council	29	6
Inverclyde Council	26	5
Total	510	100

**Table 1.2 Staff Participation by Local Authority**

Local Authority	N	%
Renfrewshire Council	211	24
South Lanarkshire Council	147	17
Glasgow City Council	133	15
East Renfrewshire	124	14
Inverclyde Council	96	11
North Lanarkshire Council	75	9
West Dunbartonshire Council	44	5
East Dunbartonshire	43	5
Total	873	100

## 1.4 Overview of Respondents

Each participant was asked to identify what level(s) of school they work in. There were 121 SLT respondents who work in an Early Years Centre/Nursery School/Class; 272 SLT respondents work in a Primary School; 162 SLT respondents work in a Secondary School. In addition, five SLT respondents work in Early Years with additional support needs; 23 SLT respondents work in Primary with additional support needs; nine SLT respondents work in Secondary with additional support needs and eight SLT respondents indicated they work in an area other than those listed above.

Of the Staff respondents, 109 indicated they work in an Early Years Centre/Nursery School/Class; 398 indicated they work in a Primary School; 326 indicated they work in a Secondary School. In addition, six Staff respondents work in Early Years with additional support needs; 27 Staff respondents work in Primary with additional support

needs; 36 Staff respondents work in Secondary with additional support needs and 14 Staff respondents indicated they work in an area other than those listed above. Other responses included but were not limited to roles such as Acting PT, EAL, Learning Support and Pastoral Care.

In addition, all participants were asked to identify or describe their gender and age. Table 1.3 includes how participants described themselves by gender while Table 1.4 details their reported age group.

**Table 1.3 Participant Descriptions of Gender**

Description	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Male	99	16	126	15
Female	401	79	703	81
In another way	-	-	3	<1
Prefer not to say	9	2	37	4
Total	509	100	869	100

**Table 1.4 Participants by Age Group**

Description	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
21 – 25	1	<1	45	5
26 – 30	8	2	111	13
31 – 35	24	5	107	13
36 – 40	72	14	130	15
41 – 45	99	20	146	17
46 – 50	110	22	110	13
51 – 55	110	22	94	11
56 – 60	61	12	80	9
61+	19	4	31	4
Total	504	100	854	100

Participants were also asked about their working hours within their establishment. Table 1.5 details the SLT and Staff working hours by full or part-time.

**Table 1.5 Participant Working Hours**

Working Hours	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Full-time	499	98	730	84
Part-time	12	2	136	16
Total	511	100	866	100

## 1.5 Overview of Respondent Roles

Both SLT and Staff were asked to identify their role within their establishment as well as identify the permanence of this role, either by identifying if it is an acting role (for SLT) or how permanent it is (for Staff). Tables 1.6 and 1.7 identify the responses to these questions for the SLT where Tables 1.8 and 1.9 identify the Staff responses.

**Table 1.6 SLT Role Within Establishment**

Role	N	%
Head-teacher/officer in charge/Head of centre	270	54
DHT/AHT/Depute officer in charge/depute head of centre	134	27
Faculty head/Team leader	65	13
Other	35	7
Total	504	100

**Table 1.7 SLT Acting Role**

Acting Role	N	%
Yes	36	7
No	471	93
Total	507	100

**Table 1.8 Staff Role Within Establishment**

Role	N	%
Class teacher	566	66
Principal teacher	137	16
Early years worker/early years learning practitioner	55	6
Other	36	4
Child development officer	29	3
NQT	19	2
ASN/support assistant	12	1
Senior child development officer	6	1
Student teacher	2	<1
Total	862	100

**Table 1.9 Staff Permanence in Establishment**

Permanence in Establishment	N	%
Permanent at establishment	779	90
On permanent supply to the authority	29	3
NQT	26	3
On temporary supply to authority	19	2
Other	16	2
Total	869	100

Lastly the demographic data collection concluded by asking participants to identify how long they have been at working in their current establishment. Table 1.10 details their responses.

**Table 1.10 Participant Time in Establishment**

Time in Establishment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
<one month	9	2	43	5
One month < six months	7	1	44	5
Six months < one year	20	4	26	3
One year < five years	179	35	256	30
Five years < ten years	123	24	184	21
Ten years or more	167	33	309	36
Total	505	100	862	100

## 2. Summary of Key Highlights

### 2.1 Enquiry and Reflection – Aggregated Data

Table 2.1.1 Enquiry and Reflection

Questions 2.1 – 2.4, 2.8	SLT		Staff	
	Frequently %	Sometimes %	Frequently %	Sometimes %
2.1 As a staff, we talk about the quality of our teaching	81	17	76	21
2.2 As an establishment, we monitor the impact of changes we introduce	81	17	63	27
2.3 Classroom/Playroom (I) staff review their (my) own classroom practice	74	23	93	6
2.4 I am encouraged to learn and share practice with colleagues from other establishments	52	41	35	46
2.8 Classroom/playroom staff in my establishment (I) work collaboratively in each other's (my colleagues) classrooms using enquiry	21	49	23	39
<b>Mean</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>28</b>

2.1 - As a staff, 81% of SLT respondents, talk about the quality of their teaching frequently, as do 76% of the Staff respondents.

2.2 - While 81% of SLT respondents believe their establishment monitors the impact of changes frequently, Staff respondents believe it to be less so, at 63%.

2.3 - 93% of Staff frequently review their own classroom practice, while 74% of SLT do so frequently.

2.4 - 52% of SLT and 35% Staff respondents, respectively, say they are frequently encouraged to learn and share practice with colleagues from other establishments.

41% of SLT are sometimes encouraged to do so, while this figure rises for Staff to 46%.

2.8 - 49% of SLT and 39% of Staff respondents, respectively, say they sometimes work collaboratively in each other's classroom using enquiry. Both SLT and Staff respondents show broadly similar results in terms of frequently working in this way, at 21% and 23% respectively. They also both show similar results for sometimes working in this way.

*Table 2.1.2 Professional learning*

<b>2.5 Does your professional learning enable you to reflect and improve your practice</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Yes, to some extent</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>

2.5 - 54% of SLT respondents say that professional learning enables them to reflect and improve their practice to some extent, with 52% of Staff agreeing.

*Table 2.1.3 Skills to undertake professional learning through enquiry*

<b>2.6 Do you have the skills to undertake professional learning through enquiry</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>I have some of these skills</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>I have most/all of these skills</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>38</b>

2.6 - Almost half, 49% of SLT believe they have most, or all the skills required to undertake professional learning through enquiry, whereas this figure drops to 38% for Staff. 48% of those respondents believe they have some skills in this area, while 44% of SLT believe so.

*Table 2.1.4 Confidence in undertaking professional learning*

<b>2.7 How confident would you be in undertaking professional learning through enquiry</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Somewhat confident</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>42</b>

2.7 - Over half, 51% of SLT respondents would be somewhat confident in undertaking professional learning through enquiry, while this percentage drops to 42% for Staff respondents.

## 2.2 Enquiry and Reflection - Narrative

As a staff, the vast majority of both SLT and Staff talk about their teaching frequently.

There is a greater disparity between the groups in their establishments monitoring the impact of changes; the vast majority of SLT do so frequently, while the majority of Staff believe this to be true. This is a smaller proportion of respondents than from the former group.

The vast majority of Staff frequently review their own classroom practice, whilst the majority of SLT do also, it is proportionally less than the former group, with almost a quarter doing so sometimes.

While just over half of SLT respondents say they are frequently encouraged to learn and share practice with colleagues from other establishments, this is only true for just over a third of Staff respondents. Less than half of the Staff group say it happens sometimes.

The highest responses from both SLT and Staff say they sometimes work collaboratively in each other's classroom using enquiry. However, those are both less than half of the respondents. Both SLT and Staff respondents show broadly similar low results in terms of frequently working in this way.

Broadly just over half of both groups state that professional learning enables them to reflect and improve their practice to some extent.

While just under half of the SLT respondents believe they have most or all the skills required to undertake professional learning through enquiry, it does mean that over half do not. Similarly, almost two-fifths of Staff think they have most or all those skills, with almost a half believing they have some of these.

Just over half and under half of SLT and Staff respectively, believe they are somewhat confident in undertaking professional learning through enquiry.

## 2.3 Planning – Aggregated Data

*Table 2.3.1 Establishment's Annual Improvement Plan*

<b>3.1 To what extent does your establishment's annual improvement plan reflect its longer-term aims</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Improvement plan includes longer-term aims to a major extent</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>

3.1 - Both SLT and Staff respondents' results are broadly similar, in that 54% of the former think that their establishment's annual improvement plan reflects its longer-term aims, 52% of the latter group think the same.

*Table 2.3.2 Establishment's Process of Planning*

<b>3.2 Which of the following statements is closest to your establishment in relation to planning</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>The process of planning and the written plan are equally important</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>51</b>

3.2 - Both groups, SLT and Staff respondents, show broadly similar results, just over 50% in thinking that both, process and written plan are equally important.

*Table 2.3.3 Familiarity with Establishment's Improvement Priorities*

<b>3.3 How familiar are you (classroom/playroom staff) with your establishment's improvement priorities</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Extremely familiar with priorities</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>53</b>

3.3 - 69% of SLT respondents identified that they were extremely familiar with their establishment's improvement priorities, this figure dropped to 53% for Staff respondents.

Table 2.3.4 Planning, Collaboration and Involvement

Questions 3.4 – 3.6, 3.9 -3.10	SLT		Staff	
	Frequently %	Sometimes %	Frequently %	Sometimes %
3.4 How frequently are you (classroom/playroom staff) involved in reviewing and modifying your establishment's plans	<b>54</b>	41	<b>41</b>	39
3.5 How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) plan collaboratively	44	<b>49</b>	30	<b>42</b>
3.6 How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) have opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for your establishment	<b>56</b>	38	30	<b>41</b>
3.9 How frequently do you receive the appropriate support for planning, preparation and assessment	46	<b>46</b>	40	<b>40</b>
3.10 How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) have opportunities to help shape the curriculum through discussions with colleagues, parents and partners	38	<b>53</b>	36	<b>43</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>48</b>	45	35	<b>41</b>

3.4 - 54% of SLT respondents said they were frequently involved in reviewing and modifying their establishment's plans, while the corresponding figure for Staff was 41%. 41% of SLT respondents identified they were sometimes involved, with 39% of Staff saying the same.

3.5 - 49% of SLT and 42% of Staff respondents answered that they sometimes plan collaboratively, with 44% of the former and 30% of the latter stating they do so frequently.

3.6 - There`s a 26% difference between those who responded, (56% SLT and 30% Staff), that they frequently have opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for their establishment. A smaller difference between those SLT and Staff respondents who sometimes have such opportunities at 38% and 41% respectively.

3.9 - 46% of SLT and 40% of Staff respondents said that they sometimes received the appropriate support for planning, preparation and assessment. The same percentages responded that they frequently did.

3.10 - There is a 10% difference between the 53% of SLT respondents who stated they sometimes have opportunities to help shape the curriculum through discussion with colleagues, parents and partners, whilst 43% of Staff respondents thought so.

*Table 2.3.5 Role in Establishment`s Self-Evaluation*

<b>3.7 How would you characterise your role in the establishment`s on-going self-evaluation</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Substantial role</b>	29	<b>42</b>
<b>Leading/key role</b>	<b>64</b>	9

3.7 - 64% of SLT respondents play a leading role in their establishment`s on-going self-evaluation, with only 9% of Staff identifying that they did. However, 42% of those respondents played a substantial role in their establishment`s on-going self-evaluation.

*Table 2.3.6 Effectiveness of Collaborative Working*

<b>3.8 How effective is collaborative working across your establishment in taking forward improvement</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Effective to some extent</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>

3.8 - The highest response to this question was the same for both SLT and Staff, in that both groups believed that collaborative working was effective to some extent in taking forward improvement in their establishments, at 47% and 43% respectively.

Table 2.3.7 Involvement in Strategies

3.11 How involved are you in the establishment's strategies for raising attainment for all	SLT %	Staff %
<b>Very involved</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>42</b>

3.11 - 86% of SLT respondents identified that they are very involved in their establishment's strategies for raising attainment, with less than half the Staff respondents at 42% believing themselves to be very involved in these.

## 2.4 Planning - Narrative

Over half of both SLT and Staff groups think their establishment's annual improvement plan reflects its longer-term aims to a major extent.

Both groups show broadly similar results in thinking that the process of planning and the written plan are equally important.

The majority of both groups SLT and Staff respondents identified they were extremely familiar with their establishment's improvement priorities, however, the proportion was much higher for the former group.

Just over half of SLT were frequently involved in reviewing and modifying their establishment's plans, while the corresponding figure was lower for the Staff group. There were broadly similar results from both groups (less than half), who were sometimes involved.

Proportionally more SLT respondents than Staff say they plan collaboratively. However, the highest responses were the same for both groups, from those who say they do so sometimes.

Over half of SLT respondents believe they are frequently given opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for their establishments, the proportion of Staff who think the same is substantially lower. More Staff identified they were sometimes given such opportunities.

There were broadly similar results from both groups on those who said they frequently or sometimes received support for planning, preparation and assessment. In each case the results were less than half.

Over half of SLT and less than half of Staff respondents say they sometimes have opportunities to help shape the curriculum through discussions with colleagues, parents and partners, with over a third of both groups stating it happens frequently.

The majority of SLT respondents play a leading or key role in their establishment's on-going self-evaluation, while less than half of Staff respondents play a substantial role.

Under half of the respondents, the highest response rates from both groups, showed that they thought collaborative working was effective to some extent in taking forward improvement in their establishments.

The vast majority of SLT respondents are very involved in their establishment's strategies for raising attainment for all, while proportionally less than half of the Staff respondents are very involved.

## 2.5 Involvement – Aggregated Data

Table 2.5.1 *Involvement in Decision Making for Change*

Questions 4.1-4.5, 4.8	SLT		Staff	
	Frequently %	Sometimes %	Frequently %	Sometimes %
4.1 How frequently are children and you people asked for their views before your establishment makes major changes	46	48	43	41
4.2 How frequently are parents' views taken into consideration when changes are made to the curriculum	34	55	35	37
4.3 How frequently do Parent Council members and staff work together to decide future directions for your establishment	32	45	32	25
4.4 How frequently does your establishment make use of external support for improvement (e.g. local authority officers, advisors, university colleagues and/or consultants)	37	51	34	33
4.5 How frequently does your establishment work with third sector and/or business partnerships to create more equitable outcomes for children and young people	37	45	29	40
4.8 How frequently are classroom/playroom staff's (your) views taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made	76	19	31	39
<b>Mean</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>36</b>

4.1 - 48% of SLT respondents believe that children and young people are sometimes asked for their views before their establishment makes major changes, while the highest response from Staff was 43% who think it happens frequently in their establishments.

4.2 - There is an 18% gap between the responses for SLT and Staff respondents who believe that parent`s views are taken into consideration sometimes, when changes are made to the curriculum at 55% and 37% respectively, with just over a third of both groups stating that it happened frequently.

4.3 - 45% of SLT respondents believed that Parent Council members and staff work together sometimes to decide future directions for their establishments. While 32% of Staff believed it happened frequently.

4.4 - Over half, 51% of SLT respondents thought that their establishment sometimes made use of external support for improvement, while this dropped to a third, 33% for Staff respondents. A similar percentage at 34% of that group stated it happened frequently in their establishments and this increased slightly for SLT respondents to 37%.

4.5 - 45% of SLT respondents stated that their establishments sometimes worked with third sector and/or business partnerships to create more equitable outcomes for children and young people, while it was 40% for Staff respondents.

4.8 - Over three-quarters, 76% of SLT respondents believe that their views are frequently taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made. This fell to 31% for Staff respondents. 39% of those thought their views were sometimes taken into consideration for the same purposes, while 19% of SLT thought the same.

*Table 2.5.2 Effectiveness of Parental Engagement*

<b>4. 6 How effective is your establishment's arrangements for engaging parents in their child's learning</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Effective to some extent</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>

4.6 - The highest response rate for both SLT and Staff was in the those who stated that their establishment's arrangements for engaging parents in their child`s learning was effective to some extent at 63% and 45% respectively.

Table 2.5.3 Involvement of Children and Young People in Learning

4.7 How involved are children and young people in talking about and planning their learning	SLT %	Staff %
<b>Some involvement</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>48</b>

4.7 - 59% of SLT and 48% of Staff respondents stated that children and young people had some involvement in talking about and planning their learning

## 2.6 Involvement - Narrative

Less than half of SLT respondents believe that children and young people are sometimes asked for their views before their establishments make major changes; while the highest response category for Staff showed a similar result from those who thought it happened frequently.

There is quite a large gap (18%) between those SLT and Staff respondents who said that sometimes parents' views were taken into consideration when changes were made to the curriculum. However, approximately a third of both groups said it happened frequently.

The same proportion, approximately a third, of respondents from both groups said that Parent Council Members and staff frequently work together to decide future directions for their establishments. However, this was the highest response from the Staff group, with the highest response from the SLT groups saying it sometimes happened.

There is a quite a large gap (18%) between those SLT respondents and Staff respondents who say their establishment sometimes makes use of external support for improvement, with this being the highest response from the former. While the highest response from the latter is from those, (approximately a third), who say it happens frequently.

Less than half of both respondents say their establishment sometimes works with third sector and/or business partnerships to create more equitable outcomes for children and young people. On average a third of both groups say it happens frequently.

Over three-quarters of SLT believe their views are frequently taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made, the same was true for less than a third of Staff. A larger proportion of those thought this happened sometimes.

There is an 18% disparity between the highest response rate for both groups who stated that the arrangements in their establishment for engaging parents in their child’s learning was effective to some extent.

The majority of SLT respondents thought that children and young people had some involvement in talking about and planning their learning. While this dropped to less than half of the Staff group who thought the same

## 2.7 CLPL – Aggregated Data

*Table 2.7.1 Value of CLPL in Establishment*

<b>5.1 To what extent is CLPL valued in your establishment</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Valued to a great extent</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>53</b>

5.1 - Nearly three quarters, 71% of SLT respondents stated that CLPL is valued to a great extent in their establishment. This dropped to just over half, 53% for Staff respondents.

*Table 2.7.2 Importance of CLPL in Establishment’s Policies*

<b>5.2 How important is CLPL in working out your establishment policies</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Some importance</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Very important</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>29</b>

5.2 - Just over half of the SLT respondents, 52% thought CLPL was very important in working out their establishment’s policies, while this fell to 29% for the Staff respondents. Both groups displayed similar results for having some importance, at 38% and 37% respectively.

Table 2.7.3 Focus of CLPL

Questions 5.3 – 5.4	SLT		Staff	
	Very focussed	Focussed to some extent	Very focussed	Focussed to some extent
	%	%	%	%
5.3 To what extent is CLPL focused on classroom/playroom practice	<b>67</b>	29	<b>41</b>	36
5.4 To what extent is CLPL focussed on building leadership capacity	<b>45</b>	42	24	<b>43</b>

5.3 - Over two-thirds, 67% of SLT respondents thought that CLPL was very focused on classroom/playroom practice, this decreased to less than half at 41% of Staff respondents. 29% of the former group thought it was focussed to some extent, while 36% of the latter thought the same.

5.4 - 45% of SLT respondents think that CLPL is very focused on building leadership capacity, while the highest response from Staff is 43% who think it is focussed to some extent.

Table 2.7.4 Time, Shared Learning, Support and Standards

Questions 5.5 – 5.6, 5.8 – 5.10	SLT		Staff	
	Frequently	Sometimes	Frequently	Sometimes
	%	%	%	%
5.5 How often does your establishment provide time for CLPL	<b>67</b>	27	36	<b>39</b>
5.6 How often does your establishment share its learning with colleagues from other establishments	19	<b>66</b>	19	<b>45</b>
5.8 To what extent are you given the opportunity to share practice and learning with colleagues from other establishments	31	<b>57</b>	17	<b>45</b>
5.9 To what extent are you supported to engage in professional learning	<b>62</b>	33	<b>51</b>	33
5.10 To what extent are GTCS standards used to support professional dialogue	39	<b>44</b>	<b>43</b>	33
<b>Mean</b>	<b>44</b>	45	33	<b>39</b>

5.5 - Just over two-thirds, 67% of SLT respondents think that their establishment frequently provides time for CLPL, while 39% of Staff say their establishment sometimes provides time for it.

5.6 - Two-thirds, 66% of SLT respondents, stated that sometimes their establishment shared its learning with colleagues from other establishments, while this dropped by 21% for Staff respondents to 45%.

5.8 - Well over half, 57% of SLT respondents, stated they sometimes had the opportunity to share practice and learning with colleagues from other establishments, this decreases to under half at 45% for the Staff respondents.

5.9 - Under two-thirds, 62% of SLT respondents and just over half, 51% of Staff respondents, stated they are frequently supported in engaging in professional learning.

5.10 - 44% of SLT respondents identified that GTCS standards are sometimes used to support professional dialogue, while this fell to 33% for Staff respondents. 43%, the highest response from Staff stated that they were used frequently, while 4% less of the SLT respondents at 39% answered accordingly.

*Table 2.7.5 CLPL Needs*

<b>5.7 To what extent are your CLPL needs being met</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Met to some extent</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>46</b>

5.7 - Nearly half of SLT respondents believed their CLPL needs were being met to some extent, this decreases slightly to just under half at 46% of Staff respondents.

## 2.8 CLPL - Narrative

A large majority of SLT respondents thought that CLPL was valued to a great extent in their establishment, whilst the majority of Staff thought so too, this was 18% less so for the latter group.

There were large differences between the two groups in the degrees of importance of CLPL in their establishment's policies, in that over half of the SLT group believed it to be very important, while less than a third of Staff thought so. Over a third of them, (the highest response) believed it to be of some importance.

A large majority of SLT respondents thought that CLPL was very focussed on classroom/playroom practice but this fell to considerably less than half of the Staff respondents.

Almost a half of SLT respondents think that CLPL is focussed on building leadership capacity, but this dropped to approximately a quarter of Staff respondents. Less than half of both groups stated that it was focussed to some extent.

Just over two-thirds of SLT respondents think their establishment frequently provides time for CLPL while there is a considerable drop in the Staff response rate who think the same. Their highest response, considerably less than half, believe it happens sometimes.

Two-thirds of SLT respondents stated that their establishments sometimes share its learning with colleagues from other establishments, with a much smaller proportion of Staff responding the same. Almost a fifth of both groups identified that it happened frequently.

Well over a half (SLT) and under a half (Staff) of both groups of respondents thought they were sometimes given opportunities to share practice and learning with colleagues from other establishments. This figure dropped considerably for both groups who said it happened frequently.

Well over half of SLT respondents felt they were frequently supported to engage in professional learning, while just over half of Staff respondents felt the same. A third of both groups thought they were sometimes supported in that endeavour.

Less than half of SLT respondents identified that GTCS standards are sometimes used to support professional dialogue, while a third of Staff thought the same. However, more of the latter group thought that it happened frequently.

Nearly half and just under half of SLT and Staff respondents respectively, believed their CLPL needs were being met to some extent.

## 2.9 Leadership – Aggregated Data

Table 2.9.1 Leadership Roles and Opportunities

Questions 6.1 – 6.4, 6.6 – 6.7	SLT		Staff	
	Frequently %	Sometimes %	Frequently %	Sometimes %
6.1 How frequently do senior staff delegate challenging tasks to classroom/playroom staff (you)	29	52	27	48
6.2 How frequently do senior staff take a lead on improvement priorities	80	18	67	21
6.3 How frequently are classroom/playroom staff (you) given opportunities to take on leadership roles	72	26	38	38
6.4 How frequently are pupils given opportunities to take on leadership roles	53	40	46	41
6.6 How frequently do classroom/playroom staff in your establishment provide/lead professional learning for colleagues in other establishments	16	56	16	36
6.7 How frequently are you given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith your establishment	21	45	8	26
<b>Mean</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>

6.1 - Just over half, 52%, of SLT respondents stated that sometimes senior staff delegated challenging tasks to them, compared to just under half, 48%, of Staff respondents.

6.2 - Four fifths, 80%, of SLT identified that senior staff frequently take a lead on improvement priorities, while just over two-thirds, 67%, of Staff respondents answered similarly.

6.3 - 72% of SLT respondents answered that they are frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles and this response almost halved from the Staff group, at 38%.

6.4 - Over half, 53%, of SLT and under half, 46%, of Staff respondents thought that pupils were frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles, with 40% and 41% respectively stating that sometimes pupils were given such opportunities.

6.6 - 56% of SLT respondents thought that classroom/playroom staff in their establishment sometimes provided/led professional learning for other colleagues in other establishments, while this dropped to 36% for the Staff respondents.

6.7 - Under half, 45%, of SLT respondents stated that they were sometimes given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith their own establishment, this decreased to 26% for the Staff respondents.

*Table 2.9.2 Leadership Support*

<b>6.5 How effective is the support from senior management for staff taking on leadership/improvement roles</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Very effective</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>35</b>

6.5 - Over half, 55%, of SLT respondents thought that the support from senior management was very effective for staff taking on leadership/improvement roles. There is a 20% disparity in the response from the Staff grouping at just over a third, 35%.

*Table 2.9.3 Management of Establishment*

<b>6.8 How much do you agree with the statement: "My establishment is well led and well managed"</b>	<b>SLT %</b>	<b>Staff %</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>

6.8 - 60% of SLT respondents strongly agreed that their establishment is well led and well managed, compared to 40% of the Staff respondents.

## 2.10 Leadership - Narrative

Approximately half of both groups of respondents stated that senior staff sometimes delegated challenging tasks to them and there were broadly similar results from both groups of those who said it happened frequently (almost a third).

The vast majority of SLT respondents stated that senior staff frequently take a lead on improvement priorities, with over two-thirds of Staff answering the same. On average a fifth of both groups think it happens sometimes.

The great majority of SLT respondents believe they are frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles, however, there is a considerable drop in the proportion of Staff, (almost half of the SLT response rate), who think the same. Proportionately, an equal amount of Staff believe it happens sometimes.

Approximately half, on average, of SLT and Staff respondents, thought that pupils were frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles, with broadly similar results from those who thought it happened sometimes.

Over a half of the SLT respondents thought that classroom/playroom staff in their establishment sometimes provided/led professional learning for colleagues in other establishments. This was much less true of Staff, (approximately a third). Both had the same low response rate for it happening frequently.

Nearly half of SLT respondents stated they were sometimes given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith their own establishment, this was less true for Staff (approximately a quarter). These figures more than halved for those [SLT] who stated they were frequently given such opportunities and an even lower proportion of Staff who said it happened frequently.

Over half the SLT respondents believed the support from senior management from staff taking on leadership/improvement roles was very effective, which varies with approximately a third of Staff who agreed.

Well over half of SLT respondents strongly agree their establishment is well led and well managed. Well under half of Staff respondents think the same.

## 3 Narrative Summary of Key Highlights

---

### 3.1 Enquiry and Reflection

It is encouraging that both SLT and Staff, as a staff, frequently talk about their teaching and review their classroom practice. However, what is not nearly as frequent is the encouragement to learn and share practice with colleagues from other establishments. Similarly, while working collaboratively in each other's classrooms using enquiry takes place, more often for SLT, it is much less frequent than talking about the quality of teaching or self-review of classroom practice.

It is heartening that establishments appear to be frequently monitoring the impact of changes they introduce, but perceptions differ between SLT and Staff as to how frequently that occurs.

Whilst the responses from both groups of participants, just over half, were closer in relation to professional learning being used to reflect and improve practice, it is of some concern that this is only to some extent rather than to a great extent.

There is a skills and confidence base amongst both groups of participants to undertake professional learning through enquiry, however the majority of both groups identify that they do not have all or most of the skills to do so or are very confident in this regard.

### 3.2 Planning

The majority of both groups believe their establishment's annual improvement plan reflects its longer-term aims to a major extent and that the process and written plan are equally important. However, in both cases this is only by a small majority.

While the majority of both groups are extremely familiar with their establishment's improvement priorities, this is much less so for Staff.

SLT and Staff are frequently involved in reviewing and modifying their establishment's plans, however, there is quite a lot of disparity and this widens considerably in terms of opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for their establishments. Both

groups have opportunities to help shape the curriculum with colleagues, parents and partners, but it is not happening frequently, it is more likely to happen sometimes.

Collaborative planning is taking place, but more commonly happening sometimes rather than frequently, say both groups and much less frequently for Staff. Collaborative working to take forward improvement is also happening with variations in degrees of effectiveness according to participants, with SLT believing it to be more effective than Staff.

There is appropriate support for planning, preparation and assessment but there are variations in how frequently the participants receive it with the highest number of both saying it happens sometimes, although there is not a lot of difference between and within the groups of those who receive it frequently.

SLT are very involved in their establishment's strategies for raising attainment for all. However, there is a considerable gap in Staff who are, even although it was the highest response rate from them. This might mean that they are not very involved in planning or development of the strategies rather than a lack of involvement in the practice of raising attainment for all.

### 3.3 Involvement

Proportionally more SLT than Staff believe Parent Council Members are sometimes involved in working together with staff to decide future directions for their establishments; although approximately a third of both groups believe it happens frequently.

**External** - establishments are making use of external support for improvement and to create more equitable outcomes for children and young people, but it's more likely to happen sometimes rather than frequently.

**Staff Views** - there is a vast difference between the participants in terms of their respective views being taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions are made. A large majority of SLT believe their views are taken into consideration frequently, while less than a third of Staff believe this to be true. A little over a third of them think it happens sometimes.

**Parents` Views** - parental engagement in their child`s learning is taking place, with variations in the effectiveness of arrangements to achieve it; the majority of SLT think it`s effective to some extent, but this is less true of the Staff group.

**Children and Young Peoples` Views** – they are involved in talking about and planning their learning, with variations in the degree of involvement, with proportionally more SLT believing they have some involvement.

### 3.4 CLPL

**Value** - CLPL is valued to a great extent in establishments. The extent to which depends on the respondent`s position; with just over half of Staff participants believing it to be so. It is also important in working out establishment`s policies, similarly the level of importance depends on the respondent`s position, with proportionately far more SLT than Staff thinking it very important.

**Focus** - CLPL is focussed on classroom/playroom practice and building leadership capacity, however, there are wide differences between the views of SLT and Staff who think it to be very focussed and focussed to some extent, with both groups believing it to be more focussed on classroom/playroom practice rather than leadership capacity.

**Time, Support and Needs** - the majority of SLT believe they are frequently given time and support for professional learning. Proportionately much less Staff believe so. Although regarding support, the highest percentage for Staff, just over 50% believe it happens frequently. SLT and Staff have broadly similar views on the extent to which their needs are being met, with both (less than half) answering they are met to some extent.

**Sharing Learning** - shared learning is taking place by establishments and individuals [SLT and Staff], but it`s not happening particularly frequently. It`s more likely to happen sometimes by both establishments and SLT, rather than by Staff.

GTCS Standards are being used to support professional dialogue, but less than half of both groups stated that it was happening frequently.

### 3.5 Leadership

Senior staff are delegating challenging tasks to other practitioners, but it's more likely to happen sometimes rather than frequently. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the majority of participants responded that senior staff frequently take a lead on improvement priorities.

Practitioners, other than senior leaders, are being given opportunities to take on leadership roles, however, this is far less frequent for Staff than SLT. Proportionately much less Staff than SLT believe that the support from senior management for Staff taking on leadership/improvement roles is very effective.

Well over half of SLT respondents strongly agree their establishment is well led and well managed. Well under half of Staff respondents think the same, which means that a substantial amount of both groups of practitioners don't strongly agree with this statement.

**Children and young people** are being given opportunities for leadership roles either frequently or sometimes.

**Leadership in sharing learning** - the provision or leading learning in other establishments is taking place but not frequently.

**Opportunities for Leadership outwith establishment** - practitioners are being given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith their establishments, but it is more likely to happen sometimes for SLT rather than Staff. It seldom happens frequently.

## 4 Cross-cutting Conditions for Change: Implications for the West Partnership

---

### 4.1 Context for Change

#### **Response Rates**

The response rates cannot and do not represent the total population of pre-school, primary and secondary practitioners in the eight local authorities. However, 1,730 is not an insignificant number per se and gives us a useful insight into practitioner views, activities and practices and implications for how the West Partnership might be able to lead change, in enabling and promoting collaborative working within and between a variety of education establishments, systems and cultures. It could be the case that the Partnership will want to drill down into the discrete sections in order to influence or inform the activities of individual workstreams. However, the overall results and summary of such, provides a useful opportunity to identify cross-cutting themes which may be used to inform strategic thinking, to underpin the learning system and to move and share the `learning` around and across the workstreams.

The `clustered` responses in each of the sections indicate a stronger tendency, albeit low, for SLT participants to answer `frequently`, rather than `sometimes`; this is perhaps unsurprising given their roles. However, what is of note is that the aggregated clustered response means, apart from in the Enquiry and Reflection Section, never rise above 50%, with the highest `frequently` response for SLT at 48% and 35% for Staff. However, caution must be emphasised in `interpreting` these results. Comparing and contrasting the responses of both groups is only for indicative purposes, because they cannot be used to show any statistical significance.

#### **Demographic**

We can note from the demographic information provided by the participants in the survey, over four-fifths of SLT respondents are Head-teachers, Officers in charge or Heads of Centre and their equivalent Deputies. They are predominantly female and most likely to be in the 41-55 age range and work full-time. They are more likely to have a non-acting role in the establishment and been there for at least a year to more

than 10; over half of SLT have been in their establishment for more than five years and a third for over ten years.

Whereas Staff are more likely to be Class Teachers, with a large minority being Principal Teachers, predominantly female and most likely to be between the ages of 26-50, with the majority 45 or under and working full-time. They are most likely to be permanent in their establishment and to have been there for at least a year to more than 10; over half of Staff have been in their establishment for more than five years and a third for over ten years.

## 4.2 Capacity for Change

**Collaborative Working** - collaborative working is taking place; with colleagues using enquiry within classrooms, it's happening by practitioners sharing learning and practice outwith their own establishments and it has a role to play in planning. **However, it does not appear to be widespread and offers an opportunity for development.**

**Sharing learning and practice – internally and externally;** while there is a baseline of collaboration, encouragement and opportunities for sharing learning and practice, particularly externally, **are more likely to be experienced by SLT.**

The majority of SLT respondents stated that their establishments sometimes share its learning with colleagues from other establishments, with a much smaller proportion of Staff responding the same. **However, it is not happening frequently for either group.**

It could mean that SLT have a more strategic perspective of such developments, whereas Staff might not be aware of such. Either way, there is scope for development.

**Skills and confidence in professional learning through enquiry** - while over half of participants report engaging in professional learning to reflect and improve their practice, it is only to some extent. This is of **some concern in that almost half report that professional learning is limited in its impact on their practice.**

Almost **half of the SLT group believe they have most, or all the self-identified skills required for professional learning through enquiry,** it does mean over half

**do not.** Nearly half of the Staff respondents say **they possess some such skills.** **Neither group would appear to be particularly confident in this undertaking.**

It would be interesting to unpick this to gain a better understanding what skills respondents believe are required for this and a role for the Partnership (and others) in developing those skills and confidence to acquire them. Additionally, it could look at ways to cascade the enquiry skills held by SLT to Staff, moving expertise and skills around the system.

There is a considerable amount of capacity building opportunities for the West Partnership (and partners), to influence the nature and type of collaboration which takes place; to increase both individual and collective agency and increase the number of staff involved within and between establishments. This could also include identifying and sharing the models of collaborative enquiry which are most effective.

### **Involvement – decision making and staff views**

Given the differences in roles played by SLT and Staff it is not surprising that **they have differing views on types and levels of involvement in planning, monitoring and (self) evaluation.** However, the **disparity between the SLT and Staff responses to how frequently their respective views are taken into consideration** by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made might indicate Staff are not actively involved in developing strategies **or** being consulted on their views.

In driving forward improvement, there could be an opportunity for the West Partnership (and others) to share and develop best practice in the empowerment of practitioners to create a readiness and increased capacity for change, which would include systems in place for monitoring the impact of changes, with clear guidance on measures of impact, in addition to more inclusive practices for Staff involvement in planning and decision making processes.

### 4.3 (What) Counts for Change - Improvement and Attainment?

#### **Priorities and Strategies for Improvement and Attainment: Staff and Leadership**

Most of all respondents are very familiar with their establishment's improvement priorities, however, **much fewer Staff are frequently involved in agreeing priorities for their establishments.** The vast majority of SLT respondents stated that senior staff frequently take a lead on improvement priorities, with over two-thirds answering the same. On average a fifth of both groups think it happens sometimes. A large majority of SLT are very involved in their establishment's strategies for raising attainment, **proportionately less than half the Staff are.** This could be a cause for concern, that **not all practitioners view it to be their responsibility to be very involved in this,** or it could be that they might not necessarily believe they're involved in the strategies, but are involved in the practices. Even so, the Partnership could have a role to play in getting the message across to senior management that raising attainment should be everyone's concern.

#### **Effectiveness of Collaborative Working – Improvement and External Input**

Under half of the respondents, the highest response rates from both groups showed that they thought **collaborative working was effective to some extent in taking forward improvement** in their establishments. Although, an equal proportion of SLT believed it to be very effective.

**External support for improvement is taking place,** with the SLT having more knowledge of it than the Staff respondents. **External partnerships are taking place** - on average a third of both groups say it happens frequently.

It might be the case that SLT are more aware of external input due to their potentially more outward-facing roles, rather than over estimating external involvement.

There is a clear role for the West Partnership in getting the message to practitioners that improvement priorities and raising attainment are everyone's responsibility. However, that said, Staff could be given more opportunities to be more frequently involved in agreeing priorities for their establishments.

While there are positive responses in relation to collaborative working taking forward improvement in establishments, the West Partnership (and partners) might want to identify and consider the type of collaborative working which is most effective. Similarly, in relation to external partners and support for establishments it might want to consider the type of support that takes place, from whom, how effective it is and what support or opportunities could the Partnership provide to fill the gaps.

#### 4.4 Cooperation for Change

**Pupil and Parent Engagement** - establishments are working with parents to help shape the curriculum and or help shape the future direction of their establishments. However, **it doesn't appear, from most responses, to be happening frequently.**

**Effectiveness of Parental Engagement** - although many respondents think that their establishment's arrangements for engaging parents in their child's learning is effective to some extent, **a much smaller proportion of both groups believe it to be very effective.**

It seems clear that **children and young people are either sometimes or frequently asked for their views** before establishments make major changes.

The responses show that the majority of SLT thought children and young people had some involvement in talking about and planning their learning, this was also true, but to a lesser extent, for Staff. This is disappointing in that Staff **are not at least as aware as SLT about whether children and young people are involved in planning their learning.**

**Children and young people are being given opportunities to take on leadership roles often frequently.** The nature and impact of those roles could be worthy of exploration.

The Partnership (and partners) would seem well-placed to identify and share the best practices that take place in parental/family engagement and particularly in engaging parents in children and young people's learning. Similarly, in terms of pupil engagement and involvement, it could provide opportunities for identifying key learning and showcasing best practice in different types of successful practice.

## 4.5 CLPL for Change

**Type, purpose and support** - while CLPL is clearly valued by both groups of respondents; there is a **considerable difference in the extent to which it is**. If we consider this in conjunction with the responses to **the extent to which professional learning enables reflection and improvement in practice**, it is somewhat concerning.

This is also a major difference between the groups in their perspective of how important CLPL is in working out establishment policies; with a small majority of SLT believing it to be very important, compared to approximately a third of Staff.

**Focus on, Time for and Needs of CLPL** - the majority of SLT believe it to be very focussed on classroom practice, but this isn't so for Staff, nor do the majority of Staff think that it is very focussed on building leadership capacity. This begs the question, **what is it focussed on?**

**There is a large gap between the SLT and Staff who think that their establishments frequently provides time for CLPL.** The latter are more inclined to say it sometimes happens. It could be the case that those SLT are the people responsible for organisational policy on, and practice in, CLPL, therefore, they are more likely to have a positive perspective. However, there is such a discrepancy, even allowing for the limitations of the response rate, that it could be worthy of further exploration.

There is less difference in views on CLPL needs being met with **under half of all participants saying their CLPL needs were being met to some extent. It is of some concern therefore, that so many feel their CLPL needs are not being met.**

**Support for Professional Learning** - both SLT and Staff are supported to engage in professional learning, with proportionately more SLT reporting that happens on a frequent basis. Although, it does mean that **a substantial minority of both groups believe it happens infrequently.**

**Support for Planning, Preparation and Assessment** - most respondents sometimes or frequently receive the appropriate support for planning, preparation and assessment.

**Support for Professional Dialogue** - GTC Standards are being used to support professional dialogue, it would appear more frequently by Staff. The open question highlighted that other professional standards could be used in professional dialogue from the Early Years Centres/Nursery /Additional Support Needs Staff participants, e.g. SSSC Standard for Childhood Practice.

There is an opportunity for the West Partnership (and partners) to provide clearer focus on the importance of developing and embedding CLPL in establishment policies. It could offer guidance on the purpose of CLPL, raise the profile of CLPL within establishments and consider the potential CLPL needs of different types of practitioners. This would enable activities, guidance or support to be geared towards individual practitioners/target groups or establishments, providing opportunity and space for professional dialogue at all levels of the system.

#### 4.6 Collective Leadership for Change

**Leadership within establishment** - Although senior staff do delegate challenging tasks to SLT and Staff, on average half the participants stated it's happening sometimes. While the **great majority of SLT are frequently given opportunities to take on leadership roles, the same is much less true for Staff.**

Over half of SLT believed they received very effective support from the senior management for taking on leadership/improvement roles, but only a little over a third of Staff agreed. This is perhaps unsurprising if Staff have not been given the opportunities in the first place.

**In terms of establishments being well led and well managed, there is a 20% disparity between the respondents who strongly agree with this.**

**Leadership outwith establishment** - Providing or leading professional learning for colleagues in other establishments is happening sometimes, but not very frequently and it's happening more often for SLT than Staff. Proportionately far more SLT were

sometimes or frequently given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith their own establishments.

There is a considerable opportunity for the Partnership (and partners) to influence or take a `leadership of change` approach in using these results, whilst being mindful of the limitations of the sample population responses. Apart from unpicking the data itself, the partnership could explore the differences between leadership and management and corresponding attitudes, attributes, behaviours, competences and skills required in both. There is an opportunity for the Partnership to lead the leaders and share models of effective leadership, to explore and discuss the potential for a range of leadership roles and how to develop those.

Additionally, the demographic information provided by the participants, allowing for the limitations of sample population responses, indicates that a substantial amount of SLT individuals might be heading towards retirement in the next five years or so, which could be both a challenge (for the sector) and an opportunity in terms of education workforce development; the West Partnership could harness that knowledge and experience to inform different leadership levels and organisational systems. In addition, **there would seem to be a substantial amount of Staff, with considerable experience on the job, who for a variety of reasons may not wish to be in a promoted post but might be willing to take on a formal or informal leadership role.** If their knowledge, experience and skills are not utilised effectively then this could represent a sunk asset to the sector.

#### 4.7 Conclusion for Change

There are many positives to draw on in terms of review of practice, active collaboration taking place; being used for planning and enquiry and in conjunction with internal and external colleagues. Similarly, there is a foundation for change through the existence of enquiry skills, planning, involvement of SLT in setting priorities for improvement and attainment and support for professional learning. However, it would appear in many instances these do not apply to the majority, are not widespread and may only be happening sometimes, rather than frequently. Similarly, there are often wide variations between SLT and Staff perspectives, particularly around involvement in

decision making, parental engagement, value of CLPL and opportunities for leadership roles within and outwith establishments.

Given the previously mentioned caveats for this research, caution is needed in interpreting the results. The limitations of the survey highlight the need to augment this data with evidence from other aspects to the external and internal evaluation strands.

However, the findings do provide a useful baseline to monitor shifts in the key question areas. Furthermore, the results offer helpful insights regarding areas in which the Partnership might want to explore, strategically, with other partners and operationally through the individual workstreams. The West Partnership is well-placed to act as a conduit to create the conditions for successful change to improve outcomes for children and young people, by brokering activity, leading conversations to challenge assumptions and share different perspectives and practices across schools and local authorities. Whilst it may not be able to easily change workloads or directly change working times, it can act as a change agent to influence thinking and ways of working differently; a fundamental aspect of this will be to leverage change, using `high-leverage` activities, to build capacity at all levels of the learning system.

In sum, it would appear there is a distance to travel before optimal conditions for change are realised and an `ecology of equity within, between and beyond school`, achieved, (Ainscow, 2015)<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ainscow, M. (2015). *Struggles for Equity in Education: The selected works of Mel Ainscow*. London: Routledge.

## Appendix 1 - Key Highlights on Enquiry and Reflection

### Summary of Responses on Enquiry and Reflection

Both participating SLT and Staff respondents were asked a series of questions surrounding Enquiry and Reflection. This section will highlight the responses to these questions from both SLT and Staff.

**Table 2.1 Talking about the quality of teaching**

As a staff, we talk about the quality of our teaching	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	-	-	6	1
Rarely	5	1	29	3
Sometimes	106	17	228	21
Frequently	<b>498</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>843</b>	<b>76</b>
Don't know	4	1	6	1
Total	613	100	1112	100

**Table 2.2 Monitoring the impact of changes**

As an establishment, we monitor the impact of changes we introduce	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	2	<1	10	1
Rarely	9	2	67	6
Sometimes	105	17	302	27
Frequently	<b>495</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>63</b>
Don't know	3	1	38	3
Total	614	100	1112	100

**Table 2.3 Reviewing classroom practice**

Classroom/Playroom (I) staff review their (my) own classroom practice	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	-	-	1	<1
Rarely	6	1	1	<1
Sometimes	142	23	70	6
Frequently	<b>457</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1033</b>	<b>93</b>
Don't know/Not Yet	9	2	3	<1
Total	614	100	1108	100

**Table 2.4 Encouraged to learn and share**

I am encouraged to learn and share practice with colleagues from other establishments	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	3	1	35	3
Rarely	38	6	160	14
Sometimes	250	41	<b>505</b>	<b>46</b>
Frequently	<b>318</b>	<b>52</b>	387	35
Don't know/Not Yet	4	1	23	2
Total	613	100	1110	100

**Table 2.5 Professional learning**

Does your professional learning enable you to reflect and improve your practice	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
No, not at all	-	-	11	1
Yes, to a little extent	27	4	126	11
Yes, to some extent	<b>330</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>52</b>
Yes, to a great extent	258	42	402	36
Total	615	100	1112	100

**Table 2.6 Skills to undertake professional learning**

Do you have the skills to undertake professional learning through enquiry	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
I have none of these skills	-	-	16	1
I have a few skills	49	8	140	13
I have some of these skills	267	44	<b>528</b>	<b>48</b>
I have most/all of the skills	<b>297</b>	<b>49</b>	427	38
Total	613	100	1111	100

**Table 2.7 Confidence in undertaking professional learning**

How confident would you be in undertaking professional learning through enquiry	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all confident	11	2	69	6
A little confident	92	15	327	29
Somewhat confident	<b>315</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>42</b>
Very confident	196	32	255	23
Total	614	100	1113	100

**Table 2.8 Staff working collaboratively**

Classroom/playroom staff in my establishment (I) work collaboratively in each others' (my colleagues) classrooms using enquiry	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	39	6	121	11
Rarely	127	21	222	20
Sometimes	<b>298</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>39</b>
Frequently	129	21	250	23
Don't know/Not Yet	19	3	86	8
Total	612	100	1112	100

## Appendix 2 - Key Highlights on Planning

### Summary of Responses on Planning

Both participating SLT and Staff respondents were asked a series of questions surrounding Planning. The tables below detail the frequency and percentage of responses from both SLT and Staff for each question asked.

**Table 3.1 Establishment's Annual Improvement Plan**

To what extent does your establishment's annual improvement plan reflect its longer-term aims	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Improvement plan does not include longer-term aims	10	2	15	2
Improvement plan includes longer-term aims to a small extent	39	7	49	5
Improvement plan includes longer-term aims to some extent	205	36	330	33
Improvement plan includes longer-term aims to a major extent	<b>307</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>52</b>
Don't know	6	1	80	8
Total	567	100	987	100

**Table 3.2 Establishment's Process of Planning**

Which of the following statements is closest to your establishment in relation to planning	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
The process of planning is more important than the written plan	230	41	224	23
The process of planning and the written plan are equally important	<b>301</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>51</b>
The written plan is more important than the process of planning	22	4	126	13
Don't know	14	3	133	14
Total	567	100	984	100

**Table 3.3 Familiarity with Establishment's Improvement Priorities**

How familiar are you (classroom/playroom staff) with your establishment's improvement priorities	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not familiar at all with priorities	2	<1	12	1
A little familiar with priorities	8	1	64	7
Some familiarity with priorities	164	29	367	37
Extremely familiar with priorities	<b>391</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>53</b>
Not yet familiar with priorities	2	<1	22	2
Total	567	100	984	100

**Table 3.4 Involvement with Establishment's Plans**

How frequently are you (classroom/playroom staff) involved in reviewing and modifying your establishment's plans	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	3	1	49	5
Rarely	18	3	97	10
Sometimes	232	41	380	39
Frequently	<b>308</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>41</b>
Not involved yet	6	1	61	6
Total	567	100	988	100

**Table 3.5 Collaborative Planning**

How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) plan collaboratively	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	4	1	64	7
Rarely	32	6	188	19
Sometimes	<b>279</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>42</b>
Frequently	247	44	300	30
Not yet	5	1	25	3
Total	567	100	988	100

**Table 3.6 Opportunities to be Involved**

How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) have opportunities to be involved in agreeing priorities for your establishment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	6	1	81	8
Rarely	18	3	155	16
Sometimes	217	38	<b>405</b>	<b>41</b>
Frequently	<b>318</b>	<b>56</b>	298	30
Not yet/don't know	7	1	47	5
Total	566	100	986	100

**Table 3.7 Role in Establishment's Self-Evaluation**

How would you characterise your role in the establishment's on- going self-evaluation	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
No role	1	<1	44	5
Minor role	36	6	401	41
Substantial role	162	29	<b>409</b>	<b>42</b>
Leading/key role	<b>361</b>	<b>64</b>	90	9
No role as yet	6	1	40	4
Total	566	100	984	100

**Table 3.8 Effectiveness of Collaborative Working**

How effective is collaborative working across your establishment in taking forward improvement	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all effective	2	<1	29	3
Effective to a small extent	27	5	147	15
Effective to some extent	<b>266</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>43</b>
Very effective	263	47	306	31
We don't do collaborative working	2	<1	11	1
Don't know	6	1	69	7
Total	566	100	986	100

**Table 3.9 Frequency of Support for Planning**

How frequently do you receive the appropriate support for planning, preparation and assessment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	7	1	52	5
Rarely	34	6	126	13
Sometimes	<b>260</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>40</b>
Frequently	256	46	389	40
Not yet	4	1	21	2
Total	561	100	984	100

**Table 3.10 Opportunities to Shape Curriculum**

How frequently do you (classroom/playroom staff) have opportunities to help shape the curriculum through discussions with colleagues, parents and partners	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	5	1	43	4
Rarely	41	7	141	14
Sometimes	<b>299</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>43</b>
Frequently	216	38	350	36
Not yet/Don't know	5	1	32	3
Total	566	100	987	100

**Table 3.11 Involvement in Strategies**

How involved are you in the establishment's strategies for raising attainment for all	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not involved	3	1	38	4
A little involved	10	2	125	13
Some involvement	59	10	362	37
Very involved	<b>490</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>42</b>
Not involved yet	6	1	47	5
Total	568	100	988	100

## Appendix 3 - Key Highlights on Involvement

### Summary of Responses on Involvement

Both participating SLT and Staff respondents were asked a series of questions surrounding Involvement. The tables below detail the frequency and percentage of responses from both SLT and Staff for each question asked.

**Table 4.1 Involvement of Children and Young People**

How frequently are children and you people asked for their views before your establishment makes major changes	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	5	1	19	2
Rarely	23	4	69	7
Sometimes	<b>266</b>	<b>48</b>	384	41
Frequently	250	46	<b>402</b>	<b>43</b>
Don't know	6	1	60	6
Total	550	100	934	100

**Table 4.2 Involvement of Parents**

How frequently are parents' views taken into consideration when changes are made to the curriculum	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	3	1	26	3
Rarely	44	8	95	10
Sometimes	<b>304</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>37</b>
Frequently	185	34	330	35
Don't know	13	2	139	15
Total	549	100	934	100

**Table 4.3 Involvement of Parent Council Members**

How frequently do Parent Council members and staff work together to decide future directions for your establishment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	12	2	34	4
Rarely	48	9	75	8
Sometimes	<b>246</b>	<b>45</b>	228	25
Frequently	173	32	<b>294</b>	<b>32</b>
Don't know	38	7	266	29
Don't currently have a Parent Council	33	6	35	4
Total	550	100	932	100

**Table 4.4 Involvement of External Support**

How frequently does your establishment make use of external support for improvement (e.g. local authority officers, advisors, university colleagues and/or consultants)	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	4	1	10	1
Rarely	42	8	78	8
Sometimes	<b>281</b>	<b>51</b>	306	33
Frequently	202	37	<b>318</b>	<b>34</b>
Don't know	22	4	221	24
Total	551	100	933	100

**Table 4.5 Involvement of External Partnerships**

How frequently does your establishment work with third sector and/or business partnerships to create more equitable outcomes for children and young people	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	7	1	10	1
Rarely	70	13	85	9
Sometimes	<b>247</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>40</b>
Frequently	204	37	274	29
Don't know	23	4	195	21
Total	551	100	932	100

**Table 4.6 Effectiveness of Parental Engagement**

How effective is your establishment's arrangements for engaging parents in their child's learning	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all effective	8	2	28	3
Effective to a small extent	60	11	126	14
Effective to some extent	<b>347</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>45</b>
Very effective	130	24	282	30
Don't know	6	1	75	8
Total	551	100	932	100

**Table 4.7 Involvement of Children and Young People in Learning**

How involved are children and young people in talking about and planning their learning	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not involved	5	1	14	2
Little involvement	34	6	90	10
Some involvement	<b>325</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>48</b>
Very involved	182	33	362	39
Don't know	4	1	23	3
Total	550	100	933	100

**Table 4.8 Involvement of Staff Views**

How frequently are classroom/playroom staff's (your) views taken into consideration by the senior leadership team before major decisions/changes are made	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	5	1	66	7
Rarely	14	3	168	18
Sometimes	106	19	<b>363</b>	<b>39</b>
Frequently	<b>418</b>	<b>76</b>	291	31
Don't know/Not yet	8	2	46	5
Total	557	100	934	100

## Appendix 4 - Key Highlights on Career Long Professional Learning

### Summary of Responses on Career Long Professional Learning

Both participating SLT and Staff respondents were asked a series of questions surrounding Career Long Professional Learning (CLPL). The tables below detail the frequency and percentage of responses from both SLT and Staff for each question asked.

**Table 5.1 Value of CLPL in Establishment**

To what extent is CLPL valued in your establishment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all valued	7	1	21	2
Valued to a little extent	15	3	67	7
Valued to some extent	128	24	281	31
Valued to a great extent	<b>382</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>53</b>
Don't know	7	1	60	7
Total	539	100	914	100

**Table 5.2 Importance of CLPL in Establishment's Policies**

How important is CLPL in working out your establishment policies	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not important	6	1	29	3
Little importance	18	3	79	9
Some importance	206	38	<b>335</b>	<b>37</b>
Very important	<b>282</b>	<b>52</b>	265	29
Don't know	26	5	205	23
Total	538	100	913	100

**Table 5.3 Focus of CLPL**

To what extent is CLPL focused on classroom/playroom practice	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not focussed	6	1	22	2
Focussed to a little extent	8	2	68	8
Focussed to some extent	156	29	327	36
Very focussed	<b>359</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>41</b>
Don't know	10	2	123	14
Total	539	100	912	100

**Table 5.4 Focus of CLPL**

To what extent is CLPL focussed on building leadership capacity	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not focussed	6	1	37	4
Focussed to a little extent	23	4	94	10
Focussed to some extent	225	42	<b>394</b>	<b>43</b>
Very focussed	<b>275</b>	<b>45</b>	220	24
Don't know	10	2	170	19
Total	539	100	915	100

**Table 5.5 Time Provision for CLPL**

How often does your establishment provide time for CLPL	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	6	1	24	3
Rarely	15	3	112	12
Sometimes	146	27	<b>353</b>	<b>39</b>
Frequently	<b>362</b>	<b>67</b>	333	36
Don't know	10	2	92	10
Total	539	100	914	100

**Table 5.6 Shared Learning**

How often does your establishment share its learning with colleagues from other establishments	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	10	2	29	3
Rarely	63	12	159	17
Sometimes	<b>357</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>45</b>
Frequently	104	19	176	19
Don't know	6	1	142	16
Total	540	100	913	100

**Table 5.7 CLPL Needs**

To what extent are your CLPL needs being met	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all	8	2	53	6
Met to a little extent	38	7	119	13
Met to some extent	<b>262</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>46</b>
Met to a major extent	229	43	275	30
Not yet	1	<1	42	5
Total	538	100	911	100

**Table 5.8 Opportunity to Share with Colleagues**

To what extent are you given the opportunity to share practice and learning with colleagues from other establishments	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	5	1	79	9
Rarely	56	10	218	24
Sometimes	<b>307</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>45</b>
Frequently	170	31	152	17
Not yet	2	1	54	6
Total	541	100	915	100

**Table 5.9 Support in Professional Learning**

To what extent are you supported to engage in professional learning	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	4	1	26	3
Rarely	22	4	96	11
Sometimes	175	33	302	33
Frequently	<b>335</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>51</b>
Not yet	1	<1	21	2
Total	537	100	914	100

**Table 5.10 GTCS Standards Support**

To what extent are GTCS standards used to support professional dialogue	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	9	2	29	3
Rarely	40	7	83	9
Sometimes	<b>236</b>	<b>44</b>	302	33
Frequently	213	39	<b>390</b>	<b>43</b>
Don't know	43	8	109	12
Total	541	100	913	100

## Appendix 5 - Key Highlights on Leadership

### Summary of Responses on Leadership

Both participating SLT and Staff respondents were asked a series of questions surrounding Leadership. The tables below detail the frequency and percentage of responses from both SLT and Staff for each question asked.

**Table 6.1 Leadership Delegation**

How frequently do senior staff delegate challenging tasks to classroom/playroom staff (you)	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	6	1	59	7
Rarely	41	8	119	13
Sometimes	<b>318</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>48</b>
Frequently	152	29	240	27
Don't know	12	2	46	5
Total	529	100	898	100

**Table 6.2 Leadership and Improvement Priorities**

How frequently do senior staff take a lead on improvement priorities	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	1	<1	9	1
Rarely	6	1	33	4
Sometimes	95	18	189	21
Frequently	<b>421</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>67</b>
Don't know	6	1	66	7
Total	529	100	902	100

**Table 6.3 Leadership Opportunities for Staff**

How frequently are classroom/playroom staff (you) given opportunities to take on leadership roles	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	1	<1	38	4
Rarely	6	1	117	13
Sometimes	136	26	342	38
Frequently	<b>382</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>38</b>
Don't know	4	1	58	6
Total	529	100	901	100

**Table 6.4 Leadership Opportunities for Pupils**

How frequently are pupils given opportunities to take on leadership roles	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	3	1	7	1
Rarely	29	6	60	7
Sometimes	208	40	368	41
Frequently	<b>278</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>46</b>
Don't know	9	2	53	6
Total	527	100	896	100

**Table 6.5 Leadership Support**

How effective is the support from senior management for staff taking on leadership/improvement roles	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Not at all effective	3	1	44	5
Effective to a little extent	14	3	106	12
Effective to some extent	205	39	312	35
Very effective	<b>290</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>35</b>
Don't know	17	3	125	14
Total	529	100	901	100

**Table 6.6 Staff Providing Leadership/Professional Learning**

How frequently do classroom/playroom staff in your establishment provide/lead professional learning for colleagues in other establishments	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	19	4	59	7
Rarely	110	21	188	21
Sometimes	<b>298</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>36</b>
Frequently	82	16	141	16
Don't know	19	4	190	21
Total	528	100	900	100

**Table 6.7 Opportunities for Leadership Outwith Establishment**

How frequently are you given opportunities to undertake leadership roles outwith your establishment	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Never	42	8	207	23
Rarely	127	24	233	26
Sometimes	<b>235</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>26</b>
Frequently	109	21	73	8
Don't know	13	3	149	17
Total	526	100	897	100

**Table 6.8 Management of Establishment**

How much do you agree with the statement: "My establishment is well led and well managed"	SLT		Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Strongly disagree	9	2	55	6
Disagree	8	2	98	11
Agree	180	34	347	39
Strongly agree	<b>317</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>40</b>
Don't know	13	3	38	4
Total	527	100	901	100

## Appendix 6 - Narrative Summary of Open Question

---

41 STL and 78 Staff chose to answer the open question. However, these `results` must be treated with caution, in that in some instances they only reflect the views of a few individuals.

**SLT** - some of those who responded felt empowered to lead change and improve professional practice and outcomes for children and young people. However, there was a broad consensus among others that workload, time and staffing were the main barriers to working collaboratively, professional development and improving the quality of education.

Change was an additional issue for some of this group, with the pace and continual aspect of it mentioned. Their perception was that it had a negative impact on time to reflect, collaborate or try new approaches or practices. Although one respondent provided a positive response to this by suggesting the pace of change had been responded to by role development and training to take the improvement agenda forward.

Some respondents aspired to working collaboratively, either in ones` own school or beyond, but identified time as the main obstacle to achieving this, while one respondent suggested that a shift in mindset was required if it was to be achieved for all staff.

A few individuals mentioned support from their local authorities and another couple thought the questions were geared towards teachers, rather than early years practitioners.

**Staff** - broadly similar `themes` emerged from the Staff answers to the open question, with several Staff feeling that they were well supported and led, and in well managed establishments. Some also identified that they had good opportunities for learning and development, particularly to engage in CLPL. However, a few respondents did mention that some of this commitment was due to the individual rather than a leadership approach or management practice.

Some individuals observed that Senior Management lacked the necessary skills for leadership or that some were unable to lead or manage effectively due to policies or

bureaucracy, both national and local, which keep them tied up in e.g. report writing. This was characterised by some as a `top-down` approach. One respondent mentioned that this was even more difficult for them as a small establishment as it didn't have many management posts to deal with the paperwork.

Time and workload were also cited as the main barriers to trying new initiatives, improving the quality of education or working collaboratively. Although, some respondents did identify that they work collaboratively already, and others were about to embark on it.

A few individuals mentioned an overloaded curriculum, while some others suggested that subject specific developments should be prioritised.

Change was not as frequently mentioned by the Staff group, where it was, some individuals perceived it to be positive or would lead to positive outcomes. Conversely an equal number of respondents thought there was too much of it and it was happening too quickly without the relevant support.

What was cited more often was that some respondents felt `undervalued` because their skills and experience were being overlooked because they weren't seeking DHT or other promoted posts. This was mentioned a few times in relation to people who held Chartered Teacher status but was not confined to them. Overall, there was a feeling, even allowing for the small number of responses, of a `missed opportunity` to use or inform a wider range or levels of leadership or professional learning of colleagues.