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Since we were established in 1986, HOST has built an international reputation for bringing a fresh approach to market intelligence and policy research in education, employment, training and related studies. HOST has also built up a strong track record across the public sector for practically focused evaluation studies. Recent client organisations have included:

- Government Departments, including the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS - formerly DfES), the Office of Manpower Economics (OME), the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS formerly BERR), the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), the Home Office, and various other directly managed national and regional agencies, including a number of Regional Development Agencies (RDAs).

- HOST has held framework agreements for research and evaluation services for a number of years with several of these departments/agencies including the Skills Funding Agency (for Good Practice research; Operational Evaluation; Strategic Evaluation; Offender Learning; Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF); and Adult Learning) and for DWP (for Ageing and Pensions; General Labour Market Research; Integrating Employment and Skills and Welfare to Work Programme Evaluation). We also hold a joint DWP/HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) framework agreement for research and evaluation on Commissioning, Performance and Business Delivery.

- HOST has also worked extensively with non-departmental agencies in policy research, evaluation and programme review including for many years with the former Learning and Skills Council (LSC), the Learning and Skills Improvement Service (LSIS) formerly Quality Improvement Agency (QIA), The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA) and Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA), and a range of other education development and quality assurance bodies.

- Sector Skills Councils (SSCs), and Standard Setting Bodies (SSBs) - HOST has worked with the Sector Skills Development Agency (SSDA) to build SSCs’ research capacity and expertise.

- Non-governmental and voluntary organisations.

Outside the UK, HOST has worked since the mid 1990s in similar capacities, with the International Labour Office, European Commission and Cedefop among others. HOST’s work across all these clients is widely recognised as practical as well as authoritative. Our work programme has included numerous sector and cross-sector studies to inform policy developments, and enhance participation and the delivery of education and employment programmes.
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

In August 2010, the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) asked HOST Policy Research (HOST) to conduct the Phase 2 evaluation of the impact of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) which complements the Phase 1 academic evaluation which has recently been reported to ESRC.1 This report draws on the available evidence and follows an interim report of early observations presented in late November 2010.

1.2 Objectives and scope

The evaluation has focused specifically on a programme-level assessment of achieved impact on teaching and learning policy and professional practice. The application of TLRP outputs has been an important feature of the design and management of the programme, its activities, and the selection of funded activities across the Higher Education (HE) sector (as outlined in Section 2).

Set against these expectations and taking account of the focus of the parallel Phase 1 evaluation, the Phase 2 evaluation has aimed to provide:

a) An assessment of the extent to which TLRP has had an impact upon policy and practice in each (home) country of the United Kingdom (UK) and internationally.

b) An analysis of the ways in which the TLRP has achieved impact through its dissemination, networking and knowledge transfer activities.

c) An assessment of the value added to policy and practice impact by programme, organisation and management.2

This framework for the evaluation has been supplemented by a series of more specific research questions (Annex A).

Our focus has been not on what the TLRP investments has produced - which is a feature of the academic evaluation (Phase 1) - but on what evident differences it has made both to teaching and learning practice and to policy formation and implementation. To assess this, the evaluation has applied tracking back methods and we have sought to overcome recognised limitations in measuring impact by drawing on multiple evidence routes - as outlined below. The scope of the evaluation has included the full range of TLRP activity across the UK but excludes the separate technology-enhanced learning (TEL) strand which will not conclude until 2012.

---

1 The first phase academic evaluation conducted by a US team of Advance Design Information (ADI) evaluators led by Professor Baker, has conducted a near-parallel academic evaluation of the TLRP-focused on Scientific Quality and Academic Impact Evaluation.

2 ESRC have asked that the scope of reviewing objective c) should be limited to assessing generic lessons for 'value added' and especially those which might have wider application for ESRC and its stakeholders.
1.3 Approach and progress

The evaluation methodology has been conditioned by the need to meet ESRC’s very specific information needs on programme impact (see Annex A) and the requirement for an intensive review able to provide for this final report within five months. Its focus has been on harnessing programme documentation supplemented by, and combined, with highly focused fieldwork. This has involved five separate but inter-related stages which are summarised below.

- **Stage 1:** Project inception and planning - involving early discussions with ESRC and the ADI Evaluation Director to provide for the Evaluation Framework Plan (September 2010) and followed by staged review and monthly progress statements.

- **Stage 2:** Secondary research including systematic review of the End of Award (EoA) reports and referee comments, and other related documentation to provide for a project-level synthesis on self-assessed outcomes (Annex B). Programme-level interviews have also been conducted with the Programme Director (from 2002), and selected members of the Programme Direction team, Programme Advisory Board, and TLRP Steering Group, and with 20 selected (national) stakeholders.

- **Stage 3:** Principal Investigator (PI) and partner surveys - extending the documentary self-assessment evidence through two ‘front-line’ e-surveys focusing on impact. The first of these was conducted from late October, securing detailed feedback from nearly four out of five of all PIs (a 79 per cent response). The second, drew on PI identification of project-level stakeholders and proved to be small scale. It was conducted from early December 2010 using a customised e-questionnaire.

- **Stage 4:** Identification and conduct of in-depth project profiles: Six case studies of high impact TLRP projects and awards were selected in agreement with ESRC, two from Phase 2, two from Phase 3, one Scottish extension award and one Research Training Fellowship. These involved PIs in six different HEIs, and project collaborations involving 11 different universities in total (Annex C provides further details). Each of the major award case study included interviews with PIs and selected other team contributors including key partners - in December 2010 and early January 2011.

- **Stage 5:** Collation and reporting: This has provided for the monthly progress reports, the November 2010 interim report, a January draft final report, a draft and final revised report (February and March 2011) and this revised version prepared for publication (May 2011).

---

3 Annex B provided a cross-programme summary of impact evidence from secondary sources – predominantly end of award reports and for each project. This annex has been excluded from the published report to protect the confidentiality of those and other sources.

4 The selected projects were: Improving Effectiveness of Pupil Groups in the Classroom (Professor Blatchford, Institute of Education); Role of Awareness in Teaching and Learning of Literacy and Numeracy at KS2 (Professor Nunes, Oxford Brookes and Oxford University); Impact of Policy on Learning and Inclusion in New Learning and Skills System (Professor Coffield, Institute of Education and University of Sunderland; Learning in and for Inter-agency Working (Professor Daniels, University of Bath and Prof Anne Edwards, University of Oxford); Play, Learning and ICT in Pre-school Education (Professor Plowman, University of Stirling; and Using Lesson Study for Innovation, Development and Transfer of Pedagogic Approaches and Metapedagogy (Dr Dudley, University of Cambridge).
Further details of the methodological approach and a review of its effectiveness are set out in Annex D.

1.4 Structure of final report

This final report is structured in accordance with ESRC’s requirements and is set out in six sections which look at:

- Background to TLRP to provide a backcloth of programme activity, distribution, impact expectations and the policy and practice context (Section 2 supported by Annex E).
- A review of the available evidence on TLRP impact on policy and policy-makers and on professional practice, including awareness of the programme, utilisation and integration with other improvement initiatives (Section 3).
- An overview on the contribution of individual projects and other investments (Section 4).
- An overview on the contribution of programme organisation and its management to achieving impacts (Section 5).
- A concluding review of the impact achievements of TLRP and recommendations for ESRC and partners (Section 6).

The scope of the evaluation and the research questions and issues being addressed are set out in Annex A, while the systematic review of programme documentation (Annex B in report to ESRC) is reserved from publication. Further annexes are provided for the distribution of programme funding (Annex C), a summary of the evaluation methodology and a review of its effectiveness (Annex D); a summary of documented evidence on outputs (Annex E), and also a supporting glossary of terms (Annex F).
Section 2: Background to TLRP

2.1 Introduction

This section sets out the context for the impact assessment and evaluation of the TLRP.\(^5\) and considers the:

- Background to TLRP.
- Outputs and outcomes.
- Programme distribution.
- Programme impact objectives.

It also looks at the policy (and practice) context against which the impact expectations of the programme were set, and the key audiences for the programme and its outputs. This draws principally on TLRP programme documentation, management information, and stakeholder feedback.

2.2 Background to TLRP

TLRP was a £30 million initiative funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Department for Education and Skills (now the Department for Education), the Department for Employment and Learning Northern Ireland, the Department of Education Northern Ireland, the Scottish Government, and the Welsh Assembly and was managed by the ESRC on behalf of the co-funders. The Programme was established in 1999-2000 and is now concluded. TLRP was designed to support leading-edge research that would inform and enrich teaching and learning throughout the UK, and to address an identified sector-wide need to build research capacity in education within UK universities. TLRP can also be seen as part of a sector-wide response to the criticisms of regulatory bodies in the 1990s, when educational and pedagogical research was: ‘heavily criticised for being small scale, irrelevant, inaccessible and of low quality’.\(^6\)

HEFCE was subsequently concerned that pedagogical research capacities in universities should be developed to address these concerns. In particular, HEFCE identified a need to establish a more robust evidence base to inform Higher Education Institutions’ (HEI) engagement with improvements to teaching and learning in England. The TLRP was established to address this need, being designed to foster relevant, accessible, and practical impact on teaching and learning practice and policy through research.

TLRP was also designed to support research and impact across all four of the UK ‘home-countries’. This was an important and distinctive feature. Throughout much of the last decade and a half, the different education policy and regulatory frameworks of the UK home countries conventionally led to discrete education-improvement and capacity-building programmes specific to a single home country.

Similarly, TLRP was designed to engage the full range of formal and informal teaching and learning phases, (ie early years, primary, and secondary school phases, further and higher education, and professional and lifelong learning), and settings and contexts (ie nurseries, schools, universities, community settings and workplaces).

---

\(^5\) Evidence of impact upon policy and practice in teaching and learning is addressed in Sections 4, 5 and 6.

\(^6\) www.tlrp.org/about/origins.html.
This diversity in phase, setting, and context is echoed in the wide range of research themes and forms of practice embedded in the TLRP research. These ranged from the use of Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) for learning with three to five year olds, to the application of pedagogical approaches originating in 19th Century Japan to teachers’ professional development, and from models of organisational learning within multi-agency working, to the role of pupils’ and teachers’ implicit and explicit knowledge in teaching and learning in the primary school.

The activity supported across the ten year life of TLRP has been substantial in both scope and scale, including over 60 major or ‘national’ projects and awards (involving more than 300 researchers), nearly 50 ‘themed’ projects and research fellowships, events, associateships, and capacity building activities. A number of the ‘additionally funded’ activities sought to synergise with, and add value to, the major projects.

2.3 Outputs and outcomes

An important distinction needs to be made for this evaluation between outputs and outcomes. Outputs are mainly products arising from the funded research and activities and are not, in themselves, impacts from programme investments.

Nonetheless, outputs remain important assets with a major role to play in achieving impact. Key TLRP outputs have included books, research briefings, commentaries, peer-reviewed journal articles, educational resources (including modified or enhanced curricula), workshops, conferences and conference proceedings booklets and newsletters. Meta-analysis of the TLRP research led to the development of a key (and, in a sense, summative) TLRP output; the ten ‘evidence-informed principles for teaching and learning or pedagogies’. The TLRP Director has noted that the Ten Principles are currently being included in education policy development at the highest levels.

There are also early signs of TLRP outputs potentially influencing (or, at the least, validating) the current direction of travel of some English and Scottish education policies. These include the recent The Importance of Teaching - The Schools White Paper 2010, the upcoming review of English vocational education, and changes to the Scottish Standard for Chartered Teachers. This reviewed in more detail alongside other impact evidence, enablers and constraints in Sections 3 and 4 later in this report.

Stakeholders and PIs have highlighted the TLRP’s early adoption of a dissemination strategy that archived all outputs online as a key success factor in influencing change and achieving impact. As commonplace as this approach appears in 2011, it was notably forward-looking in 1999, when even rudimentary on-line access could not be guaranteed for researchers and certainly not guaranteed for practitioners. Stakeholders have also commended the TLRP management team and Programme Director for their ‘personal touch’ in the dissemination of research findings and outputs.

The TLRP also developed strategies to promote post-programme sustainability of outcomes, outputs and impacts. This included building capacity in research and the embedding and sustaining of partnerships forged during the life of the programme. This has also met HEFCE’s requirement that the programme should leave a legacy of assets for future researchers.

---

7 The programme has also supported a separate technology-enhanced learning (TEL) strand which will end in 2012 but is beyond the scope of this evaluation.
8 www.tlrp.org/themes/themes/tenprinciples.html.
2.4 Programme structure and investments

The final budget for the TLRP (excluding the Technology-enhanced Learning programme strand which is beyond the scope of this evaluation) was in the region of £30m and was supported by a wide range of UK government,9 arms-length bodies10 and non-governmental and representative organisations (eg University Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) and CfBT Education Trust). Thirty three institutions were involved in leading TLRP projects or activities (not including smaller awards made through ‘Meeting of Minds Fellowships’ and ‘Thematic Awards’), although many more had co-direction or subsidiary roles in delivery of the projects (as from Annex B). Most of these HEIs (18) were engaged in one project or funded activity. Five HEIs held multiple awards, with the Institute of Education (IOE) hosting nine TLRP projects. The IOE hosted nearly one in five of all English projects (not including smaller awards) although this is a proportion probably consistent with IOE’s standing in the education research community.11 This data highlights the prevelence of England-based projects within the TLRP (Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1: Breakdown of TLRP projects by UK Home Country

Analysis of the average number of projects based within participating HEIs, shows no notable trend in the number of projects undertaken by institutions in different home countries (Figure 2.2).

Taking into account the ‘weighting effect’ of the IOE and the general ‘map’ of the distribution of HEIs, and Schools or Departments of Education it seems regional distribution and average number of TLRP projects hosted by individual HEIs shows no great anomalies and as would be expected for a pedagogy-based research programme of this size.

9 Such as, to some degree, all four UK governments and assemblies and the policy-making departments.
10 Such as the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), the National College for Leadership in Schools and Childrens’ Services and the four national General Teaching Councils.
11 The 2008 RAE rated the IOE as the highest-placed UK institution in quality and quantity of education research, conducting over one-third of all education research in the UK (and over 40 per cent of research funded by the research councils).
2.5 Programme impact objectives

TLRP had six stated aims, each of which related to carrying out educational research of the highest quality and to employing that research and its outcomes to positively impact upon teaching and learning policy and practice. The aims\(^{12}\) were:

**Learning and learning outcomes**: Here TLRP was seeking: To conduct research with the potential to improve outcomes for learners; to explore synergies between different research approaches; to build research capacity; and to maximise the impact of the research and to present it in an accessible way. Intended TLRP learning outcomes included the acquisition of skill, understanding, knowledge and qualifications, and the development of attitudes, values and identities relevant to a learning society.

**Lifecourse**: TLRP supported research projects on many ages and stages in education, training and lifelong learning. The programme was concerned with patterns of success and difference, inclusion and exclusion through the life course.

**Enrichment and expertise**: TLRP was committed to engaging users in its work. It worked in all disciplines and sectors of education and used a wide range of appropriate methodology. TLRP cooperated with other researchers within and beyond the UK whenever appropriate. TLRP also worked to enhance capacity for all forms of research on teaching and learning and for research-informed policy and practice.

**Improvement**: TLRP worked to develop the UK knowledge base on teaching and learning and to make sure that the knowledge it developed was applied in practice and policy.

In addition, the TLRP’s own measures of success required both high-quality academic research outputs and direct impacts on teaching and learning policy and practice. The

\(^{12}\) www.tlrp.org/aims/index.html.
2.6 The policy and practice context

TLRP can be seen as a significant and timely response to concerns about the quality of education research capacity and capabilities in the UK. However, TLRP did not operate in isolation. Other initiatives, such as Teacher’s TV, The Teaching and Learning Resource Bank and the bank of teaching resources developed by the Times Educational Supplement, have all to some extent attempted to translate research into positive impact on teaching and learning practice and, in some cases, policy. In addition, the HEFCE-funded Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs) and the initiatives of the HE Academy have also been of significance in seeking evidence-based improvement.

The influence of the TLRP has been identified in a number of other research-led pedagogical improvement programmes that were launched either during the life of the TLRP or shortly after the main programme’s closure. Stakeholders have suggested that at least two of these programmes (The Scottish Applied Educational Research Scheme and the Pedagogy Strategy for Wales) directly drew on the experience and methodologies of the TLRP in their design and ambition.

The establishment of clear and mutually supportive links to other TLRP projects was a key criterion in bidding to access TLRP funding and support. What is notable is the number of TLRP projects that became central, but distinct, components of ‘portfolios’ of research, which were ‘owned’ by a single university, a group of universities or a university in partnership with a non-HEI body with an interest in research relating to teaching and learning practice and policy.13

A number of influential major educational research projects were carried out confluent to TLRP projects. For example, research into assessment for learning,14 educational practitioners’ use of ICT15 and teaching and learning for learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN)16 shared researchers or precursor/successor research projects with TLRP projects. This scenario can cause difficulty in positively identifying outputs or outcomes that are directly and solely attributable to the TLRP project.

The TLRP impact evaluation has not addressed HEI-centred capacity-building in educational research. It should be noted that stakeholders reported this issue was of concern to many policy and practice-based bodies during the active period of the TLRP. However, it is important to note that contemporary programmes such as the Teacher Education Research Network (TERN) (funded by ESRC) and the Training and Development Agency for School’s (TDA) Research and Development Awards17 underline the contextual background of the educational research community turning its attention to issues of sustainability and succession pedagogical research. The TLRP Phase 1 academic evaluation18 suggests that capacity-building is potentially a strong legacy-outcome of the TLRP but that the longevity of any new capacity may be challenged by changing national policy contexts and pressure on university budgets.

---

14 Such as http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/node/97905.
16 Such as http://www.trrb.ac.uk/attachments/d5b36d9c-ba4b-4c6d-922f-ae81f1d89099.pdf.
17 www.trrb.ac.uk/viewArticle2.aspx?contentId=11963.
2.7 Key audiences for TLRP

The UK teaching and learning landscape is defined by, and attempts to address the needs arising from, a complex and overlapping system of cultural, economic, political, and social contexts. In addition, TLRP operated within a UK policy and practice context of devolved government funding and distinct and differentiated policy priorities at a home-country level. This has seen TLRP projects and awards, and their attempts to secure impact, operating within four distinct and often contrasting national infrastructures expressed in, for example:

- Different models of practice employed across the home countries.
- Distinct and independent inspection and compliance regimes.
- Home country-specific and policy-led curricula.
- Home country-specific and policy-led professional standards and expectations relating to teachers and educators.
- Home country-specific and policy-led expectations and standards of learner achievement and progression.

These and other differences in education practice and policy within the UK means that careful and sensitive translation and compromise is required to share research findings and practice between the home-countries. In addition to being mindful of the differences in infrastructures between the home-countries, projects also needed to make their research outputs available and accessible to a number of distinct audiences with different interests and circumstances, including:

- Policy-makers - to inform centrally-mandated pedagogical policy, approach, and practice.
- Government and non-Government bodies - to contribute to other research or dissemination initiatives designed to improve practice in teaching and learning.
- Teaching practitioners - to contribute to the profession-wide ‘educational conversation’ and to directly impact upon practice within the context of formal and informal ‘chalk face’ teaching and learning.

The TLRP, and its expectations of impact, had a particular focus on engendering high-quality pedagogic engagements between universities and these diverse audiences. This focus aimed to increase the responsiveness of pedagogical research and researchers to established and emergent needs and challenges in teaching and learning practice and policy.19

---

19 This became a particular focus for the Widening Participation in HE programme strand which eventually counted for over a quarter of all major funded projects in TLRP.
Section 3: Impact on Policy and Professional Practice

3.1 Introduction

This section draws together the interim assessment and evaluation of the impact of the TLRP on professional practice in teaching and learning. More specifically it looks at:

- The extent to which TLRP has met is policy and practice impact objectives.
- The relationship between TLRP and other major initiatives aimed at improving teaching and learning in the UK.
- Policy-makers and practitioner’s awareness of TLRP and its work.
- Utilisation of TLRP research by policy-makers.
- Utilisation of TLRP research in teaching and learning practice.

It concludes with an assessment of lessons from TLRP for enhancing the practical impact of future educational research initiatives. Evidence is drawn from various sources but in particular interviews with stakeholder organisations and project partners; and also evidence and illustrations from case study reports. Evidence from the PI impact survey and documentation has also contributed but is drawn on separately, and more extensively, in the analysis of project-level contributions in the following section.

3.2 Meeting TLRP’s policy and practice impact objectives

TLRP was a large and diverse programme, and perhaps unsurprisingly the evaluation indicates substantial contrasts between projects and awards in meeting the programmes objectives for achieving policy and practice impacts (as outlined here in Sections 3 and in 4 below). Overall the evaluation concludes that the impact of the TLRP research, knowledge exchange, and dissemination have been generally positive in some areas of teaching and learning practice, but (with some notable exceptions) have not been widely embedded in policy development.

However, the evidence underpinning this conclusion - gathered from different perspectives, is not consistent. It appears that the self-assessment of impact made by PIs (and others) was more positive than that identified by other stakeholders. While national stakeholders acknowledged the robustness, quality, and potential of the TLRP research, they were more cautious about the level and depth of subsequent impact achieved to date. This was notably the case for achieved impacts on policy. There have also been differences (explored below) between the PI opinion of what has enabled impact and the opinion and experiences of those having a cross-TLRP view (such as the TLRP programme-direction team and national stakeholders).

It is important to note the context for policy and practice in teaching and learning, always dynamic, is currently subject to important changes in all four home countries. This poses challenges for the impact of the TLRP, as the evidence (set out below) suggests that research-based TLRP impacts have not been readily or easily achieved by many of the funded projects within the life of the TLRP - for many projects it may take some time for influence and impact to be realised.

The evaluation concludes that while the programme has certainly achieved its objectives for developing research to influence change in policy and professional practice in the UK,
impacts have mostly been limited in scale, and have fallen below the expectations of many stakeholders.

### 3.3 TLRP and synergies with other improvement initiatives

User engagement and partnership working have been central to the aims and ambition of TLRP; one of the programme strategic commitments was to develop *Partnerships for Sustainability*. TLRP also sought to synergise with other teaching and learning initiatives. These are clear programme aspirations, but how well such synergies have been reflected in project and award-level work remains open to interpretation. The PI survey provides little evidence of the successful TLRP projects having shaped subsequent or parallel TLRP bids to better develop synergies or to relate to other improvement agendas, initiatives, or policies. Wider evidence can be drawn from a combination of case study evidence and comments from stakeholders. However, as the case study evidence is drawn from ‘high impact’ projects and TLRP activities, their experiences cannot be taken as typical of wider integration with other initiatives or policy developments.

In fact, three of the case studies have significant synergies with recent or current policy issues and these were a feature in the development of the TLRP research. These synergies came about in very different ways and specifically:

- The development and shaping of the Scottish Extension *Interplay* project benefited from strong links with Learning and Teaching Scotland, the Scottish Executive, Stirling Council and West Lothian Council. However, this seemed to have followed and not preceded policy developments for ‘ICT in Early Years’ which had been influenced by earlier work by key project contributors leading to the Scottish Executive policy/staff development document *Early Learning, Forward Thinking: the ICT Strategy for Early Years* (2003).

- The University of Bath and University of Oxford led *Learning in and for Interagency Working* (Phase III) was developed at the same time as the 2003 Green Paper *Every Child Matters*. Here, the co-PIs had some links with those developments as a result of the lead researchers’ existing areas of interest on multi-agency working in order to address the needs of the child. The project was specifically centred on practical ways of building a momentum for more integrated support for the Children’s Act 2004, and the improvement synergies here have been reflected in some of the project partnerships subsequently formed and notably with the Local Government Association.

- The Oxford Brookes-Oxford project on the *Role of Awareness in the Teaching of Literacy and Numeracy in Key Stage 2*, stemmed from a review by co-PIs of gaps in the national curriculum set against international performance evidence. This was perhaps the only case study where a ‘needs analysis’ against policy and improvement issues was conducted to help shape the TLRP bid, although its policy goals to inform any subsequent remodelling of the national curriculum,
while more aspirational and not set against any specific policy intentions or opportunities.

Even in these high impact projects, policy synergies were not always clear cut and were in some cases very broadly expressed and aspirational. Arguably only one had close policy or improvement synergies on current issues. This may not be surprising since in a programme of this length where individual project timetables are unlikely to be well aligned to specific and often intensive policy development agendas.

Synergies can also be formative, and the evaluation points to the Applied Educational Research Scheme (AERS) and the Strategic Forum for Research in Education (SfRE) as projects that have grown from the TLRP and, to some extent, serve to further embed the legacy of the TLRP. Similarly, evidence suggests that ongoing work being carried out by the University Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), the Subject Centre for Education (ESCalate) and British Educational Research Association (BERA) serve to further ‘embed the TLRP outcomes within the UK educational conversation’.

However, there is evidence that identifies other improvement initiatives that have failed to ‘key-in’ with the programme. For example, several stakeholders felt there was a lack of coherence in England with research commissioned by the TDA having: ‘...overlapped with the aims of the TLRP’.

Inter-organisational dynamics and separate streams of funding for research mean that synergies have not always proven easy to harness, despite often energetic programme-level interventions. The evaluation has identified a series of what one stakeholder called: ‘...missed chances for forging mutual interest relationships’. As an illustration, the TDA, and its predecessor the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), was an early stakeholder in the TLRP and contributed to programme steering and selection, with both ESRC and TDA taking a deep professional interest in the National Teacher Research Panel (NTRP). In the early stages of the TLRP, the TDA/TTA and TLRP funded complementary research and sustained an active partnership at least partially based on the inclusion of ‘practitioner as researcher’ initiatives in the remit of the TDA/TTA. However, the TDA/TLRP relationship can be seen to have later entered a more passive mode as the TDA remit changed and emphasis shifted towards the dissemination of the TLRP outputs, through the TDA-sponsored Teacher Training Resource Bank (TTRB).

In terms of links and synergies developed outside the UK, there is evidence that direct relationships have been largely confined to improved cross-institution links and cooperation, but with a potential for wider impacts as TLRP outputs are exploited by the international literature on pedagogy. There is evidence of academic interest and, in some cases direct engagement, in TLRP derived outputs from researchers in Brazil, Portugal, New Zealand, Australia, Singapore and Hong Kong, among others. For example, the Scottish Extension Project ‘Interplay’ led by Stirling University has been employed by policy-makers in Australia and New Zealand during the development of their ‘ICT in the Early Years’ policy and continues to be cited with reference to CPD for teachers. In addition, conference papers on TLRP projects have been delivered even more widely with the potential of linking to practice-audiences from the USA to Brazil and from Hong Kong to Australia.

---

25 The NTRP is an independent group of teachers and head teachers with research expertise who work together to support and encourage other teachers to engage in and with research. This chapter contains information on the NTRP and a selection of teacher research case studies.

26 The evidence suggests that, at this stage, synergies were more dependent on pro-activity by TLRP at programme level - which was not always effective or well-received by TDA.

27 www.ttrb.ac.uk.

3.4 External awareness of TLRP

As different processes and mechanisms are likely to be involved, the evidence of external awareness of TLRP, and its effects on achieving impact, is looked at separately for national stakeholders including policy-makers and influencers, and for practitioners.

**Awareness among national stakeholders:** The evidence here is limited to the interviewed agencies but suggests that all were aware, at some level, of the programme. However, the depth of awareness varied greatly and beyond those which had a role in TLRP steering, or other direct relationships with ESRC, few seem to have had much knowledge of the programme in its early days.

Among those stakeholders that were aware of the programme, few were engaged directly in project-level activity at bidding or post-bidding planning stages. The most common experience was that stakeholders’ understanding of programme activity, and its potential, stemmed from pro-active programme-level intervention; predominantly the Programme Director establishing and sustaining bi-lateral working relationships. Stakeholders commonly reported that these programme-direction level relationships were sustained and that programme-level communications were broadly effective in keeping them aware of TLRP developments. However, this seems to contradict the experience of the programme-direction team itself. Here it was felt that ‘staff churn’, particularly in public funded agencies, and other organisational rigidities, had compromised the sustaining of working relationships and that stakeholder ‘awareness raising’ was seen as a continuous rather than incremental process.

Particular attention was drawn by at least a third of the stakeholders to the programme summaries and their distribution. One senior manager in a regulatory body commented:

> 'These things were dropping on my desk - they were succinct...and I just about always read them. It’s not so often we see research digested in this way'.

Stakeholder awareness of other outputs was less extensive and at least one felt that the focus seemed to have been on knowledge exchange among the academic participants, commenting it was: ‘...not easy for agencies to break into that loop’. The evaluation case studies showed important examples of where this was not the case, but programme documentation (Annex B) suggests that these may have been the exception rather than the rule.

This evidence needs to be reviewed cautiously since it relates only to one perspective – that of the interviewed stakeholders. Also, the nature of the selection of stakeholders (see Annex D) has focussed on those more likely to have had experience of TLRP. These constitute many of the most important departmental and non-departmental agencies and interest groupings, but it is not clear if others who have not been a part of this evaluation were as aware. In addition, it was clear that TLRP awareness could vary within stakeholders with at least two indicating a strong programme awareness and links at executive management level but engagement not being cascaded to the crucial tier of middle and professional officers who had responsibility for most policy developments.

**Professional and practitioner awareness:** Based on the available evidence, practitioner awareness of the TLRP and the TLRP outputs is seen as very high amongst practitioner communities (such as schools, FE settings, HEIs and government bodies) that were directly involved or partnered in the programme. The evidence suggests this may be attributed to two factors:

- A programme-level ethos of the researcher and any practitioner involved in the research working in a partnership of shared recognition of expertise. All TLRP projects were required to commit to such an ethos.
• A programme-level dissemination strategy of high-level and high-quality materials, supported by project-level outputs such as ‘dissemination and verification seminars involving practitioners’, practitioner networks, ‘feedback via e-mail networking’ and peer-supporting professional development sessions.

Beyond practitioners directly engaged in the programme, there is very little evidence of a wider awareness of TLRP. However, this apparent lack of awareness relates to what may be called the ‘TLRP brand’ and contrasts with evidence of some of the TLRP research and derived outputs being used widely by practitioners, particularly in schools.

On this evidence, there appears to be a distinction in programme awareness between practitioners involved with TLRP inputs - where awareness would seem to have been high, and outputs - where it is not. This suggests three ways in which practitioners have engaged with TLRP outputs without necessarily being aware of the ‘TLRP brand’.

**Non-recalled usage:** Here practitioner awareness was minimal or nil. The practitioners had engaged with a TLRP output, but even where clearly branded (as part of TLRP) it was not recalled or registered as such.

**Intermediary-chain usage:** This form of awareness would involve practitioners engaging less directly with TLRP outputs, with TLRP outputs passing through a ‘supply chain’ of mediation and combination with other resources before reaching the practitioner. Within what might be a long chain the (TLRP) origin is likely to be lost.

**De-branded usage:** This form of awareness may see practitioners engaged with TLRP outputs but where the outputs have had any TLRP ‘branding’ obscured, not included, or removed. For example, local authority advisers or institutional principals have developed ‘in house’ Continuing Professional Development (CPD) sessions where TLRP materials have been used in an extracted form (and have lost their ‘TLRP badges’) as a part of a wider suite of materials and resources.

It seems probable that this issue of a distinct and retained brand and brand awareness is endemic for programmes of this nature. In some cases, PIs have suggested that to secure impact on practice, de-branding may even be desirable to promote ownership by, for example, subject-specific or professional interest groups. One PI, with wide success in further developing ‘mainstream’ TLRP resources observed:

> ‘Teachers can be very committed to their professional networks...it’s not too surprising that resources that stem from those channels are trusted [and]...are much more likely to be looked at and taken up’.

Branding may also be confused, especially where TLRP projects built on earlier research work. In addition, anecdotal evidence suggests Advisory Groups of major projects may not have always supported distinctive TLRP branding of project outputs.

### 3.5 Utilisation of TLRP research by policy-makers

Assessing the contributions made by TLRP research to policy development and its implementation is not without difficulties. In particular, the self-assessed documentary evidence lacks robustness. EoA reports (the most consistent documentary evidence source), show some confusion about the distinction between outputs and outcomes (or impact). About a third of the EoA reports have focussed on process and outputs, with little or no evidence of impact on policy. However, it is unclear if those projects and awards had actually secured no impact, or failed to review impact in the EoA reports and focused only on processes and outputs.
The survey evidence indicates that policy links may have been more extensive than is suggested by the EoA reports, with only a handful of projects which could not identify any policy impact against a series of tested measures. Most impact seems to have centred on research contributions to policy-makers nationally, where just over a half (52%) saw significant impact. Knowledge or evidence exchange with policy-makers at national level was also a common outcome and where just under a half (46%) had seen some impact of their activities.

A more detailed review of this evidence follows in the assessment of project level contributions (Section 4). However, the evidence suggests there may have been disproportionate impact on policy in professional learning and lifelong learning, and rather less (so far) on schools (the sector that dominated the project selections). Other evaluation evidence from stakeholders re-enforces the impact on professional learning policy but seems to challenge the impact on lifelong learning policy; key stakeholder groupings felt that this had been one of the more disappointing areas of TLRP impact.

Generally, stakeholder evidence is not consistent with the self-assessed evidence from projects and awards that identify significant policy-engagement and impacts. Even where there was direct engagement between individual projects and policy-making and implementing bodies, stakeholders felt it was uncommon for the engagement to translate directly into policy impact. The case studies of high impact projects seem to endorse this, with projects such as the Oxford Brookes-Oxford university review of literacy and numeracy at KS2 demonstrating substantial professional impacts, but acknowledging that they had secured little or no influence on policy developments. This is not to say that high impact projects did not secure some policy impacts, but aside from notable exceptions such as the University of Bath project on inter-agency working, these were generally stronger on contributing to professional impacts.

The evaluation suggests that complex issues were involved in what might be seen as a disappointing outcome set against programme aspirations. While some positive engagement effects are seen for collaborations with policy-orientated bodies with a front-line presence for disseminating ‘good practice’, the stakeholder feedback from departmental and non-departmental agencies suggests these do not translate as readily into observable effects on policy-making and its implementation, as the self-assessments by PI suggest. In part this may be related to the policy formation process, which PIs lacked access to, and which stakeholders suggest is typically progressive, draws on multiple inputs, and where research may not always be the most significant contribution.

While acknowledging the value of interacting with the TLRP at a programme level, stakeholders have pointed to patchy and often ineffective communications with projects - although evidence suggests this was a two-way process. Stakeholders have also drawn attention to a perceived lack of the practical outputs that are required to generate impact on policy and practice. They have also reflected on some misalignments between TLRP projects and (then) current policy priorities and issues. In contrast, they are generally positive about programme-level mediation impacts (see Section 5).

Finally, impacts outside the UK seem to have been limited. There has been extensive international TLRP dissemination activity but only around one in six projects felt this has led to, for example, new collaborations with non-UK policy-making bodies.

3.6 Utilisation of TLRP research in teaching and learning practice

The TLRP model has closely linked ‘practice’ impact with the quality of subsequent utilisation of TLRP outputs by practitioners. Interview, survey and documentary evidence suggests that policy and practice stakeholders regard the TLRP outputs and activities as
high quality, but that the *utilisation* of the outputs and activities by practitioners has been more variable.

EoA reporting gave each TLRP project an opportunity to self-assess and present evidence of impact on teaching and learning practice. However, securing impacts on practice may well take longer to realistically assess than for policy where influence can be rapid. In particular, the Programme Director felt that whilst most PIs had a realistic understanding of reporting practice impacts\(^{29}\), it was felt that EoA reports could not represent the full impacts achieved by a project due to an inherent time-lag between the end of a project and the embedding of changed practice. Where self-assessment did provide for at least some review of impacts\(^{30}\) it was of variable quality (see the more detailed analysis of project-level contributions in Section 4) but suggests approaching a half (48%) of all TLRP projects felt they had some direct impact on policy and/or practice.

It cannot be assumed that those not providing impact evidence in their EoAs had not secured any impact at all. In any event, much of this self-assessed evidence of impact is now substantially out of date. The PI survey (see Section 4) helps to extend this evidence, and suggests that that eight out of ten funded and responding award holders providing feedback (80%) consider that their impact expectations for their projects have been met to at least some extent. This is a confident expression by these PIs. Indeed, the same source shows that nearly a half of those recognising impact felt their impact expectations had been met ‘to a great extent’.

This is a stronger impact effect than that recorded in the EoA reports and is likely to reflect practice impacts achieved after the end of TLRP funding. A more detailed analysis suggests the most common practice impacts from TLRP projects and awards was seen by PIs to be on pedagogy-centred issues, including an ‘improved understanding of innovative and more effective practice’ in the UK, and on ‘improved knowledge exchange with practitioners’.

A number of specific TLRP resources and activities have been highlighted by stakeholders as being of exceptional quality. These resources include the publications relating to the ‘Ten Principles’, the Professionalism and Pedagogy publication, and the Research Briefings. The TLRP website has also been cited as contributing to a ‘widespread’ take-up of some TLRP outputs by practitioners. Evidence points to some TLRP projects being *flooded with direct queries* from practitioners who had accessed their project materials on the TLRP website.

The evidence points to their being an efficacy in ‘off the peg’ outputs for securing practice impacts. This seems to underline the need for a diverse and mixed economy in the development and usage of activities and resources designed to impact on practice; educator-practitioners do not all interact with their learners in the same manner and not all episodes of teaching and learning can be improved through a single form of resource or activity.

As the next section suggests, practice effects have clearly not been secured evenly across projects or across phases. A number of stakeholders identified the comparatively small number of TLRP project activities and outcomes related to teacher education; this perceived gap being notable because of the number of TLRP project teams drawn from HE Schools and Departments of Education. Again, there are specific examples that differ

\(^{29}\) The programme direction provided guidance and facilitation to support this through: adjustment of the standard ESRC EoA report to provide greater opportunity for impact reporting; development of a TLRP ‘outputs folder’; and introduction of output ‘summit meetings’ with TLRP projects a year before the end of the award.

\(^{30}\) This drew on 36 of the available 58 EoA reports - others being discounted due to: absence of impact evidence; inappropriate evidence; and/or an inappropriate focus or relevance for impact assessment.
from this general observation, with evidence of at least one TLRP-hosting University regularly using its project outputs within an Early Years ITT programme. Stakeholders also drew attention to elements of the TLRP website as a ‘key resource’ for ITT. Overall, impacts on teacher education seem to be focused on CPD, particularly in M-level modules or programmes.

Set against this generally positive evidence of diverse impacts on professional practices, some stakeholders have characterized project-level outputs as fragmented, lacking in accessibility to practitioners and remote in style. The same stakeholders felt this did not apply to programme-level outputs with the Research Briefings series being especially valued (as noted above). However, this evidence needs to be interpreted cautiously as it appears to contradict evidence from PIs that suggests that practical outputs were often made available and that criticism may be restricted to issues regarding outputs’ density and digestibility. It is possible that the programme rhetoric about practice and impact, or the size and visibility of the TLRP, may have increased stakeholders’ expectations of what the TLRP could achieve to an unrealistic level. Regardless of this divergence of views, there is evidence that a number of TLRP projects have produced very practical outputs which are in extensive use in the teaching and learning sector.

3.7 Lessons from TLRP for enhancing impact

The evaluation has sought to establish lessons arising from TLRP for enhancing the practical and policy impact of future educational research. Findings are set out here for three main areas:

- Understanding the success factors, or enablers, which have helped some of the funded activities secure impact.
- Understanding the constraints, which have held back impact in TLRP projects and awards.
- Other lessons emerging for enhancing impact.

These lessons are limited to those arising from project experience - as reflected by PI’s and award holders themselves, and by the policy and professional stakeholders interviewed. Section 5 provides further reflections on the parallel lessons relating to programme level organisation and management.

Understanding enablers to impact: Almost two thirds (61%) of PIs in the impact survey felt that publication of journal articles and books was the key enabler to securing impact (Figure 3.1). Just over half of PIs (52%) felt that inter-peer knowledge exchange within HE was seen as the next most effective in enabling impacts, largely through networking activities/events with UK research-peers. A range of other enablers were also seen as important by PIs, with the results suggesting:

- Collaborations with policy informing or influencing bodies such as professional bodies or specialist associations were seen as particularly significant - and cited as impact enablers by over four in ten of the responding PIs (44%). This was ahead of direct engagement and collaboration with policy making bodies (39%).
- Collaboration with other TLRP researchers was also important (39%) but this was rated as a less effective enabler than networking activities with the wider community of research peers in the UK (52%).
- Resource development did not rate highly as an enabler for policy impact (or practice), being mentioned by only just over a quarter (27%) and with more
traditional academic outputs, such as journal and book publications, rated as much more significant (61%).

While this evidence comes directly from those mobilising impact, it needs to be interpreted with some caution as it seems to be at odds with some of the stakeholder feedback and case study evidence. The case study evidence, while not neglecting the value of publications, emphasised non-publication activities (such as liaison with external bodies and dissemination through events) as enablers crucial to securing policy and practice impacts. This is not to say that high impact research teams neglected publications - one case study logged 26 publications stemming from the TLRP research in the last four years - but emphasises what the PI referred to as a segmented approach to achieving project impacts.

**Figure 3.1: Enablers to securing policy and related impacts from TLRP**

PI’s self-assessment of enablers to achieving significant impacts on policy and practice, at November 2010 (% of PIs)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of PIs who rated different enablers as significant.]

Valid cases = 69

**Source:** HOST TLRP impact survey, October-November, 2010

The role of pro-active external relationships and (often specially constituted) impact facilitation events geared to non-HE audiences was central to achieving impacts in at least a half of the six high impact cases. In particular:

- For the Bath project on inter-agency working, the key enabler in knowledge sharing was a subsequent collaboration with the Local Government Association.
The Phase 2 project on the *Impact of Policy on Learning and Inclusion in the New Learning and Skills System* saw the PI prioritising working progressively through industry groupings to raise the policy issues emerging.

The Oxford Brookes-Oxford Phase 2 project on literacy and numeracy in KS2 had most policy success outside the UK (and notably in Portugal and Brazil) and this stemmed very largely, not from publications, but from nationally organised teachers fora for disseminating the resources developed.

This impression of harnessing multiple dissemination pathways and not relying on more conventional publications or HE-centred conferences was also supported by stakeholders, not just in terms of the impact of the TLRP, but also the wider issue of how academic research can best engage with policy-makers, implementers, and practitioners. Added to this, stakeholders close to professional practice felt that a key enabler was: ‘...engaging the front line in the research and its assessment’.

One stakeholder went so far as to suggest that without direct engagement of practitioners in evidence gathering, it would always be difficult for academic researchers to raise the profile of findings with policy-makers. This concern was echoed by one of the more successful projects in securing practice impact - the Oxford Brookes-Oxford partnership - where the PI drew on her wider international experience, to observe that policy in the UK was far more likely to be driven from inputs from practitioners and practice than university research. Other stakeholders supported this assessment and some felt this to be linked to the growing currency of ‘action-research’ among policy making bodies and the influence of representative groups (such as provider groupings) on policy development and policy-makers.

Stakeholders were often concerned about the ‘traditional focus of academics on refereed publications’, and felt this to be problematic for most of those concerned with improving practice and policy development. One succinctly suggested the:

‘Key is clearly producing user specific outputs, clearly written, de-jargonised...short and sharp assessments of implications for ‘next day’ practice but linking this to mainstream practice and issues’.

Stakeholders have also identified the availability of realistic budgets for dissemination and partnership-building with communities of practitioners at a project level as key enablers. To this was added the quality of programme-level resources, and the quality of the academic, pedagogical, and management skill-set(s) (referred to by one stakeholder as ‘an outward facing skill set’) of the TLRP Core Team. These issues are returned to in Section 5.

**Understanding constraints to impact:** The evaluation does not provide a consistent picture of constraints to impact. The feedback from stakeholders and PIs is fragmented but some specific issues can be identified, including:

- Concern about rigidities in policy-making bodies in the take-up of research-based implications. In particular, where it was difficult to sustain working relationships due to changing policy development priorities and staff turnover.
• The reported lack of foresight and what one called ‘creative thinking’ within key Government Agencies. A number of PIs referred to a lack of understanding of the importance of social and educational research in policy development.

• Specifically in Wales, an important constraint to securing policy impacts was little or no distinctive TLRP engagement with the Welsh language and the distinctive school curriculum in Wales.

The most commonly identified constraints were seen as the lack of opportunity for follow-up studies and the absence of continuity funding that would ensure that the core TLRP messages continue to be promulgated nationally (and internationally). The PI of one of the largest funded projects commented that the TLRP approach was welcomed and imaginative but remained an exception within the funding of research inquiry. It was also felt that what most held back impact was a lack of sustained development, described as:

‘...[there is] an assumption that one-off projects, however well conceived and however well-resourced (relatively), could have a substantial and lasting impact. We look enviously at the much longer-term timeframes in things such as the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematic (STEM) subjects...and can’t help but wonder how much impact medical research would have if it were typified by short-term and turbulent funding’.

The successes of some of the case study projects appear to endorse this view. Notably, the Phase 2 project on the Role of Awareness in the teaching of Literacy and Numeracy in Key Stage 2 was able to secure additional funding for three follow-on projects - each being multi-agency collaborations drawing on the TLRP project and its findings. While continuity funding appears to be a significant issue, the case studies raise the question of whether the need for continuity funding reflects programme management and/or funding availability, or the capacities of different PIs and projects to capitalise on the TLRP investments to seek out and secure such funds from other sources.

Other lessons for enhancing impact: While not highlighted by the PIs, the programme direction team and some stakeholders expressed great concern that ‘perverse incentives’ had held back impacts, in particular impacts on practice. The 2007 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) was particularly criticized. It was felt that the RAE influenced project team decisions on dissemination channels and output priorities at the time of the RAE deadline. It is suggested that projects prioritized ‘refereed’ publications, which were felt to better satisfy the RAE criteria, potentially at the cost of diverting energy away from more applied and practical outputs. The feedback from the PI survey would seem to support this suggestion.

The Programme Director felt that the RAE criteria were a major disincentive for PIs in them making commitments to developing ‘practice publications’. In particular, the RAE criteria were a demonstrable constraint to PIs’ commitment to the programme’s Improving Learning publication series. This observation was endorsed by practice-focused stakeholders who noted that project outputs seemed to prioritise what one called:

‘...all the usual culprits - academic conferences, international and learned journals, special editions of journals and chapters in edited collections...Where were the resources and practice guides for schools?’

A concluding issue for raising impacts from future educational research initiatives is the need to develop robust mechanisms for progressive project-level measurement of developing (or achieved) outcomes (as opposed to outputs). This evaluation has already acknowledged that as a result of a combination of confusion and weak monitoring of outcomes, TLRP projects may have underestimated their own impact achievements. It
seems likely that procedures being implemented in many HEIs to monitor applied effects of research for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) may increase the efficacy of such self-assessments, but even here the focus seems to be on ‘hard’ outputs and short term outcomes. Without more robust approaches to local impact measurement and recording, and an understanding of the distinction between output and outcome, initiatives similar to the TLRP will continue to be adversely effected.
Section 4: Impact Effects and Contribution of Individual TLRP Projects

4.1 Introduction

This impact evaluation has centred on a programme-level review of the contribution of the TLRP research to policy and professional practice. However, this has been a ‘bottom up’ review which has assembled considerable evidence on individual project level effects. This section does not attempt a project-by-project assessment of impact, but does look at this front-line evidence in more detail focussing on three important project level contributions:

- The extent and nature of achieved external partnerships within TLRP projects and awards.
- The contribution of TLRP projects to securing policy impacts.
- The contribution of TLRP projects to professional impacts.

The assessment draws on a combination of the EoA reporting (reviewed in more detail in Annex B and E), PI feedback from the impact survey, and the in-depth case studies, and provides a front-line assessment to supplement the previous section looking largely at national and related evidence.

4.2 External partnerships within TLRP projects and awards

The intention of the TLRP to translate HEI-based research into impact upon professional practice in teaching and learning necessitated TLRP projects securing the engagement of practitioners. Reflecting the diversity of the TLRP, the programme emphasised projects securing relationships with not just with other HEIs, (which seems to have come easily to many PIs), but also with schools, workplaces, early years setting, regional and national government bodies, and local authorities.

There is some evidence that points to the ‘forging of links’ between universities and schools and the development of collaborative practice engendered by the TLRP as one of the important outcomes for teaching and learning practice. The PI survey evidence (Figure 4.1) suggests that while one in eight projects apparently had no active external collaborations or partnerships (other than within the HE sector), the remaining projects worked with a notable diversity of partners. In particular:

- Front-line partnerships with schools, college or related practitioners were the single most harnessed partnership by TLRP projects (27%).
- Partnerships with private sector providers and/or employers delivering education or skills based programmes were also apparent (7%), and most strongly represented in English-based projects.
- Partnerships were also widely forged with those bodies potentially well placed to broker or facilitate the further dissemination and embedding of TLRP activities and outputs. These included educational professional or knowledge transfer bodies including subject associations (11%), but also the regulatory and standard setting bodies (9%) with a remit to highlight better and emergent practice.
Beyond this, the most notable feature of the programme is the scale and range of external partnership outside the ‘front-line’ and in particular with local and central government - where a quarter of all projects seem to have active collaborations.

**Figure 4.1: TLRP HEI project team collaborators and partners**

![Bar chart showing collaborators and partners](image)

NB. PIs were invited to identify all collaborators and partners that applied to their project(s).

Valid cases = 69

**Source: HOST TLRP impact survey, October-November, 2010**

Considered alongside other evidence, there is an indication that projects that embedded collaborations with partner schools or teachers, (in either co-conduct of research or in the testing of findings or materials), have been the most likely to demonstrate early or subsequent impact on teaching and learning practice. The Phase 2 ‘Awareness of literacy and numeracy’ project led initially by Oxford Brookes University in collaboration with the University of Oxford, and later led by the University of Oxford, worked with a series of partner schools in Oxford and Hillingdon. A total of 318 pupils were directly involved in testing research-derived teaching and assessment materials using a control-group approach. The resultant tested materials, based on the use of morphemes in KS2 teaching, have attracted widespread interest among primary teachers across the UK and overseas, and are reported as being valuable tools to support widely documented gaps in the teaching of literacy.

The same project team has gone on to use these research methods and a similar engagement model to provide resources and training for teachers of deaf children, under an additionally funded research programme supported by The Nuffield Trust and others.
Evidence also points to the likelihood that projects that anticipated the need for, and formed effective links with, stakeholders in a position to disseminate ‘good practice’ were able to demonstrate engagement with practitioners and impact on practice. While such projects represent a minority of programme activity, the positive effects of employing collaboration to secure practice impacts seems to have been substantial. For example, the ‘Lessons for Learning: Using Lesson Study to innovate, develop and transfer pedagogic approaches and metapedagogy’ Research Training Fellowship established extensive links with the (then) Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the National Strategies. The DCSF and National Strategies subsequently trained two thousand ‘Leading Teachers’ in the Lesson Study pedagogy underpinning the research outcomes. The Leading Teachers carried out lesson study cycles with year six teachers in selected schools in 14 local authorities, with over 30,000 children engaged in the cohort. Subsequent KS2 results showed double the national improvements in mathematics test results and double the national improvement in the combined English and mathematics test score. This improvement was repeated in 2009 with roll-out funding made available to all local authorities.

4.3 Project contributions to policy impacts

The PIs’ self-assessed EoA reports suggest that just over a half (56%) of the projects or awards identified links to, or impact on, policy formation or implementation. However, assessing the substance of those links and the actual contributions made to policy by the projects remains problematic. As discussed in Section 3, many projects may have not only under-recorded, but also under-estimated, their own impact achievements. Indeed evidence from two of the six case studies shows clear links with policy-influencing bodies which were not cited in the relevant EoA reports.

From the available evidence it seems projects sought to engage with the policy arena in diverse ways, but specifically:

- PI or project team membership of external policy advisory groups.
- Bi-lateral and other high-level presentations to policy-makers and/or policy implementers.
- Miscellaneous dissemination including ‘policy audiences’.
- Direct support through secondment and consultancy with policy-making or influencing bodies.
- Additional research funded by policy bodies.

Project members of, or contributors to, external policy advisory groups: Six projects noted that team members were appointed to expert or topical groups advising policy-makers (the Government Review of Information, Advice and Guidance for Adults (IAG) in England; Welsh Assembly Government’s Schools ICT Strategy Working Group) or, in one case, an independent foundation (Nuffield Review of 14-19 Education and Training). One of these projects had seen two such linkages simultaneously.

Three of these projects made specific contributions to high level policy reviews or review groups, and specifically: the Foster’s Review of FE; the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Skills in 2007 in their enquiries into post-16 skills; and the (then) Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit team on public service reform.

Bi-lateral and other presentations to policy-makers/implementers: This was the most extensive form of engagement with policy groupings and typically involved direct
and specific dialogue and/or presentations to departmental or non-departmental agencies on research findings or implications. These activities were not confined to ‘end of project reporting’. A total of 19 projects cited such links, predominantly in England.

The contributions of these inputs are not easy to assess but some PIs felt they produced clear policy impacts. One PI cited the team’s presentation to a DfES review group leading to recognition in policy of the need for strong partnerships between home and school. This later became one of the five components of personalised learning in DfES guidelines. Other projects cited influence on the Welsh national guidelines for involving parents at transfer, and on the Scottish Executive’s move to link policy-making to pedagogic structures. Such contributions could not be easily validated; departmental staff having usually moved on, although in the case of the DfES, the department acknowledged that the TLRP research input was: ‘...helpful and significant’.

Miscellaneous dissemination to include policy audiences: This is the least straightforward area to assess projects contribution to policy impact. Over a half of the projects that identified policy impact cited non-specific dissemination channels as ways of taking policy-related messages to a wider audience. These do not seem to have been policy-targeted but a part of the wider dissemination channels routinely harnessed by TLRP PI’s teams and researchers.

Direct support through secondment and consultancy with policy shaping groups: This was not a widespread feature of TLRP engagement with, and influence on, policy-makers but was cited in at least two projects. These included one PI on ‘partial secondment’ to the Council for Curriculum Examinations and Assessment, and a team member of another project in England seconded to the Government Office for Science.

Additional research funded by policy related groups: A small number of projects cited their contributions being reflected in supplementary studies commissioned by policy bodies (ie in addition to their TLRP awards). For example, one cited a programme of work on the theme ‘Integrative Assessment’, funded as part of the Scottish Quality Enhancement initiative, while another cited a £16,000 extension project in Northern Ireland to pilot e-consultation mechanisms involving pupils.

Other: There are some specific examples of projects influencing policy implementation at local level. For example, one (then) Local Education Authority (LEA) was cited as having established a ‘pupil voice’ support service led by a school leader with whom the project had worked closely.

The survey evidence indicates that actual policy links may have been more extensive than those recorded in the EoA reports. Indeed, in the four out of five PIs who responded to the impact survey, only a handful could not identify any policy impact (Figure 4.2). Most impact seems to have centred on research contributions to policy-makers nationally where just over a half (52%) saw significant impact. Knowledge or evidence exchange with national policy-makers also a commonly reported outcome (46%).
Figure 4.2: Award holders views on achieved project-level policy impacts

PI’s self-assessment of ‘significant impact’ achieved in selected generic areas of policy development or policy implementation, at January 2011 (% of PIs)

Valid cases = 69

Source: HOST TLRP impact survey, October-January, 2011

Other evidence shows that policy impacts appear to have been more widely reported in relation to links with national rather than local policy-makers. This may reflect other evidence suggesting fewer projects had collaborative links between themselves and local policy implementing bodies (23%) (in particular local authorities), than with national agencies (52%). However, the policy links that did exist at a local level seem to have been more robust as, on this distribution, projects with local engagement were more likely to have contributed to policy refinement or changes.

In addition, the survey suggested:

- Rather fewer award holders contributing to the PI impact survey were able to identify impacts achieved through making direct research or evidence contributions to specific policy implementation at local level (29%) than national (37%). Impactful TLRP projects seem to have been geared to national level developments and change.
• A significant impact - reported by over a third of PIs (34%) to date - was in contributing to a better understanding by UK policy-makers of teaching and learning research methods/capacities. As a project-level contribution, this may be particularly significant as some stakeholders report that one of the rigidity affecting the use of research in evidence-led policy was a poor understanding by lead staff in policy-making bodies of the best use (and limitations) of applied research methods.

• A number of PIs (24%) were able to report that their projects had led to new or improved research-based collaborations with policy-making or implementing bodies at national level. However, validation of these effects with departmental and non-departmental bodies in the stakeholder interviews proved problematic due to the gap between such effects having been secured and the timing of this evaluation.

• There is some parallel evidence that collaborations with policy-makers may have had more impact in Scotland and Wales. However, these were not limited to links between the home country policy bodies and universities that were indigenous to the home nations. Indeed in Wales most impact seems have stemmed from a joint TLRP-NAW initiative developed late in the programme to review policy and practice implications across the TLRP portfolio (see section 5), and as such taking particular account of the research taking place in England.

A final observation is that impacts outside the UK seem to have been limited. There has been extensive international TLRP dissemination activity but only around one in six projects felt this has led to impact such as building new or improved international collaborations with non-UK policy-making bodies (17%). As noted in the previous section, this may reflect the functional distance between TLRP research and the different policy contexts and teaching and learning infrastructure in other countries. Where effects were seen this seemed to reflect a combination of pro-activity by other national bodies – in some cases mediated through the TLRP programme direction team, and more occasional direct and previous established relationships between PI, or other TLRP team members, and national governmental organisations or professional bodies.

The impacts that have been achieved seem most robust for developments in HE itself (Figure 4.3). This is the largest single category where PIs felt that policy and related impacts were focused, with nearly a third (30%) reporting outcomes in this area. This may simply reflect the distribution of funded TLRP projects across different phases and stands of activity and, in particular, the considerable expansion of the project mid-term to look at ‘Widening Participation’ (WP).

It seems that there may have been disproportionate impact on policy in professional learning (17%) and lifelong learning (20%). Other evaluation evidence re-enforces the impact on professional learning but seems to challenge the impact on lifelong learning where key stakeholders felt that this had been one of the more disappointing areas of TLRP focus and impact.

The survey evidence is more positive about project-level policy impacts than the EoA reports. This may reflect the variable approach to recording impacts in the EoA reports and/or the time lags between the EoAs and the survey. In many cases the EoAs were completed some years before this evaluation, during which time impact effects may have matured and embedded. However, this needs to be set against the evidence provided in the Section 3 that suggests that PIs seem to have a distinctively much more positive view of achieved impact from the TLRP funded research and activities than was the case with the interviewed stakeholders.
Figure 4.3: Policy and related impacts by education phase

PI’s self-assessment of ‘significant impact’, January 2011 (% of PIs)

Valid cases = 69

Source: HOST TLRP impact survey, October-January, 2010

4.4 Project contributions to professional impacts

The engagement model which has underpinned TLRP has closely linked ‘practice’ impact with the quality of subsequent utilisation of TLRP outputs by practitioners. Evidence suggests that the patterns of the utilisation of outputs are variable and complex. To help unpack this, the evidence of project-level contributions is reviewed for:

- PI self-assessment of evidence of the utilisation of TLRP activities by practitioners, drawn from EoA reports.
- Other evidence for the utilisation of TLRP activities by practitioners and the potential utilisation of the legacy of the TLRP.

Self-assessment of utilisation of TLRP activities: This evidence is derived mainly from PIs through the TLRP EoA reports, but as previously noted, difficulties in self-assessment of practice effects are widespread across projects. Of the 58 EoA reports available to the evaluation team, 22 have been discounted due to either one or more of: absence of evidence (for example, no reference to project outputs or outcomes, or to professional practice); misunderstanding of evidence (for example, PIs reporting project outputs as ‘impact’), or inappropriate focus or relevance for impact assessment. A total of 36 projects did provide some evidence of contributions to practice impacts, and these have been categorised as:

- Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners. *Projects where it can be reasonably expected or inferred that...*
outcomes were made available to practitioners but where this has not be explicitly evidenced.

- Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects making project outcomes available to practitioners but with no direct evidence of utilisation of those outcomes.

- Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects engaging with professionals’ practice through an intermediary. For example, TLRP outcomes included in training sessions, toolkits, or other resources delivered by head teachers, training organisations, or local authority representatives.

- Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects directly engaging professionals and their practice, such as projects working directly with professionals in their teaching and learning setting(s).

- No evidence of outcome or impact made available within project documentation. No evidence provided or explicit evidence of focus on teaching and learning policy only.

Figure 4.4 classifies the 36 projects able to provide some evidence of practice impact at the end of their projects or awards by the degree of evidence for the level of impact on professional practice. These data are reviewed in rather more detail in Annex C.

**Figure 4.4: Categorisation of TLRP EoA reports by the degree of evidence of the level of impact on professional practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of outcome or impact within project documentation</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: HOST analysis of TLRP EoA reports, October 2010**

Analysis by project cost, geographical location and teaching and learning sector of the 36 TLRP projects with evidence of impact on professional practice has also been undertaken (with full details at Annex C). This shows no clear indication of evidence of impact being greater in larger-scale (ie higher-cost) projects. Of the three projects so far identified
with most far-ranging evidence of substantial outcomes for professional practice and practitioners, two fall into the lowest cost band.

There is also no apparent trend in any relationship between the level of evidence of impact, the award budget level and the sector impacted upon. Although numbers are very small, it seems the four home countries displayed similar proportional splits between the sectors that their projects engaged with.

Much of this self-assessed evidence of impact is now out of date, but the PI impact survey provides a more current view (Figure 4.5). This suggests that eight out of ten (80%) of the PIs that contributed to the survey consider that the impact expectations for their projects had been met to at least some extent. On this evidence, and as with the evidence of contributions to policy impacts, there seems to be some dissonance between the level of impact identified within the project documentation, (where the lack of reported impact evidence may indicate some caution in identifying achievements) and that from the PI survey which is more positive. Evidence from the Programme Director and stakeholders strongly suggests that this reflects the inherent time lag in projects securing or recognising impact. Other evidence suggests that impact on practice may take rather longer to achieve in the school sector than elsewhere.

**Figure 4.5: TLRP PI perception of achieved impact of their own TLRP project, November 2010**

PIS’ self-assessment of achieved impact on Teaching and Learning against their project-level aims and expectations (% of PIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>% of PIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a limited extent</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases = 69

**Source: HOST TLRP impact survey, October-November, 2010**

The case studies provide support for this conclusion about the time needed to secure impacts from research, and also suggested that such lag effects may have operated unevenly across projects and even within them. For example, the Oxford Brookes-Oxford collaboration achieved widespread and early impact from their literacy materials...
for KS2, aided by their ease of use and on-line availability. However, the project outputs that related to numeracy in KS2, required further support for practitioners to achieve what the PI called: ‘...a need for reconceptualisation of the way teachers teach’. In the case of the numeracy materials, it is thought that the full impact on practice was likely to need a long lead-in time and some policy-based stimulus.

The survey provides other indicative evidence. Figure 4.6 suggests the areas where funded activity has seen significant impacts on Teaching and Learning practice. PIs assessed the most common practice impacts from their research and its dissemination as having been on ‘pedagogy centred’ issues, including an ‘improved understanding of innovative and more effective practice’ in the UK (64%), and on ‘improved knowledge exchange with practitioners’ (60%). More direct impacts on curriculum and procedures seem to have been significant for rather fewer projects, although the focus of many projects may not have leant themselves to influencing such applied outcomes. One of the project case studies, for example, at the University of Bath was specifically focused on strategic and delivery partnerships and as such did not expect any immediate teaching and learning practice impacts.

As might be expected, impact on practice was centred on the UK, but not wholly so. Around one in ten of the projects reported the development of new or improved teaching and learning practice outside the UK. For example, the Oxford Brookes-Oxford Phase 2 project secured demonstrable practice impacts in Brazil through regional conferences and developing and distributing resources to over 8,000 teachers in one state alone. A similar impact was achieved using much the same resources in Portugal.

A number of stakeholders felt that TLRP had provided an opportunity for HE to develop the research capacity of school and college practitioners. This was seen as an important asset in a policy environment where improvement programmes often emphasise ‘action-research projects’ by front-line practitioners. However, while 62 per cent of the TLRP projects report success in building front-line collaborations and 30 per cent of projects report improved research collaborations with school and colleges, rather fewer report success in building research capacity in schools and colleges (19%).

**Other evidence for the utilisation of TLRP activities by practitioners:** Other evidence for the utilisation of TLRP activities by practitioners relates to the evidence of utilisation by (i) practitioners who were directly engaged in a TLRP project and (ii) practitioners from the wider educator community. In terms of the former category, one EoA report states that the project (which addressed Teaching and Learning at KS2);

> ‘...succeeded in improving the teachers' understanding and knowledge of the topics. Moreover, the pupils of these teachers went on to make better progress than others whose teachers did not attend the literacy and numeracy classes’.

Similarly, a second project (addressing multi-agency and inter-agency working):

> ‘...had an immediate impact on the research sites and are credited by the leaders of the schools with taking their collaborative work forward, particularly in the school sites’.
Figure 4.6: Achieved impacts of TLRP projects on Teaching and Learning professionalism and practice, November 2010

Self-assessment of significant ‘practice’ impacts achieved - selected indicators (% of PIs)

- General improvement to Teaching and Learning practice in subject(s)/phase(s)
- Improved understanding of innovative or more effective Teaching and...
- Development of new or improved Teaching and Learning...
- Development of new or improved Teaching and Learning...
- Development of new or improved Teaching and Learning...
- Development of new or improved Teaching and Learning practice/...
- Improved knowledge exchange with Teaching and Learning practitioners
- Increased research capacity in school/college practitioners
- Improved research collaborations with school/colleges
- New or enhanced Teaching and Learning research collaborations...
- Other Teaching and Learning improvement impact
- Not answered

Valid cases = 69

Source: HOST TLRP impact survey, October-November, 2010

In both of these cases, the evidence points to a deep and rich impact on practitioners who were directly engaged in the TLRP project but also to a further ‘roll-out’ of impact to practitioners from the wider educator community. These ‘disseminated’ impacts on the
wider educator community are often diffused (ie being combined with the impact from other non-TLRP projects) or not necessarily recognised by practitioners as being TLRP-specific (as discussed in Section 2.6). At least one project team suggested that much of the development of improved practice occurs informally and slowly from practitioner to practitioner with word-of-mouth cascading of the use of resources and approaches. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascribe cause and effect to any project programme in the context of this peer-to-peer development of practice.

There is also some evidence that suggests which forms of TLRP output appear to have a greater impact on, or at least preference from, practitioners. PIs, along with stakeholders, have highlighted practitioners’ respect of practice-based evidence, supported by verifiable approaches which allow them to reflect on their own practice and engage as an ‘educator-researcher’. There is also some evidence that practitioners have responded well to activities that have built on, or challenged, established practice such assessment for learning; synthetic phonics; or the use of ICT in the classroom.

There is some evidence of the critical importance of minimizing the need for practitioners to have to translate messages from research outputs to practice. In one case study, the PI felt that there was a need for research outcomes to signposting linkages to curricula and teaching methods and produce ‘teacher ready’ resources.

What is less clear is just how successful TLRP investments at project level have been in rising to this challenge of providing practical and accessible outputs. As noted in the previous section, while stakeholders have acknowledged the success of some projects in securing practice effects, they tended to characterize project-level outputs as often inaccessible and remote from direct application by practitioners. This is in contrast with the same stakeholder views of the accessibility of programme-level outputs with the Research Briefings series being especially valued.

What emerges is a dichotomy of opinion, with PIs suggesting that where they were produced, practitioner-centered outputs were accessible and usable, in contrast to the stakeholders’ doubts about applicability. This difference of view may stem from different expectations about how far research-based inquiry can be expected to translate to direct practice.

However, there is compelling evidence that a number of TLRP projects have produced very practical outputs which are in extensive use in the teaching and learning sector - some projects have become embedded so deeply in accepted practice that they will continue or even develop further. For example, the outcomes of the ‘Lessons for Learning: Using Lesson Study to innovate, develop and transfer pedagogic approaches and metapedagogy’ Research Training Fellowship are so central to the primary National Strategy that it is likely that the TLRP outcomes will continue and develop even after the end of the National Strategies in early 2011. It is likely that this will be due to the 2000 Leading Teachers trained in the methodologies underpinning the project, and the recent endorsement by pedagogical experts Sir Michael Barber and John Hattie of the underlying methodologies as ideal key elements of future standard toolkits for teachers’ CPD and ITT.
Section 5: Contribution and ‘Value Added’ of Programme Organisation and Management

5.1 Introduction

A distinctive feature of TLRP has been the effort and energy put into programme-level organisation and management, including support relating to project impacts. The evaluation has been asked to look at the contribution and ‘value added’ to TLRP impact of these arrangements, including its leadership (Programme Directors), the contributions of the TLRP Steering Committee and the ESRC’s management function. The evaluation findings here are set out for:

- Stakeholder perceptions of the added value of programme organisation.
- Perceptions of PIs and others from within the programme of the added value.
- Programme level impacts identified by PIs.

The evidence is drawn from stakeholders and the feedback from three out of four PIs (from the projects and activities survey). It also draws on documentary evidence as well as the programme direction team’s own reflections.

5.2 Stakeholder perceptions

The programme direction team were widely recognised as an important focus for engaging stakeholders. The evaluation findings suggest:

- The programme was widely seen to have had clear and solid leadership from its Programme Director from 2002. Different programme direction arrangements before this were not considered by the evaluation. This was recognised by nearly all interviewed as an important asset for the programme which provided a robust focus for raising awareness, communication, and issues referral.

- Enabling project and activity impact was not commonly cited as an output from programme-level interaction with stakeholders. However, this may reflect the limited stakeholder awareness of impact at project level. However, over a half of the interviewed stakeholders acknowledged that programme-level interactions facilitated contacts between PIs and stakeholders. There is evidence that suggests that in some cases these facilitated contacts contributed to subsequent impacts. More commonly, however, this facilitation seems to have mixed successes. For example, a TLRP policy conference set up with one home country executive attracted 40 civil servants from policy and other teams but few of the attendees took up the opportunity to forge links with individual projects.

- ‘Out-working’ by the Programme Director, in particular, was valued by the home country stakeholders (notably in Scotland and Wales) in establishing the wider relevance of what had been seen as: ‘...an all England show...funded by HEFCE’. In at least one of the home countries this was felt to have been the main intervention leading to their support for a home country extension project.

- The programme direction team and several stakeholders acknowledged the difficulties in sustaining working relationships. This was seen as a particular challenge for devolved administrations. Sustaining relationships (especially
within departmental and non-departmental bodies) was not helped by ‘staff churn’. There is evidence that TLRP had seven successive ‘main’ contacts in one devolved administration.

The collaboration developed later in the programme between the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) and TLRP, saw a jointly funded activity to explore final reports and major publications from the major awards and relevance to the distinctive policy environment and developments in Wales. This involved a sector workshops, a separately commissioned systematic review, wider consultation hosted by NAW policy teams, and a series of themed policy and practice summaries launched (and widely distributed) with Ministerial endorsement. This stemmed from a number of influences but was seen as being facilitated by rapid and effective engagement with the programme direction team by NAW personnel.

Overall, only three stakeholders doubted the added-value of programme-level links with the TLRP. One of these was a specialist agency focussing on one teaching and learning phase and felt this reflected a limited focus in commissioned projects relevant to that particular phase. Two stakeholders acknowledged that their own communication processes had worked against establishing effective links. In one case the TLRP was obliged to liaise across several interest groupings within the same agency. One departmental agency stressed the difficulties that programme-level liaison was presented with in stimulating impact, adding:

‘The real leverage for research (on policy formation) is with policy teams - there are several of these (in the department), their focus is almost constantly changing...staff come and go, and often they are...not at ease with talking to academics. It does not make for easy links’.

In general, non-departmental bodies valued the ability to liaise with the programme direction team on a ‘one-stop-shop’ basis. The programme direction team was often seen by stakeholders as central to the effectiveness of links and relationships between projects and stakeholders. Stakeholders also pointed to the development of ‘phase’ Deputy Directors as a key development that allowed stakeholders to refer directly to an individual, thereby speeding-up and maximising programme communication. One commented on the ESRC’s effectiveness in picking: ‘...such a well placed, energetic and ‘getting it done, team’.

Two non-departmental bodies did contrast their experience of working with the TLRP programme direction team with their past experiences of working with Research Councils direct. One simply saw this to be:

‘So much more direct...you get to the right person, right off. They know what they are talking about and if they can’t help you directly, act as broker to someone who does. It’s fast and efficient...and really helpful when you are chasing deadlines or needing immediate help’.

5.3 In-programme perceptions

The PI survey feedback was generally supportive of liaison with the programme direction team and their contributions to enabling impacts. Not all PIs originally welcomed the programme direction team interactions. One case study commented that they were initially surprised by the amount of programme-level management and input but that they came to see this as: ‘...a model of good management and for (programmes)...of that scale’.
Support for programme organisation and management seems to have focused on the project direction team and, especially, the added-value of cross-project mediated liaison and intra-programme networking with other projects in TLRP. Nearly a half of those commenting through the PI survey drew attention to this, with one summarising: ‘The TLRP organisation was brilliant at enabling individual projects to be joined up’.

This viewpoint was also a feature of the case studies. At the University of Bath, the TLRP programme-level organisation was seen to have acted as an enabler in drawing together not only a community of researchers and encouraging on-going debate, but also in extending the scope of those relationships beyond ‘the usual culprits’. The same project also felt that programme leadership had very actively encouraged and facilitated people to work together and which had been seen to overcome what might have been inter-institutional tensions or academic competitiveness.

Not all networking activities promoted at programme-level were seen as successful. The Stirling Interplay project had been a founder member of TLRP’s ICT intra-project group. The group was short lived although this project attributed this, not to programme-level factors, but simply to staff pressures and availability which had meant the group: ‘…failed to blossom’.

Others drew attention to the added value provided by the activities of specific ‘Phase’ Deputy Directors and, in particular, for HE phase networking where one PI observed:

‘…(the) HE Programme Director has been an enormous help in creating opportunities for publication and for generally disseminating the outcomes of the projects within the WP (Widening Participation in HE) Strand’.

There were mixed views among practitioners on the extent to which the programme direction team had enabled policy links. Only a minority commented specifically on this issue; some PIs seeing the brokerage of links to policy as being very positive, with one adding that the Programme Director had facilitated networks: ‘…and created opportunities for engagement with policy-makers which really helped’.

Others drew attention to the focus of the Programme Director, in particular, in stimulating cross-programme dissemination and providing a focus for links with policy-makers. Overall, this was favoured but perspectives varied widely across projects. Among the case studies for example, one saw policy links initially brokered by the programme direction team leading first to a policy conference with the LGA, which saw substantial dissemination to local authorities and later an LGA-funded extension project to capitalise on their TLRP findings. However, another felt that the programme direction team was focused strongly on theme based external collaborations and that a more disciplinary based focus would have helped them better in securing policy links.

Not all PIs felt the influence of the programme direction arrangements on impact were easy to unpick. One Phase 3 PI observed that the contribution of the programme team was mainly indirect but nonetheless significant:

‘The context provided by TLRP provided an environment where the intellectual engagement (or projects) was very high...This encouraged the development of significant ambition when we sought to take the academic outcomes and translate them into applied contexts’.

5.4 Programme level impacts

In a supplementary focus for the evaluation, PIs were asked if they were aware of programme level impacts arising from the work of the programme direction team. Just
over a quarter of those providing feedback was able to do so, highlighting in particular programme level impacts on practice:

- The summaries of TLRP research were widely seen as effective in getting findings and implications disseminated to a wider audience than would have been achieved by individual projects. Case studies showed how these had value to PIs beyond their own dissemination with one PI noting that he regularly took recent briefings from other TLRP projects to sector meetings (as well as his own): ‘I would go with 100s and they would all go’.

- The team’s development of ‘Professionalism and Pedagogy’ as a cross programme focus was also seen by some as a significant contribution to enhancing thinking in policy and practice. A minority of PIs also drew attention to the publication of Ten Principles into Practice as having been an important conceptual development and very well received.

- A small number drew attention to the opportunity provided through the team for effective engagement with the devolved assemblies and parliaments (Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland), although with variable outcomes.

In addition, as noted in Section 2 above, the influence of the TLRP has been intensified through programme level engagement with other research-led pedagogical improvement programmes launched within the life of TLRP projects and awards, or shortly after. In particular, stakeholders have suggested that at least two of these programmes (The Scottish Applied Educational Research Scheme and the Pedagogy Strategy for Wales) were influenced by programme direction engagement to draw on the experience and methodologies of the TLRP projects.

The picture has not been entirely positive, and other evidence suggests there may have been missed opportunities for programme-level impacts arising from the work of the programme direction team. The Improving Learning series potentially provided a valuable route to influencing practice in different phases but was seen by the programme direction team as underexploited, with too few PIs responding to invitations to contribute. The reasons for this may lie with timing and, in particular according to Programme Directors, the effect of the RAE in 2007 (as discussed in Section 3).

International links were also relevant - notably where additional resources were provided to bring policy or practice related evidence to wider audiences. In general, however, where there have been distinctive TLRP impacts at international level from projects, these seem to have stemmed mostly from the existing working relationships and networks of PIs or other team members.

In the UK, the programme direction stimulus to dissemination was also seen as crucial in bringing the findings of specific projects to a wider audience than might have otherwise been achieved. Three PIs commented specifically on the edited collection led by the Programme Director and a Deputy Programme Director which related to the WP sub-programme.
Section 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Introduction

The evaluation has been focused specifically on an assessment at programme-level of the achieved impact of TLRP on Teaching and Learning policy and professional practice. This section draws together the findings and conclusions set against the programme backcloth mapped in Section 2, and the analysis in Sections 3, 4 and 5, for the three principal objectives of the review:

- Assessing the extent to which TLRP has had an impact upon Teaching and Learning policy and practice in the UK and internationally.
- Analysing the ways in which the programme has been able to achieve impact through dissemination, networking and knowledge transfer.
- Assessing the ‘value added’ to achieved impact of programme, organisation and management.

It also sets out recommendations for ERSC and for others harnessing large-scale and HE-led education research activity to influence policy and practice development.

6.2 TLRP impact upon policy and practice

Unpicking the impact of the programme raises challenges not only of the quality of the impact evidence (as reviewed in Annex D) but also in the attribution of impact effects to programme investments and activities. The evaluation shows that the awareness of the programme and impact potential are inter-dependent in an initiative of this nature. As a cornerstone to achieving subsequent impacts, there has been extensive effort at programme-level and within some individual projects to raise and, sustain, awareness of TLRP and its outputs among both practitioners and policy-makers. This seems to have been particularly successful among policy making and influencing bodies, although significant staff turnover poses a challenge to sustaining awareness of the programme.

However, the extent to which awareness of TLRP has translated into impacts – for policy or practice, has been more variable across the programme. The analysis in the previous sections does not always provide a consistent picture across the different evidence sources. However, these inconsistence seems to go deeper than any evidence gaps. In particular, on project-based (self-assessed) evidence, few projects do not see at least some impact on policy and/or practice, and a half of these felt there was considerable impact. This impression is not shared outside of project teams. Indeed, while being supportive of the quality of research generated by TLRP, stakeholders are generally rather more cautious about what impact has been achieved, particularly on teaching and learning policy.

The evaluation concludes that these contrasts largely reflect different programme expectations combined with contrasting perspectives on what impact can be expected from research-based contributions over a limited period of time. Project and award leaders are close to projects (and their outputs), but stakeholders are closer to policy and practice influences - and both perspectives are valuable. Nonetheless, it remains that stakeholders have questioned whether the project outputs are sufficiently practical to drive take up and change in policy and practice. Set against this, some projects had low aspirations not all PIs felt that practical outputs were a realistic expectation of their
project’s focus or (despite programme guidance on focus and outputs) that it was an appropriate expectation for them to go beyond identifying practice implications.

Those that have produced practical outputs seem often to have chosen ‘product-strategies’ and dissemination channels which were not best placed to mobilise the practice potential of projects. Here there was a common, but not universal, focus or prioritisation of more conventional ‘academic’ dissemination and knowledge exchange channels. This has not been discouraged by, and may stem largely from, what appears to be the perverse incentives offered by the Research Assessment Exercise during 2007.

This should not detract from the achievement of those projects which have seen clear impact successes. The evaluation has chronicled a range of achieved practice impacts and it seems likely these could be extended through more in-depth review and longitudinal tracking of projects. Some of these impacts have been widespread with, for example, TLRP derived resources being taken up by tens of thousands of practitioners in some specific subject areas and phases, creating an enduring impact legacy. Others have aimed at, and achieved, more localised effects.

While the TLRP projects have demonstrated the potential of research-based inquiry for producing demonstrable short and medium term professional impacts, the actual achievements of individual projects have consequently been patchy. In particular, where research-based evidence challenges current arrangements, or requires some reconceptualisation of approach by teachers, practice impacts may take some time to come about. The evaluation concludes, nonetheless, that the practice impacts of TLRP have been demonstrable and for many projects significant. This may have fallen behind the expectations set by programme rhetoric at and after its inception, but has been sufficient to provide for an enduring and growing ‘practice’ legacy.

In contrast, the available evidence suggests that the impact on policy formation and implementation has been disappointing, and while there have been successes overall, the programme has failed to tap into available opportunities. Again PIs may not agree, but the evidence suggests that any policy relationships secured have too often been fragmented, marginal to the policy-formation process, and transitory. Stakeholders have almost universally reflected this impression of most project-level (but not programme direction) activity.

The difficulties in securing policy impact are compound and complex, but at least in part stem from programme design, with evident misalignment between TLRP project investments and (then) current policy priorities and issues. The evaluation suggests this raises significant questions about selection processes and prioritisation needing to be more robustly aligned with the programme aspirations for securing impact. At the same time, some of the impact constraints have been outside projects’, or the programme’s control, and individual projects do seem to have found real difficulties in engaging with policy audiences unless the project had substantial pre-existing relationships with policy-makers or shapers.

A question is also raised about how well a coherent and interrelated UK programme has supported impacts on policy and practice in a context where policy (and issues of practice-guidance, standard setting and regulation) is devolved to four home countries. This is not to say that all four home countries may not profit from more generically orientated pedagogic research, but that translating specific research findings into practice and policy implications may be constrained unless projects are in possession of clearly expressed context and content relating to devolved authorities and their systems.

It was probably beyond the resources or expertise of individual projects to do this and, at programme-level, resourcing relationships with devolved authorities may not always have been well enough developed for this to have been provided to projects and awards.
In a home nation where this has happened, as in Wales, the mediated ‘implications’ across the programme seem set to provide a powerful focus for translating aspects of TLRP activity into current policy issues and priorities.

6.3 Enabling impact

A number of impact success factors can be seen from programme direction and stakeholder reflections, and the case studies of high impact projects. The evidence suggests these are rather different for practice and policy impacts, and need to be considered separately.

Teaching and learning practice; Put together the evaluation suggests the impact achieved from the research owes as much to the way a project is managed and delivered, and in particular the organisation and embedding of (any) external (non-HEI) professional relationships, as to its precise subject matter or pedagogic focus. More specifically, the evidence shows:

- A key enabler has been constructing and embedding effective external partnerships in the research. In particular, projects that have ‘embedded’ collaborations with partner schools in either co-conduct of research or the testing of findings or materials, have shown early or subsequent impact on teaching and learning practice. Such collaborations have commonly drawn on established relationships of HEIs, with (often) local schools, but have also been brokered. For example, through co-operation with subject associations.

- Not all projects or awards have been looking to produce evidence-based resources. However, where they have, the evidence points to the value of a ‘problem-centred’ focus for the resources. For example, addressing challenging or hard to teach themes or areas.

- Impacts are more likely to secure wide and rapid dissemination through accessible and ‘off the peg’ resources signposted to curricula or specific teaching improvement challenges.

The evaluation also suggests that an enabler to practice impact is a diverse and mixed economy in the development and usage of activities and resources. The variety of learning contexts will have implications for resource dissemination and content, as different educator-practitioners will not interact with their learners in the same manner.

Teaching and learning policy: The evidence of enablers to policy impact from this programme is not strong. There are relatively few success stories, although others may emerge over time. Indeed, the evaluation shows how little is known of how research can have constructive engagement within a multi-layered and often intensively driven policy formation process. What does emerge is:

- The crucial importance of sustained and diverse pro-activity aimed at direct engagement with policy making and influencing groups. Here, the evidence suggests that high impact projects have typically had more success when engaging initially not with those directly engaged in shaping policy, but with those influencing policy teams and others either as ‘brokers’ or evidence mediators.
• The ease of use and accessibility of research-based project outputs to those in the policy arena also emerges as crucial to securing impact. Policy groupings reflected that other than the highly valued TLEP Research Briefings (at programme level), where they were aware of policy-related project outputs these were often not presented in ways which made them indigestible by policy audiences. Here, the focus on more traditional ‘academic’ pathways in project outputs and knowledge exchange at policy-level has not served dissemination to policy-audiences well.

• Awareness of policy impact potential and its importance to programmes of this nature also emerge as issues. Some of the contributing HEI PIs and researchers seem to have doubted if it was their task to unpack policy messages and implications in this way.

The evaluation has been able to show more clearly evidence of policy impact constraints and suggests that some of these have operated at programme management (not direction) level. The relevance of teaching and learning improvement or development to policy themes is crucial. The starting point for programme and project success in securing policy impact would need to be appropriate prioritisation at the point of project selections to relate funding to policy relevance. For whatever reasons, TLRP was not well placed to provide this prioritisation.

It must also be noted that the cycle of policy challenge, formation, development and implementation in teaching and learning, in the UK is an often intensive processes. Stakeholders, and the few more successful projects securing policy impacts, have shown the centrality of timeliness of research and evidence-based debate in this process. With often extended TLRP project durations, and at project-level a common emphasis on securing end-of-project impact, it must be doubted if TLRP’s policy impact expectations in this respect were realistic.

6.4 Added value of programme organisation and management

The Programme Direction team have emerged from the evaluation as a crucial focus for engaging national stakeholders from a wide range of departmental and non-departmental bodies, professional and interest groups. These bodies saw the programme as having clear and tangible leadership since 2002, recognised widely as providing added value and an important asset for raising awareness among policy-making and other bodies. This team was also valued widely for its energy and capability as programme brokers and as a ‘one-stop-shop’ for establishing project-links with external agencies, and for cross-programme communication and issues referral.

To this can be added the effects of TLRP meta-analysis led by Programme Directors and Deputy Directors and, in particular, what stakeholder feedback suggests is a growing awareness of the ten ‘evidence-informed principles for teaching and learning or pedagogies’ and the current inclusion of the principles in education policy development at the highest levels.

A further added value from the programme-level activity seems to have been in leading, and selecting, the smaller scale and more discretionary TLRP activity, in particular, the thematic awards and Meeting of Minds fellowships. Evaluation evidence for these is not as strong as for major TLRP projects and awards, but there is evidence that decisions at programme-level meant smaller-scale activity has helped to build coherence between some larger projects and their outputs, and to fill some phase and learning context gaps emerging from the distribution of the major awards.
The evaluation also concludes that the programme-level brokerage of the collective knowledge and outputs of the major awards and themed activity through BERA, the AERS and the SfRE are also set to serve to further embed the impact legacy and potential of the TLRP. Here there is already evidence from stakeholders that such programme-level activity have proven important in shaping ongoing work being carried out, for example by UCET, ESCalate and BERA. From with the programme, PIs were also widely supportive of liaison with the Programme Direction team and their contributions to enabling impacts. In general, participants’ support for the added value of the programme organisation and management seems to have been brought about by cross-project mediated liaison and intra-programme networking with other projects in TLRP.

6.5 Recommendations

Much can be learnt from the programme and its impact achievements, enablers and constraints. In this, the evaluation suggests some specific areas for development for future large-scale education research initiatives such as TLRP, including:

i) Diverse programmes of this nature may have project-level research as their bedrock but to aid impact the individual investments need the guidance, facilitation and brokerage which a well resourced and pro-active cross-project tier of programme direction and management can secure. TLRP has provided the opportunity to develop a valuable and we believe replicable model for this, and demonstrates what can be cost-effectively achieved through a such a tier. We propose, that replicating, and perhaps extending, the role of the TLRP Programme Direction team and the quality of its leadership, will be vital in any future parallel initiatives to securing higher-levels of policy awareness of programme content and, in due, course impact.

ii) Seeking to secure and demonstrate impact on policy and practice is a legitimate and desirable expectation of large-scale research based programmes such as TLRP. However, such expectations need to be carefully considered to ensure that they are viable within timescales, and with a programme focus which is both timely, realistic and responsive to policy and improvement agendas. Setting impact assumptions needs careful consideration and planning, with due consideration given in programme design to achievable outcomes which can be measured within viable timescales, and effectively communicated to project leaders. We propose that in future programmes of this nature, funding bodies needs to determine if impact is a primary or secondary goal, and shape programme focus, timescales, selection, monitoring, dissemination and management accordingly. Such expectations will also need to be clearly communicated to bidding (and successful) projects, and the wider stakeholder community.

iii) Securing impact will impose some tensions with other possible programme goals such as providing ‘demonstration’ projects of research excellence and building research capacity. Where impact is seen as a primary goal for the research investments, programme expectations would need to be sharply focused on measuring ‘impact potential’. While this should not detract from measuring realised short-term benefits, such a focus would need to recognise that project-level actors can be held accountable for providing opportunities to stakeholders for evidence-based improvements but not for changing policy or practice – which is likely to be multi-faceted and may need longer timescale. We propose this will require change in current focus away from realised benefits and outcomes measurement, to recording and assessing demonstrable policy relationships and attributed influence as well as practice-related outputs and relationships. We also propose that research is needed to help shape
measurable direct measures and proxy indicators for securing impact opportunity and relationships, to include where it is realistic to expect some demonstrable causal relationships between the leverage of research findings and new knowledge, and changing policy and practice.

iv) Measurable and realistic impact indicators may help to stimulate stronger project outcomes. However, these need to be matched with in-project and cross-programme impact planning and monitoring arrangements which can ensure that what is achieved is demonstrable – and recognised. We propose that impact monitoring should be a formative and not summative concern for projects, and needs to be progressively, systematically and robustly assessed – and embedded in the research methods applied and project management. We also propose that future funders of large-scale research programmes look to establishing impact monitoring arrangements within standardised progress reporting arrangements, and utilising some of the arrangements universities are already putting in place for REF record keeping.

v) Despite a growing concern with relevance and securing impacts from research-based projects, just how research can best relate to policy influencing channels and approaches remains confusing and obscure to many in the academic education research community, and perhaps more widely in social science. We propose there is a need for a more robust and inter-disciplinary understanding that can influence future guidance to researchers on what works well and in what circumstances. This study may provide a starting point but the weakness of secured policy impacts suggests a need for ‘better practice’ collaborative research with key departmental agencies, and which can take account of different cultures and emerging traditions in different home countries. Such an approach may also help build more robust bridges between policy-teams and academic researchers which seem currently to be either lacking or under-resourced. There is scope also to extend this to include comparative analysis outside the UK to identify transferable processes from other developed economies.

vi) Impacts on professional practice are likely to continue to provide fertile ground for research-based impacts but will need to be informed by ‘product strategies’ at project level which are closer to application than has been the case in many TLRP ‘practical’ outputs. This approach may not come readily to some academic research teams, and on the evidence of this evaluation not all leading researchers will have realistic expectations of what translation is needed to provide opportunities for policy-makers and practitioners to apply research findings. Some may even be hostile to using research in this way. Making the case studies from this evaluation more widely available may be a useful starting point for this. We propose also that future large-scale research funding of this nature will need to provide for greater clarity and direction on expectations of what constitutes usable and accessible materials and resources, and the need for distinctive product and dissemination strategies which may re-enforce (but will often be separate from) channels for sharing research and knowledge between the education-research community. This need not detract from ‘knowledge-based’ inquiry, but is set to strengthen policy and practice confidence in the utility of social science research and the value of investment in building research capacity and supporting conduct and dissemination.

vii) The evaluation shows just how long it may take for research-based impact opportunities to translate into improvements and change. We consequently propose there is a need for large-scale research projects such as those in TLRP to be supported by legacy resources to help mobilise impacts. Planning for securing impact often seems to come late in funded projects, and in some cases
this is a natural and inevitable consequence of the empirical process. Better project planning may help to anticipate such opportunities, but for most research, effort to generate significant impact comes in the closing stages of the project. Project funding cycles will consequently continue to work against impact achievement unless they can be supported in this way. We also propose that the most appropriate mechanisms need to be informed by further investigations in other disciplines but may well focus not on individual project legacy funds but on thematically organised activity to draw together similar strands of activity, and to exploit synergies in dissemination.

viii) Programmes such as TLRP, and where impact is a primary goal of the investments, need to match any rhetoric for securing impacts with project selection methods which reflect such aspirations and build confidence in them. Such selection processes need to recognise that pursuing academic excellence alone is likely to work against exploiting other research bids with perhaps greater impact potential. In addition, without careful prioritisation such an approach is also at risk of failing to provide for research-investments in the most relevant areas for policy and practice improvement. We recognise that this will be a deep-seated challenge for programme architects, and not the least in conducting a broadly-based, open and responsive programme-level review prior to (and during) funding decisions to identify policy and practice areas amenable to research influence. Nonetheless, we propose that a research-based programme of this nature need such ‘needs analyses’ and also appropriate selection processes, priorities and decisions to better align decisions on research investments on those relevant to needs and most likely to secure impacts. We suggest that this need not compromise on independence or quality of selected research projects and awards but will require some change in emphasis in balancing what may be competing selection priorities between ‘academic excellence’, topical relevance and impact potential of both research focus and methods.

HOST commends this assessment, and these recommendations to ESRC.
Annex A: Scope of the impact evaluation - research questions and issues being addressed

Specific research questions which have been the focus of the evaluation were established by ESRC and have been clarified and modified in the early stages of the evaluation. These include:

- To what extent has the TLRP met its impact objectives for both policy and practice?
- What is the quality of integration of the TLRP and, in particular, the relationship and synergies between this programme and other major initiatives aimed at improving teaching and learning in the UK?
- What is the extent to which policy-makers and practitioners have been aware of the TLRP and its work?
- To what extent have the communications channels used to promote the programme, its activity, outputs and outcomes been effective in supporting programme goals?
- To what extent, and how, has TLRP research been utilised and applied by policy-makers?
- What changes in policy have occurred that can be attributed wholly or partly to TLRP research?
- What TLRP factors or focus have enabled or constrained policy impact or otherwise contributed benefits to policy-making?
- To what extent has TLRP influenced changes in professional practice and/or educational research capacity outside HEIs.32
- What TLRP factors or focus have enabled or constrained changes in professional practice or capacity building?
- What has been the impact of ‘front-line’ changes and the potential and scope of a lasting legacy?
- What are the lessons emerging from the impact and realised benefits of TLRP for enhancing the practical impact of future educational research initiatives?

The impact evaluation has also been asked to look at the value added to the achieved impact of programme organisation, including its leadership (Programme Directors), the contributions of the TLRP Steering Committee and the ESRC’s management function.

---

32 The specification for the evaluation called also for a review of how TLRP had: ‘...built research capacity in major educational sectors’. This has been refined to exclude any review of capacity building in HE which was expected to have been addressed in the Phase 1 evaluation.
Annex B: Impact summaries from programme documentation

Annex B was presented initially in the interim report to ESRC and modified for inclusion in the draft final and final reports. It is reserved from publication at ESRCs request to retain confidentiality of sources.
### Annex C: TLRP programme distribution

#### Figure C.1: TLRP programme distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Phase 1 Networks</th>
<th>Career Development Associates</th>
<th>Phase 2 Projects</th>
<th>Phase 3 Projects</th>
<th>Scottish Extensions</th>
<th>Welsh Extensions</th>
<th>Northern Ireland Extensions</th>
<th>Widening HE Participation</th>
<th>Research Training Fellowships</th>
<th>Supplementary Impact Grants</th>
<th>Capacity Building Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol (6)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (3)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Education (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (3)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants UC (1)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evaluation of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (Second Phase) Final Report*
**Figure C.1: TLRP programme distribution (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Phase 1 Networks</th>
<th>Career Development Associates</th>
<th>Phase 2 Projects</th>
<th>Phase 3 Projects</th>
<th>Scottish Extensions</th>
<th>Welsh Extensions</th>
<th>Northern Ireland Extensions</th>
<th>Widening HE Participation</th>
<th>Research Training Fellowships</th>
<th>Supplementary Impact Grants</th>
<th>Capacity Building Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens - Belfast (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of Music (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity - Carmarthen (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All projects and awards</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include here smaller awards through 'Meeting of Minds Fellowships' and 'Thematic Awards'.

**Source:** HOST analysis of TLRP programme documentation, September 2010
**Annex D: Evaluation methodology and reflections on its effectiveness**

**Introduction**

The evaluation methodology has been conditioned by the need to meet ESRC's very specific information needs on programme impact (see Annex A), and by its intensity. A key feature has been the need to provide for a robust but intensive review able to provide for this final report within five months.

The methodology has drawn on a tried and tested review process that combines a focus on secondary methods that harness the extensive programme documentation and self-assessments by project leaders, with highly focused fieldwork. This has involved five separate but inter-related stages:

- **Stage 1** - Project inception, planning, steering and progress reporting.
- **Stage 2** - Secondary research and analysis and stakeholder interviews.
- **Stage 3** – Design and conduct of supplementary impact analyses by e-surveys of PIs and partners.
- **Stage 4** - Identification and conduct of a series of in-depth project case studies.
- **Stage 5** - Collation and reporting.

These are summarised below.

**Stage 1 - Project inception, planning and steering**

The focus for the evaluation was shaped by early discussions with ESRC and the ADI Evaluation Director. This built upon the detailed HOST methodology set out at the tendering stage and pre-contract negotiations, supplemented by inception discussions held in August 2010. A (revised) Framework Plan for the evaluation was set out and agreed as the focus for all evaluation inputs together with a risk assessment (to key inputs) and key input milestones for staged delivery (September 2010).

Progress on the evaluation has been reported through monthly progress statements which have also contributed to a continuing 'risk' review carried out in liaison with ESRC. These continuing inputs have fine tuned aspects of the timing and delivery and especially in terms of the focus for Stages 3 and 4 of the evaluation.

**Stage 2 - Secondary research and analysis**

A crucial part of the evaluation has been making full and best use of the considerable documentary and programme-level evidence produced over more than eight years of funded TLRP activity. This has included:

Stage 2a): Systematic review of programme documentation and management information, with a particular focus on project-level reporting, the EoA reports from major projects and refereed observations on the same. This was an important early input to the evaluation, which identified evidence gaps and limitations which informed the focus of the Stage 3 PI survey and contributed to the identification of Stage 4 case...
studies. This was subsequently drawn together in a project-by-project synthesis on reported outcomes and which was a major focus for the Interim Report (November 2010). The full evidence matrix as presented in that report was presented as part of the final report to ESRC as Annex B but for confidentiality is reserved from publication here.

Stage 2b): Programme-level interviews which, in addition to ESRC commissioning personnel, have included a two-stage discussion and further liaison with the Programme Director (from 2002) and selected members of the Programme Direction Team, the Chairman of the Programme Advisory Board over that period and three members of the TLRP Steering Group.

Stage 2c): The evaluation also included a review of the experience of selected (national) stakeholders from across the four home countries, which centred on:

- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Department for Education (England).
- Department for Education (Northern Ireland).
- Estyn (Wales).
- General Teaching Council for England.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- General Teaching Council for Wales.
- Higher Education Academy.
- Higher Education Funding Council (England).
- Institute for Learning.
- Lifelong Learning UK.
- Learning and Skills Improvement Service (previously Quality Improvement Agency).
- National Institute of Adult and Continuing Education.
- Scottish Executive.
- Teaching and Development Agency.
- Universities Council for Education of Teachers.
- Welsh Assembly Government.

In addition, the Skills Funding Agency (formerly the Learning and Skills Council – England) and Universities UK were approached but unable to provide inputs.

The focus was on assessing awareness, expectation and experience of programme impact. E-mail liaison was also conducted with three international contacts identified from programme-level discussions as having distinctive engagement at programme-direction level.

**Stage 3 - PI and partner surveys**

Reported impact evidence from the EoA reports had proven to be highly variable and the evaluation sought to supplement this with two ‘front-line’ surveys focusing on impact.

The first of these was a self-assessed impact review using a customised e-survey of all TLRP PIs\(^{33}\) - conducted initially in late October and November 2010 and extended into early New Year 2011 to allow for late responses.

\(^{33}\) The survey was focused on all PIs for the Phase 1 networks, Phases 2 and 3 major awards, ‘extension projects’ in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, supplementary impact awards, widening participation research projects, Capacity Building and Research Training Fellowships. It did not include award holders in Thematic Analyses (Programme Director Awards) unless covered by the ‘major’ funding PIs or those in the smaller-scale Meeting of Minds Fellowships.
The PI survey was successful in securing detailed feedback from nearly four out of five of all PIs (a 79 per cent response).\textsuperscript{34} Key points and data from a more complete analysis of these findings are set out in the main report. A non-response analysis showed no identifiable response bias, although with slightly lower rates of response among the ‘widening participation’ projects.

The second survey drew on provisions within the first survey for PIs to identify project-level stakeholders directly engaged in delivery or dissemination. This proved to be small scale and was conducted from early December 2010 using a modified e-questionnaire of the identified project partners (from the PI survey as above). The PI survey was unable to provide contact details for more than a small number of external and non-academic (HE) partners with many PIs responding that such details had either not been retained by projects, had since been lost or were substantially out of date. A further 15 external partners were identified and surveyed for their experiences of the project outcomes but few of these were able to make a contribution.\textsuperscript{35} Two were also followed up at ESRC’s suggestion with telephone discussions.

\textbf{Stage 4 - Identification and conduct of in-depth project profiles}

The evaluation had always anticipated the need for project-level evidence which went beyond the essentially self-assessed contributions of projects from Stages 2a) and 3. In discussions with TLRP it was agreed that reflecting limitations in the EoA reports (Stage 2a) these additional evidence sources should focus on ‘high-impact’ projects, in order to assess success factors and determinants of effective impact on teaching and learning policy and/or practice. It was also agreed that the available resources should be focussed on in-depth profiles rather than light-touch indicative case studies of projects.

Project selections were determined from a combination of: the matrix mapping of EoA reports; feedback from stakeholders; insights from the programme management and direction teams. A number of short-listed projects and awards were identified, from which six priorities were selected, taking account of the availability of lead investigators. Five of the selected project profiles were project-based case studies and one of a TLRP Fellowship. Two PIs had declined to take part due to intense work pressures,\textsuperscript{36} and the final selections drew on two reserves.

The projects selected are shown in Figure D.1 below, and while focussing on ‘high-impact’ provide for a small cross-section of experience - with two Phase 2 projects, two Phase 3 – including one with a supplementary impact award; a Scottish extension project and also one Research Training Fellowship. Within these, interviews were conducted involving various personnel in, or directly engaged with, each of the major awards using a semi-structured interview checklist, and included:

- Review of relevant project documentation including supplementary materials supplied by projects.
- Interviews with project lead-PIs - all interviews being conducted face-to-face.

\textsuperscript{34} The response is taken at 19 January 2011 and counts fully competed questionnaires only. A number of partially completed questionnaires were also returned but are excluded from this response rate although they have been taken into account in the analyses in the main body of the report.

\textsuperscript{35} The achieved response was limited to three completed questionnaires. Given the evidence problems of accurate contact details and time lag, no reminder stage was conducted.

\textsuperscript{36} The intensity of the evaluation and some delays in securing agreement on the case study selections meant that some PIs were given only four to five weeks notice and some found this difficult to accommodate in busy schedules.
## Figure D.1: Case study summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Institution (s) and PI</th>
<th>Funding allocated from TLRP</th>
<th>Date commenced</th>
<th>Project summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Effectiveness of Pupil Groups in Classrooms</td>
<td>Institute of Education: Professor P Blatchford</td>
<td>£1,013,442</td>
<td>06/05</td>
<td>This Phase 2 project developed and evaluated effective groupwork at the primary and early secondary school level. The project established a network with schools - on Social Pedagogic Research into Group Work (SPRinG) to review gaps between the potential of the approach and its limited application by schools. It aimed to enhance the learning/achievement potential of pupils (at Key Stages 1 to 3) working in classroom groups, in a programme designed to raise levels of groupwork during typical classroom learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Awareness in Teaching and Learning of Literacy and Numeracy in Key Stage 2</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes University; Oxford University; and Institute of Education: Professor T Nunes</td>
<td>£788,161</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
<td>The research award (Phase 2) compared the effectiveness of implicit and explicit teaching for developing literacy and numeracy skills in an experimental situation, looking at the needs for (re)conceptualisation by teachers and testing empirically-derived resources in diverse classroom situations. A particular focus was on the use of morphemes in Key Stage 2 literacy skills development, and the use and potential for improved learner performance of intensive fractions in a difficult to teach area of numeracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Policy on Learning and Inclusion in the New Learning and Skills System</td>
<td>Institute of Education; University of Sunderland: Professor F Coffield</td>
<td>£652,704</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td>This Phase 3 project evaluated the impact of key national policy levers (eg funding, targets and inspection) on teaching, learning and assessment (TLA). This included extensive liaison with policy actors in the sector, with a focus, for example, on issues such as learner outcomes and motivation in the Learning and Skills System (LSS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning in and for Interagency Working (LIW) AND Supplementary Impact Grant on 'Learning from across boundaries'</td>
<td>University of Bath; and University of Oxford: Prof. H Daniels and Prof. A. Edwards</td>
<td>Major award funding and also £12,245 for SI award</td>
<td>08/06 and 02/09</td>
<td>The 4 year Phase 2 collaborative project developed and tested a model of the work-based professional learning needed to support inter-agency working. Its emphasis was on the practitioner skills across multiple disciplines and how to ensure responsive collaboration between professionals concerned with a particular focus on the social inclusion of at risk children, young people and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure D.1: Case study summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Institution and PI</th>
<th>Funding allocated from TLRP</th>
<th>Date commenced</th>
<th>Project summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERPLAY: Play, learning and ICT in Pre-School Education</td>
<td>University of Stirling: Professor L Plowman</td>
<td>£88,654</td>
<td>08/06</td>
<td>The project was supported as a ‘Scottish Extension’ award with the purpose to identify ways of enhancing young children’s experiences with ICT through guided interaction with practitioners, peers and parents. The collaborative project adopted a broad definition of ICT as technology ‘being embedded in a range of children’s everyday experiences’. Interplay was based on the earlier policy studies for LT Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons for Learning</td>
<td>University of Cambridge: Peter Dudley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/03</td>
<td>This was a Research Training Fellowship funded specifically under TLRP. Its particular focus was on using Lesson Study to innovate, develop and transfer pedagogic approaches and metapadagogy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Supplementary interviews using a combination of face-to-face and telephone methods with selected team members (where available) and selected delivery partners.

All interviews were conducted in December 2010 and early/mid January 2011 and included PIs, selected team members and partners and, in some cases, other stakeholders. Detailed project profiles have been prepared for each and provided to ESRC with each having previously validated for attribution by PIs.

Stage 5 - Collation and reporting

This has provided for the monthly progress reports, the November 2010 interim report, a draft final report (January 2011) and this revised report. All outputs have met ESRC’s agreed output schedule and analytical needs. In addition the interim report included a stand-alone systematic review of documented outcomes from all major-funded projects.

Effectiveness of the evaluation methodology

Progress against each of these stages has been steady and effective. Delays in securing ESRC clearance on case study selections resulted in some slippage in the case study stages, but these have not proven significant beyond the need to defer a small number of the required interviews until HEIs resumed activity in early 2011. This has not affected the coverage or on-time reporting of the evaluation.

The approach taken to ‘tracking back’ has generally been successful, bolstered by the use of multiple sources to triangulate the evidence arising on key impact metrics. The strengths of the approach can be seen to have been the very high level (and quality) of response (79%) to the PI survey - which some might regard as exceptional for an e-survey of this nature. To this can be added the quality of engagement with national stakeholders and the substantial insights provided by the in-depth project profiles (albeit limited in number).

The case study evidence has been especially significant and has provided for an exploration of process issues identified in the stakeholder interviews and practical illustrations of success factors in achieving impact. There is little doubt that more and more diverse project profiles would have further enriched this analysis and provided for further illustrations but we doubt would have materially changed the conclusions. However, more (or a more progressive approach to conducting the cases – as originally planned) might have provided opportunities to explore in later cases some of the issues emerging from those conducted earlier in the evaluation process.

There have been three significant limitations to the quality of evidence secured. The first of these, paradoxically, has stemmed from what might have been regarded as its likely strength - the deferral of this summative impact assessment until some time after the funded projects and awards had concluded. Programme impact evaluations are, by the nature of funding streams, often limited to immediate or very early short term impact effects. This has not been the case with this impact review of TLRP and the evaluation has been able to draw on evidence from up to five years after some of the projects concluded. It is, therefore, able to produce a substantive medium term assessment of outcomes. However, this extended summative focus has generated its own problems from the time delays involved with a significant minority of PIs not available due to retirement or mortality, some difficulties in recall of detail (eg of partnerships) and some loss of management information at project-level (eg of contact details for the partners survey) due to lost ‘data’ or changed IT systems. These difficulties have been counter-balanced by the fact that the evaluation has been able to take into account longer-term
impacts stemming from the TLRP funding at project level and how this has influenced subsequent research activity and the TLRP legacy.

The second limitation relates to the stakeholder review. This has been a valuable but resource intensive part of the evaluation and the timeframe and budget for the review meant that it has focused on only a limited number of national stakeholder bodies. While allowing for 20 stakeholders would conventionally provide for a sufficient focus, this could have been usefully extended to reflect the devolved nature of teaching and learning policy and practice in the UK. There has also been limited opportunity to engage with the very diverse professional and other national bodies in this sector – and the opportunity of doing so may have embellished the evidence available for practice impacts. We doubt this would have materially changed the conclusions emerging but it would have provided an opportunity to reflect on engagement and TLRP potential with agencies less directly involved in TLRP management or delivery.

The third and, we believe, most significant limitation of the evaluation, however, has been the absence of a consistent and effective end of project impact baseline. The EoA reports had been expected to have contributed to the baseline with the programme direction team having provided projects with an adjusted reporting structure for the self-assessment of impacts, (a structure which later became standard practice for similar ESRC awards). Nonetheless, the self assessments available proved to be widely variable in terms of the quality of end-of-project assessment of impact secured and expected. Too many self-assessments seem to have not taken account of programme level guidance - confusing project outputs with outcomes.

These are not crucial limitations, with limitations in one evidence source being compensated for, at least in part, by others. Overall, this has involved a highly intensive methodology with significant risks to completion and coverage. In the event, the cooperation secured for the evaluation has seen it able to deliver to the ambitious timetable and to draw on extensive evidence from multiple sources. HOST commends this detailed assessment to ESRC.
Annex E: Impact of TLRP awards on Teaching and Learning practice

HOST’s review of project documentation (as from Annex B) has systematically analysed the self-assessed evidence for project-level TLRP impact on teaching and learning practice.

This analysis took into account project documentation up to and including EoA reports. As such it cannot take account of evidence for impact that post-dates the EoA reporting. Some of this later evidence for impact is drawn out by the survey data, as is reported in Chapters 3 and 4.

This note sets out a brief summary of self-assessed evidence for impact on teaching and learning practice drawn from the available project documentation.

As noted in Section 3, project documentation for 58 TLRP projects were available to the evaluation team. The minimum definition of ‘project documentation’ was the availability of an EoA report.

Of these 58 projects, 22 have been discounted in the analysis of evidence for impact on professional practice due to either:

1. Factors of absence, (for example, no reference to project outputs or outcomes or to professional practice) or
2. Factors of presence (for example, explicit statements that an individual project is concerned only with impacting on teaching and learning policy).

Of the remaining 36 sets of project documentation, 35 include project budget and/or cost details.

Therefore, in the analysis that follows, the initial set of tables (which are largely concerned with project budget) draw from a set of 35 projects, while the second set of tables (which are largely concerned with self-assessed evidence for impact on teaching and learning practice) are drawn from a set of 36 projects.

Cost bands

The set of tables below ranks the set of 35 projects with project documentation relating to teaching and learning practice and budget and/or cost details by three cost bands:

1. **Low** (<=£350,000).
2. **Medium** (£350,001 to £749,999).
3. **High** (>=£750,000).

Evidence categories

In addition to the cost bands, the set of figures below also employ the reference framework for evidence of impact noted in Chapter 3. To re-cap, the reference categories have been constructed as follows:

- Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners. Projects where it can be reasonably expected or inferred that
outcomes were made available to practitioners but where this has not be explicitly evidenced.

- Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects making project outcomes available to practitioners but with no direct evidence of take-up or utilisation of those outcomes.

- Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects engaging with professionals’ practice through a teaching and learning setting-relevant intermediary. For example, cascading outcomes such as training sessions, toolkits, or resources via head teachers, training organisations, local authority representatives, etc.

- Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners. Evidence of projects directly engaging professionals and their practice, such as projects working directly with professionals in their teaching and learning setting(s).

**Figure E.1: Evidence for impact of projects by cost bandings**

(a)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost banding</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Mean cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low³⁷</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£147,218.76</td>
<td>£2,502,719.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£493,604.33</td>
<td>£4,442,439.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£893,602.11</td>
<td>£8,042,419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£14,987,577.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost banding</th>
<th>Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁷ Including two projects where electronic and paper-based budget details differ. Budget quoted is from electronic records.
(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical location</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Early Years</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>Workplace/ Professional/Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost banding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HOST analysis of TLRP EoA reports

Generally, higher-cost projects are clustered in England (all but one of the projects from Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales combined lie within the lowest cost bracket).

While this is suggestive of the general trend for more English projects within the TLRP programme overall, it is notable that the majority (53.7%) of the funding allocated to the 35 projects with budget and evidence of impact on teaching and learning practice went to projects in the highest cost band, all of which were England-based.

Looking across the documentation and the self-assessed evidence for impacts on Teaching and Learning practice, there is no clear evidence of impact on professional practice being greater in larger-scale (higher-cost) projects. Indeed, of the three projects with the evidence of greatest impact (defined as 'evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners'), two fall into the lowest cost band. The third of these projects is to be found in the highest cost band.

There is no clear evident trend in terms of a relationship between budget of project and the sector\(^\text{38}\) impacted upon.

\(^{38}\) Categorised as Early Years, Schools, FE, HE and Workplace/ Professional/Lifelong Learning.
TLRP utilisation and impact on professional practice by geographical location:
The geographical locations of the 36 projects with EoA impact evidence have been defined as the four home countries engaged in the TLRP (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

Figure E.2: Evidence of impact of projects by geographical location

(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Mean cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>25(^{40})</td>
<td>£519,718.79</td>
<td>£12,473,251.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£66,851.50</td>
<td>£133,703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£321,173.67</td>
<td>£1,927,042.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£151,193.67</td>
<td>£453,581.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£14,987,577.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{39}\) Including two projects where electronic and paper-based budget details differ. Budget quoted is from electronic records.

\(^{40}\) Including one project where documentation does not contain project budget/cost details.
### Source: HOST analysis of TLRP EoA reports

This analysis builds on the evidence on quality of impact to underline the dual factors of a preponderance of both budget/spend and the number of projects in England. However, what is notable is that the quality of evidence of impact is evenly spread across England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. On this evidence, it appears that value-for-money in terms of the production of high quality evidence of impact and engagement is greater outside England (especially when considered in parallel with the preponderance of higher-cost projects in England).

Proportionally, there is little variation in the spread of sector-focus across the four nations. However, what is notable, is the exclusivity of evidence of utilisation and impact relating to school-focused projects in Wales and Northern Ireland and the exclusive presence of evidence of utilisation and impact in Workplace/Professional/Lifelong Learning projects in England.

The project documentation and EI survey within this evaluation were unable to shed light on why these peculiarities of value-for-money and sector-focus may be the case.

However, the majority of stakeholders from outside England who were involved in this evaluation noted the small and more ‘focused’ nature of the university and ‘teaching and learning systems’ in the non-English home countries. In this context, many stakeholders felt that the small of non-English University Schools of Education and primary and secondary schools led to school-university partnerships that were uniformly characterised as extremely close, long-lasting and ‘jealously guarded’.

It is not unreasonable to conclude, (as a number of stakeholders from Wales and Scotland did), that non-English University-based projects tend to carry out research within their existing, established partnerships. These partnerships will predominately be with primary and secondary schools, engendered by previous CPD, ITT and education research-based activities carried out by the university.

In addition, stakeholders suggested that these school partnerships would tend to be established and secure, and therefore less costly to include within a TLRP project than a new partnership of bodies would be. For example, budget would not have to be allocated to the same degree to, for example, partner organisation development, staff and organisational induction, developing reporting systems, or establishing partnership-working ground rules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>Early Years</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>Workplace/Professional/Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TLRP utilisation and impact on professional practice by Teaching and Learning sector: The Teaching and Learning sectors impacted upon by the 36 projects with EoA impact evidence have been defined as:

1. Early Years.
2. Schools.
3. FE.
4. HE.
5. Workplace/Professional/Lifelong Learning.

It has not been possible from the documentation currently available to split-out the Schools category into primary or secondary phases without a high risk of interpretive error. Further, it has also been impossible to meaningfully assess the phase-specific elements of the programme from the PI impact survey, due to the very small base numbers within the categories.

Figure E.3: Evidence of impact of projects by Teaching and Learning Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Sector</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Mean cost</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£88,654.00</td>
<td>£88,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£421,221.13</td>
<td>£6,739,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£926,514.00</td>
<td>£926,514.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>£412,360.50</td>
<td>£4,948,326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace/Professional/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£462,187.41</td>
<td>£2,284,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£14,987,577.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

41 Including one project where documentation does not contain project budget/cost details.
42 Including two projects where electronic and paper-based budget details differ. Budget quoted is from electronic records.
(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Sector</th>
<th>Speculative or anecdotal evidence only of impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of indirect impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct mediated impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
<th>Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace/Professional/ Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Sector</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace / Professional / Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** HOST analysis of TLRP EoA reports

The most notable aspect of this analysis is the exclusivity of ‘Evidence of direct impact on professional practice and practitioners’ within the school sector. We conclude that this reflects the prevalence of school-based projects within the set of projects that have evidence of TLRP utilisation and impact. Indeed, the case studying phase of this impact evaluation highlighted the prevalence of school-based projects using classroom (or early years) professionals as co-researchers reflectively examining their own practice and interventions.
This approach, through an explicit engagement with day-to-day professional practice as part of the research methodology, cannot avoid either positively or negatively impacting directly on the involved practitioners’ practice during the life course of the project. However, the evidence presented in the EoA reports do not (and cannot) address the key issue of whether these projects have embedded (or even further spread) positively changed professional practice in the post-project period.
Annex F: Glossary

ADI  Advanced Design Information
AERS  Applied Educational Research Scheme
BERA  British Educational Research Association
CETL  Centre(s) for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (in HE)
CETTs  Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training
CFBT  CfBT Education Trust
CPD  Continuing Professional Development
DCSF  Department for Children, Schools and Families
DELNI  Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland
DfE  Department for Education (current departmental agency in England)
DfES  Department for Education and Skills (past departmental agency in England)
DIUS  Department for Industry Universities and Skills
EoA  End of Award
EPD  Early Professional Development
ESCalate  the Subject Centre for Education
ESRC  Economic and Social Research Council
FE  Further Education
GTC  General Teaching Council
HE  Higher Education
HEFCE  Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEFCW  Higher Education Funding Council for Wales
HEI  Higher Education Institution
HOST  HOST Policy Research
IAG  Information, Advice and Guidance for learners
ICT  Information, Communication and Technology
IOE  Institute of Education
ITT  Initial Teacher Training
KS2  Key Stage 2
LEA  Local Education Authority
LGA  Local Government Association
NTRP  National Teacher Research Panel
PI  Principal Investigator
QAA  Quality Assurance Agency
QCA  Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
QTS  Standards for Qualified Teacher Status
RAE  Research Assessment Exercise
REF  Research Excellence Framework
SEN  Special Educational Needs
SFC  Scottish Funding Council
SfL  Skills for Life
SFRE  Strategic Forum for Research in Education
STEM  Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
TDA  Training and Development Agency for Schools
TEL  Technology-enhanced Learning
TERN  Teacher Education Research Network
TLRP  Teaching and Learning Research Programme
TTA  Teacher Training Agency
TTRB  Teacher Training Resource Bank
UCET  University Council for the Education of Teachers
UK  United Kingdom
WAG  Welsh Assembly Government
WP  Widening Participation