The production of an annual progress report is a requirement for all investments within TLRP. However, we hope that the process of working on your report will also provide a formative, team focus for a review of progress during 2004.

[Note: If your work has just begun or is about to end, an annual report for 2004 may not be required. If your award finishes on or before March 31st 2005, your end-of-award report will subsume the annual 2004 report and the latter is thus not expected. If your award started on or later than 1st October 2004, a report is also not required]

Your report contributes to an annual cycle which is used to both support each investment and to steadily improve the Programme as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn Term</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept: BERA conference</td>
<td>By end April: feedback provided on Annual Reports</td>
<td>End Jan: Annual Reports required for Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Nov: Prog. conference</td>
<td>Early May: internal publication of compendium of Annual Reports from Programme and Projects</td>
<td>Late Feb: Capacity building conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Nov: Steering Committee meeting</td>
<td>Late May: Directors’/Award Holders’ conference</td>
<td>Early March: Steering Committee meeting including discussion of Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Dec: suggested Project Team and Advisory Group reviews of the year to inform Annual Reports</td>
<td>Early July: Steering Committee meeting</td>
<td>End March: Programme’s Annual Report required for ESRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your report is of enormous importance in enabling the Steering Committee, Directors’ Team and others to take stock of progress within each project, and to inform both practical organisation and strategic decisions concerning the Programme as a whole. Thank you therefore, in advance, for taking the time to complete the report. The template indicates the anticipated length for each element. In the light of feedback, we have tried to make the items
more discrete. If you completed a report last year, you will find that there are many continuities - but there are also some differences intended to make the report easier to write and also more useful. The main substantive item is 9., on ‘Research Progress’, for which up to four pages is available.

The Programme is now required to report on a selection of ‘key performance indicators’ (KPIs). We will be focusing on ‘contributions to knowledge’, the ‘development of research capacity and expertise’ and ‘user engagement, communication and impact’. Some of the data needed has to be collected through this report.

2004 outputs should be deposited in two forms, and this is part of the annual reporting process. First, all substantive publications (newsletters, papers, journal or newspaper articles, book overviews, etc) should be deposited within D-space in an appropriate form. We hope that the training which was offered during the Autumn will pay off at this point. Further advice is available at: http://www.tlrp.org/manage/admin/index.html If you are really stuck, please contact John Siraj-Blatchford by email at: jsb303@cam.ac.uk. (You may be interested to know that analysis of the keyword discussions at the Cardiff conference will produce a development of the D-space tags within the next few days.) Second, please also send two hardcopies of all 2004 publications to Andrew Pollard, TLRP, University of London, Institute of Education, Bedford Way, London, WC1H OAL.

For confidential matters, which you would not wish to be circulated beyond the Steering Committee, please use a Confidential Annex as indicated.

The deadline for submission of the report and deposition of outputs is Monday, January 31st 2005. Unfortunately, the schedule for consideration of these reports does not allow for any slippage since the draft Programme report is due just one week later. Please do your utmost to submit and deposit on time.

Subject to editing to remove any personal, sensitive or inappropriate information, it is again intended to circulate a compendium of reports (including appropriate end-of-award reports) across the Programme to share good practice, facilitate inter-Project liaison and support cross-Programme development. Some items are also likely to be the subject of detailed cross-Programme thematic analysis. Others will provide essential information on which plans will be made to provide appropriate support and assistance. The Directors’ Team will use your report to prepare its annual overview of the Programme’s progress.

As indicated in the cyclical model above, following discussion of the reports by the Steering Committee, the Directors’ Team will do their utmost to provide feedback to each team by the end of April 2005.

When completed, please send electronic copies of your report to the following:

1. Gary Grubb, gary.grubb@esrc.ac.uk
2. Andrew Pollard, a.pollard@ioe.ac.uk
3. The member of the Directors’ Team who acts as your ‘DT critical friend’.

You are encouraged to make copies of, or edited versions of, appropriate parts of your annual progress reports available through your project or network’s website - bearing in mind of course that the text would be fully in the public domain.

Thank you for working on these documents. Andrew Pollard, 1st November 2004
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1. Original aims:

The overall project aim is to improve the learning of new teachers and other new professionals by developing, evaluating and disseminating a research-based, practical model of early professional learning (EPL), and to add value to previous approaches by integrating outcome-oriented competencies with non-formal learning, context and identity.

Specific objectives are:

1. To develop an integrated model of EPL from a grounded understanding of non-formal learning and the use of competence-based standards in practice, taking account of individual differences and differences in context.

2. To develop and implement a multiple testing instrument for assessing the performance of new teachers and to adapt this for application in other professional contexts.

3. To demonstrate that the research-based model of EPL can be embedded in practice in such a way as to enhance professional learning, performance and mentoring, and thus contribute to policy on early professional development.

2. Design and methods:

The design is essentially to develop a research-based model of early professional learning (EPL) which integrates outcome-oriented competencies with non-formal learning, context and identity, to develop this into a practical strategy which can be implemented in schools/Local Authorities and to assess the impact in two consecutive controlled trials. This involves the production of a multidimensional instrument for assessing the performance of new teachers in their working context. Practitioners have a central role in gathering in-depth data in local sites to the construction and dissemination of the model. In the initial case study phase, a group of six teachers have been trained and supported as ethnographers of new teachers in their own schools as a central part of the research team and are principally responsible for gathering the foundation of qualitative data on the learning experience of new teachers within their own schools. Testing of the model and further
adaptation for different teaching contexts will take place in two phases following the case study phase. Ultimately, there will be direct contact with several hundred teachers in some 40 schools and dissemination and extension of model to other professional contexts with the intention of making a serious contribution to policy in the field of early learning in the professions. The model will be further informed by a parallel longitudinal study and focussed literature reviews.

3. Award conditions, if applicable:

We were asked in the award letter of 11 April 2003 to:
- reduce the bid to £675,000 (at current prices then)
- cut project duration to 48 months
- reduce conference attendance costs

4. Progress in relation to Award conditions:

The project was revised to meet all of these conditions and discussed with the Programme Director. Details of the revised costings were sent by letter on 15 August 2003 to both Alex Monckton, ESRC Research Division and Andrew Pollard, Programme Director of TLRP.

5. Confirmation statement:

The research is being conducted in the initial contract with only one variation agreed with the Programme Director. We appointed six teacher-researchers instead of four with a corresponding adjustment in their time out of class. This was because of the extensive interest from teachers in these posts and the quality of applications but also our awareness that loss of one teacher from four – for a number of reasons - could leave the early case study phase vulnerable.

6. Practical changes to original award:

There have been no practical changes affecting directors or contract staff but one of the six teacher-researchers has taken maternity leave (October 2004 – March 2005).

7. Research staff:

We have an associated research student, Allen Blake, under the Institute’s MRes arrangements, from September 2004 – 2006/7.

8. Programme links or project roles:

- Capacity building liaison: Peter Gray
- ICT development liaison: Peter Gray
- Publications and output liaison: Jim McNally
- Project spokesperson/s for media work Jim McNally, Nick Boreham, Peter Cope, Ian Stronach

9. Research progress:

1. Enhancing outcomes for the learning of new teachers

The main aim of the project is to improve the learning of new teachers and we are currently half way through the first phase of case study ethnography of how new teachers learn. It is the data from this that will be the basis for our grounded theory of early professional learning. Beginning in the Spring of 2005, this will be translated into a practical model in collaboration with our partners within the user community. These are the teacher-researchers, the advisory group, local authorities and, most importantly, the test schools in Scotland and greater Manchester.

The main initial thrust is in Scotland where we now have sets of sequential interviews with 22 new teachers in 5 schools, supplemented by ethnographic observations of school culture as a context for learning to teach - equivalent to some 150 pages of transcript. It is already apparent in the data collected that informal learning, emotions, context and identity formation are important dimensions of the experience and these have the capacity to conceptually enhance any theory or model based solely on competencies. Studies which focus on the impact of induction programmes, for example, the recent systematic review by Totterdall et al (2004) tend to
systematically exclude informal learning. The imposition of generalised definitions have not recognised problematic nature of the term in different contexts and indeed highlight a lack of empirically grounded evidence (Straka 2004). It is interesting that, in over 50 semi-structured interviews with new teachers already completed during the first half of their first year in teaching, there has been little reference to the professional standard in general (the Standard for Full Registration) or to any of the 80+ specific statements of competence within it. However, we do expect to gain more insight into how new teachers engage with the professional standard when the interim reports on their progress are completed around January 2005. We have also been able to make an early start to data collection in England. 18 interviews with NQTs in Manchester NQTs have been conducted (out of 23 willing to participate in 6 schools). These are currently being transcribed and dates have been set for the others in early February.

The multiple testing instrument in our proposal involves the development of 5 indicators of the performance of new teachers. At the time of writing, ‘job satisfaction’ is nearly complete and ‘pupil attainment’ is in progress. ‘Interactivity’, ‘children’s descriptions’ and ‘expert judgement’ are at the design stage where dialogic possibilities involving video and group feedback to an intermediary are being considered. These will be used initially in the test phase for summative assessments of the new teachers. We have become more confident, through our interaction with users in discussing and developing the indicators, that they may also have a legacy of a formative kind as new teachers are encouraged by their authorities and schools to adopt them for self-evaluation. This would result in an additional enhancement in the longer term.

2 Summary of development of research in the first year

a) Teachers as ethnographers in their own schools

In selecting the teacher researchers we drew largely on our own prior experiences as teachers, researchers and interviewers in educational contexts. Our view was that we wanted credible teachers who had the respect and trust of their colleagues in school. Those who applied would be applying to do a job for which they were not specifically trained and for which we did not expect them to be trained. We wanted the kind of good teacher who was also able to stand outside the inevitable absorption of the job. The broad ‘person specification’ that emerged from our deliberations was:

- capable, respected colleague
- approachable – a ‘friendly face’ - and part of a wider school community
- access to people and situations
- reflective, active practitioner
- not closed mind or dogmatic
- offers some insight into new teacher experience
- ability to engage in explanatory dialogue
- genuine interest and not a pure career move
- energy and commitment to see the job through
- operates well within a group of peers

Discussion within the appointments panel proved to be important in reconciling the differences and disagreements amongst ourselves, and in learning how others interpreted the interviews, from psychological profiling to impressionistic and intuitive. We also began at this stage to envisage several individuals interacting well with each other as a working team. The six appointed have some 140 years of teaching altogether with ten years as the least and none of them is in or seeks, as far as we know, further promotion.

Introduction to ethnographic methods was done over four two-hour sessions after school from March to June in preparation for gathering data at the start of the new school session in August. For these sessions we drew specifically on selected literature and some case study excerpts. Thus we covered interview approaches, the need for sensitivity to the emergence of data, theoretical refinement, styles of reporting and also an awareness of their ethnographic selves. To a large extent they were naturally attuned to much of this. They were well aware of the possibility that their very closeness to the action as teachers, particularly if they had some mentoring responsibility themselves, would become an ethical issue. They are eliciting data in their own styles with a knowledge of the immediate context.

From the outset the potential ethical dilemmas of their dual role - researching new teachers while also providing possible support - have been acknowledged and discussed. It was anticipated that there would be changing perceptions by colleagues (and by themselves) of their ‘new’ identity once they assume this rather singular position as researchers of some of these same colleagues. Being seen as respected and trustworthy by school colleagues does therefore become a fairly important criterion, reflecting an importance on the selection process that we had perhaps not adequately realized at the time.
They reported feeling ‘odd’ in suddenly not doing ‘teachery things’. Immediate colleagues were not slow to notice this ‘day off’ but such comments appear to have been delivered as friendly banter with some actual expression of interest in the research itself. They have had to organize themselves for this different kind of work, to protect the time given to them.

Current writing at MMU is looking at the ways in which teacher-researchers appropriate research methodological texts on reflexivity. These appropriations are undetermined and creative in ways that hitherto have been neglected by the literature. We take the view, therefore, that we need to think in more interesting ways about what is going on when one reading enters another and re-emerges with a claim to methodological warrant.

Early data supports our provisional theory i.e. support of colleagues, acceptance by children in classrooms, emotional aspects of beginning, orientation in new context, and so on. Continuing interrogation and analysis, however, has led to a provisional theorisation in terms of dimensions of the experience – formal/external; social/relational; physical/spatial; emotional. Interestingly, a cognitive dimension is more elusive and this will be pursued in ensuing interviews. In comparing this with our understanding of EPL amongst General Practitioners (from a current Doctoral study), we have begun to pick up a comparative strand earlier than initially planned. The national (Scottish) induction scheme itself (see SEED leaflet 2004) has revealed some unfortunate casualties in inappropriate placements of individuals, and an overload of anachronistic information from some local education authorities. One crucial bridge has been encountered: how to get at what and how new teachers learn. The teacher-researchers’ suggestion is to ask ‘how have you/do you think you have changed?’

b) job satisfaction as an example of indicator development

The development of the ‘jobsat’ indicator described here is seen as a broad template for the development of the other indicators, currently at earlier stages of development. A review of the job satisfaction literature indicates that most of the published research uses a standard type of job satisfaction instrument which lists job facets and asks the respondent to rate his or her level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with each of them separately. Starting with job satisfaction as a construct in occupational psychology research, we extended our search into teaching and then, for the purposes of the project, refined the design of the research instrument to target new teachers in their induction year. Within the frame of Herzberg’s two-factor theory, Fraser et al’s (1998) study of 250 primary and secondary teachers in Scotland and Nias’s (1981) study of 100 early career teachers in primary schools, the six teacher researchers involved in the project, all of whom were currently interviewing probationary teachers as part of the research, were asked to generate a list of the dimensions of a probationary teacher’s job about which they felt satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Satisfiers and dissatisfiers were generated separately. This resulted in 57 items (which contained duplications). Two teams of three teacher educators and a teacher researcher then examined the 57 items and sought to eliminate duplication. Each team proposed its own list of job facets. The teams and the researchers then compared the two lists and agreed on a consensus list. This list was then systematically compared with six previous studies of job satisfaction, generally and in teaching. This revealed a high degree of overlap with most of the job facets identified in previous studies. However, three facets cited in previous literature were not represented in the list generated by the teacher researchers: financial reward/salary; ability to exert influence over policies/procedures; promotion/career prospects. It is understandable why these facets would not be major sources of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction among teachers in their probationary year. Nevertheless, we decided to cover them to ensure as much convergent validity as possible with previous studies. New items were specially constructed (e.g. “Your salary as a probationary teacher”) or adapted from the original list generated by the teacher researchers (e.g. “The availability of permanent posts in your subject” to deal with career prospects).

The extended list of facets was assembled into a scale and reviewed by the six teacher researchers. The main changes they made were increases in the specificity of some of the facets and minor revisions to the wording of particular items. ‘Jobsat’ currently consists of 40 facets of teaching in the probationary year plus one item to rate satisfaction with the job as a whole. It is being pretested on over 200 probationary teachers in Scotland. This will be followed by statistical analysis of scale properties and the production of a final version.

3 Difficulties encountered

No difficulties have been encountered so far that have required any major adjustment to the plan. The process of appointing the teacher-researchers took up more time than anticipated. There were over 40 applications to be considered and two interview stages involving 32 on the long leet and 13 on the short leet.
The time spent on this process was a worthwhile investment as the six teachers appointed are proving to be a group of diligent, talented individuals who operate as a highly collegial team. They are becoming ever more central to the project in a variety of ways.

We were aware that liaison between collaborating institutions can be difficult in a number of respects. However, contact between Stirling and Manchester Metropolitan has been generally good from the proposal formulation through to contract and, importantly, current working relationships. We are in regular email contact and make use of ‘WebCT’ for electronic logging of and access to starter papers, notes of meetings and interview data. We also meet together every two months or so to discuss progress, clarify issues and talk about the data.

The extended team listed in the proposal has changed due to changes in personnel and commitments since it was accepted but there are others who have expressed interest and who we are happy to involve. Several staff have either attended and contributed to discussions on research design and development of indicators, benefited from RCBN seminars, assisted with ICT input or shown interest in an associated research project.

4 Changes in the research objectives or design

At this stage there are no material changes to the objectives or the design. The increase in number of T-R’s from four to six does not affect the design. If anything, it has improved the range of data collection and the strength of the research team. We have also called a meeting of Scottish local authorities in March 2005 so that a more formal basis for partnership with schools can be established. This was as a result of discussion within our Project Advisory Group and, although not specified in the proposal, is consistent with our need for user engagement at this critical stage of access to schools. From contact with local authority officers in the last month or so our impression is that this level of partnership may well prove to be more productive than we had anticipated.

5 updated schedule of research milestones

End December 2003: Teacher-Researchers and Research Fellows appointed

1) This was completed later than originally planned following agreement with Programme Director and ESRC on a January 2004 start instead of October 2003.
2) The process of advertising and interviews for the Teacher-Researchers took 1 month longer than anticipated but was completed by end of March 2004 in time to start induction meetings in April.
3) Appointments of research fellows were one and three months later than anticipated due to contract transitions

August 2004: Start Case Studies
These started at the planned time.

September 2004: Start to select and negotiate with Test Schools
On the advice of our Project Advisory Group a meeting with Local Authorities has been arranged for early March. Access will be discussed with them in the first instance rather than a direct approach to schools. Our informal discussions with users suggest that May/June 2005 would be the best time to meet with schools.

April 2005: Complete development of Test Instrument and Indicators
We are on course for this

May 2005: Cluster Conferences take place; Model adapted
As above, meetings with schools should take place in May/June 2005. We shall be guided by LA’s and schools on whether it is appropriate to meet in local clusters or one by one.

We accept that there is a degree of risk in presuming access to schools. We think we have minimised this as much as possible through:
- our good relations with schools and authorities in ITE and CPD
- proper consultation with the user community at all stages of the research
- piloting of indicators and discussion of intervention to minimise time demands
- guarantee of dissemination of findings to all LA’s and participating schools and the wider user community, taking account of their guidance

June 2005: Complete Case Studies; Start Longitudinal Data
We are on course for this August 2005: Start Test Phase 1
We are on course for this, subject to outcome of meetings with LA’s and schools

We see no reason at present to suggest that there will be any major slippage in the milestones below
April 2006: Apply Test Instrument and Indicators
May 2006: Start to extend Model to other Professions and Countries
June 2006: Complete Test Phase 1
August 2006: Start Test Phase 2
June 2007: Complete Test Phase 2
September 2007: Start final adaptation of Model; Feed in Longitudinal Data
March 2008: Complete Final Report

10. Highlights of the research:
The two main developments have been a) the emergence of the team of teacher-researchers as an increasingly crucial part of the research team, and b) the complexity of devising indicators which balance rigorous measurement with practical utility. The teacher-ethnographers have so far succeeded as a design concept beyond our expectations. They are well integrated into the team and have begun to influence how we organise our meetings and thinking about the project. There are grounds for thinking that their contribution will continue to evolve during the next few months in data analysis, contribution to writing and liaison with local authorities and schools. The job-satisfaction indicator has been piloted in several local authorities and appears to be both rigorous and practical. It is also new in that, as far as we know, it is the first of its kind to focus on beginners. The fact that it takes around ten minutes for new teachers to complete makes it of course an additional attraction to busy professionals. We are trying to achieve a similar level of attractiveness in our other indicators.

11. Key findings:
The following key findings are provisional and presented with the caveat that we are at the half-way point of the first phase of data collection. We have only recently begun to examine the data closely and so they may well be revised as we collect more data and subject this to further analysis.

The ethnographies in Scotland reveal an absence of reference to the standard for registration as a teacher in the ‘learning’ experience. We may obtain evidence of more explicit use of the standard in the remaining interviews, following engagement with the interim report in January, but already this has to be an important finding for policy on induction. In England too the profile appears to be unvalued by beginning teachers whose focus is more on short-term survival than career.

The main dimensions of the experience can be provisionally categorised as formal or external input; social/relational; physical/spatial; emotional. Interestingly there is little evidence to support a cognitive dimension though this is about to be explored further in interviews and as a comparative issue for EPL in other professions.

Informal Learning as a concept has been useful in that it has, as it were, opened up the research to the above dimensions which accommodate the idea of personal change in new teachers as they form their new professional identity.

12. Warrant:
The findings are so far based on over 60 interviews with 20 new teachers conducted by teacher-researchers who are members of the communities they are researching. The emotional and relational nature of the learning experience of new teachers is broadly corroborated by various other qualitative studies in the literature (e.g. Eraut 2004; Hargreaves 1998) though the scale of our study allows a more sustained interrogation of the interview data and the holistic, nuanced nature of reported experience.

We may be able to offer evidence on which parts of the standard matter to beginners. For example, in some of the interviews a recurring theme is about living with and learning about difference – between classes taught and in getting to know and understand children as individuals. There is no obvious match between the way in which this is expressed and any specific competence or benchmark statement, bound up as it is in emotions and relationships.
13. Publications during 2004:


14. Publications in press/preparation:

We are at the stage of developing the above internal starter papers and conference papers from our first year’s work for submission to refereed journals during 2005.

15. D-Space deposition:

Deposited on D-Space on 28 January 2005.

16. Hard copy deposition:

Hard copy sent on 31st January 2005.

17. Programme badging:

Badging for both ESRC and TLRP has been included on all outputs to the best of my knowledge.

18. Enrichment activities:

The project is based on multiple methods. It will generate grounded theory from ethnographic case studies with ‘users’ as researchers and test this out in a quasi-experimental design using quantitative indicators. Collaboration is initially within the UK but will extend to other European countries in the final stage. We have submitted a symposium proposal to ECER on early professional learning that has contributions from Scandinavia and Southern Ireland as well as England and Scotland. Although our work is still in its early stages, we have participated in a number of seminars and discussions across the programme – eliciting tacit knowledge, work-based learning and identity, early career development in the professions; supported Northern Irish and Welsh TLRP extension bids; agreed to contribute to ESRC seminar series. The development of the ‘children’s descriptions’ indicator is being led by MMU where it is linked to a congruent and associated TTA project on pupil perspectives.

Based on sample of two RF’s and six TRs – 100%

19. Capacity building activities:

The project has an extended team who are invited to meetings about design and data discussion. Three colleagues have taken advantage of RCBN activities. Perhaps the main beneficiaries have been the teacher-researchers whose interest and confidence appears to have noticeably developed since their tentative beginnings. They will be presenting initial papers on the research at an internal conference in early February and later that month at a RCBN seminar.

Our collective rating is ‘good’ – indeed better than ‘good’

20. Users participating in empirical work:

The six teachers working as ethnographers represent the principal ‘user participation’. We have also consulted teacher-fellows on our ITE Programme on the design of indicators. The next stage of the project is
heavily dependent on engaging local authorities and schools as partners, although we have already received high levels of co-operation from LA’s.

21. Users providing strategic advice:

Strategic advice is sought formally through the Project Advisory Group which consists mainly of practitioners in schools and local authorities, is chaired by a local headteacher and meets twice a year. We have followed their advice in preparing for the critical next stage of the project. Should we come through this successfully we shall be in a position to consult on a much wider basis about future dissemination and impact.

22. Advisory Group and critical friends:

Membership of Project Advisory Group

Lisa Bagley (New Teacher – St Modan’s High School), Mairi Breen (Headteacher – Braehead Primary), Andrew Burnett (New Teacher – Balwearie High School), Ken Currie (Education Officer – Falkirk Council), Claire Findlay (New Teacher – St Modan’s High School), Linda Horsburgh (Headteacher – Wallace High School), Lesley Low (Teaching Fellow – University of Stirling), Danny Murphy (Headteacher – Lornshill Academy & Chair of PAG), Dean Robson (Research Fellow – GTCS), Lesley Saunders (Research Policy Adviser – GTCE), John Siraj-Blatchford (Associate Director – TLRP), Phil Siwerczek (PT – St Mungo’s High School & EPL Teacher-Researcher).

Our main contact has been with John Siraj-Blatchford from the Directors’ Team. In addition to ICT advice at the start, our main discussions have been at the first meeting of the PAG in May 2004 and then at the Annual TLRP Conference at Cardiff. We expect to extend this consultation to our critical friends in the Steering Committee in 2005.

Next meeting of PAG is 23 March 2005 at 1.30 pm in University of Stirling – we shall communicate future meetings to critical friends once decided.

23. Impact strategies:

Our impact on users so far has been on the teacher-researchers and their schools, where there appears to be a degree of genuine interest. We have also presented to the Scottish Executive and to SERA, BERA and ECER Research Conferences. However, the main step towards impact will be taken during the March-June period of 2005 when the project moves into its test phase in collaboration with local authorities and schools.

24. User engagement, impact or communication events:

The main impact has been in the regular meetings with the teacher-researchers in preparation, as stated above in 23, for the intervention in the test phase.

25. Potential media stories:

The T-R ‘story’ may be of media interest and we hope to have video footage soon. Engagement with the Standard/Profile – or rather the absence of – may be of media interest for its potential controversy.

26. Progress of, and towards, outputs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key expectations</th>
<th>Formally scheduled date</th>
<th>Actual anticipated date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of project</td>
<td>31/12/07</td>
<td>31/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update of project website (regularly)</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on project’s user registrations on TLRP database (regularly)</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media training (c12 months)</td>
<td>31/12/06</td>
<td>31/12/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date 1</td>
<td>Date 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Summit Meeting (c12 months before End)</td>
<td>31/12/06</td>
<td>31/12/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for ‘Improving Learning’ book to publisher via DT (c6 months before End)</td>
<td>30/6/07</td>
<td>30/6/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Research Briefing (3 months before End)</td>
<td>30/9/07</td>
<td>30/9/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key user events (c6 months either side of End)</td>
<td>30/6/07 – 30/6/08</td>
<td>30/6/07 – 30/6/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video asset production (before End)</td>
<td>30/12/07</td>
<td>30/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report to ESRC (3 months after End)</td>
<td>31/3/08</td>
<td>31/3/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript handover of ‘Improving Learning’ book (6 months after End)</td>
<td>30/6/08</td>
<td>30/6/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Inter-project liaison:

We have made contact (or are about to) with certain projects: Early Career Learning (Eraut et al) in both findings and in how to elicit tacit knowledge; Consulting Pupils about Teachers based at Cambridge on designing our indicator of children’s descriptions of teachers.

28. Thematic contributions:

We have participated in the first of the inter-project meetings on Workplace Learning and Identity and have agreed to contribute a paper to the ESRC seminar series on Teachers’ Roles, Identities and Professionalism (C-TRIP).

29. Other programme engagement:

We have attended one inter-project seminar series on work-based identity (as above) and will develop more connections in 2005 as findings develop.

30. Formative Programme evaluation:

Again, our comments are based on recent engagement with the Programme. However, our early experience is favourable. We have welcomed the opportunities to meet and learn from others at different stages and working in different areas – many of which have been more closely related to our own work than we first thought. The Programme Team clearly put in an enormous amount of work to facilitate these meetings and to encourage synergy. There is a great deal to absorb in relation to procedures and expectations but the emphasis on generating new knowledge is clearly there.

Again better than ‘good’

31. Requests for Programme support:

We expect to test this more in 2005. So far support has been there when needed.

32. Confidential annex (optional):

None
Summarising reminders:

All 2004 outputs which are available in electronic form should be appropriately deposited within D-space.

Please also send two hardcopies of each output to Andrew Pollard, TLRP, University of London, Institute of Education, Bedford Way, London, WC1H OAL.

Your completed progress report should be forwarded electronically to three people:

1. Gary Grubb, gary.grubb@esrc.ac.uk
2. Andrew Pollard, a.pollard@ioe.ac.uk
3. The member of the Directors’ Team who acts as your ‘DT critical friend’.

The depositions should be made and the report sent no later than **Monday 31st January 2005**.

Thank you!